

Future of UC Resource Sharing Report

Appendices

[Appendix A: Future of UC Resource Sharing Project Team Membership](#)

[Appendix B: Charge of Future of UC Resource Sharing Team](#)

[Appendix C: 2013 ILL Environmental Scan](#)

[Appendix D: Final List of Requirements](#)

[Appendix E: RFI Questions and Rankings](#)

[Appendix F: Project Timeline](#)

[Appendix G: 2015 ILL User Satisfaction Survey Analysis Report](#)

[Appendix H: UC Supplementary Tools and Equipment](#)

[Appendix I: Requirements Voting Instructions](#)

[Appendix J: Compiled Requirements Survey Responses](#)

Appendix A: Future of UC Resource Sharing Project Team Membership

Judea d'Arnaud (Resource Sharing Expert Representative)

Head of Interlibrary Loan

UC San Diego

Joe Ferrie (CDL Technical Representative)

Discovery & Delivery Services Senior Developer

California Digital Library

Tara Gooden (Resource Sharing Expert Representative)

Head of Interlibrary Loan

UC Santa Cruz

Jennifer Lee (Project Team Convenor, ILL Common Knowledge Group Chair)

Head of Interlibrary Loans

UCLA

Caitlin Nelson (CDL Resource Sharing Product Management Representative)

Discovery & Delivery Services Product Manager

California Digital Library

Elizabeth Salmon (Public Services Representative)

Head of Access Services

UC Merced

Bala Balakumar (UCOP Purchasing Liaison)

Commodity Manager

UC Office of the President

Sarah Troy (DOC Liaison)

Head of User Services & Resource Sharing

UC Santa Cruz

Appendix B: Charge of Future of UC Resource Sharing Team

Future of UC Resource Sharing Project Team Charge - August 28, 2015

At ALA 2015, OCLC made clear that they will stop support for VDX and has a migration plan for moving to Worldshare ILL that extends for approximately 30 months. It is not clear, though that UC's VDX product replacement needs will be satisfied by WorldShare ILL. Given UC's complex ILL and document delivery services and needs, a suitable replacement set of services should be identified and implemented. This project team has the responsibility to think strategically about the shifting landscape for resource sharing and look for a set of services that will position UC for the future.

VDX is software managed and supported by CDL; it is deeply entwined with 2 other services developed and maintained by CDL. The first is PIR (Patron Initiated Request) and the second is the Request service. Any consideration of a replacement for VDX needs to be informed by the full set of services that are involved. The Project Team should engage with the CDL team responsible for these services to fully understand them and the role they play.

SAG 2 believes the time is right to form a Resource Sharing Project Team to look at our options for a replacement set of services for the following reasons:

- There is widespread dissatisfaction among the UC Libraries with VDX.
- VDX is being sunsetted; and it will be a lengthy process to identify a suitable suite of services as well as launch formal procurement processes
- New resource sharing services are emerging such as RapidILL, Relais, and others.
- The UC Libraries have new emerging service needs, among them Shared Print, and eBooks lending. This is not an exhaustive list.

AREAS TO CONSIDER

1. Understand the suite of services provided by CDL that are closely integrated with VDX – PIR and REQUEST). PIR and Request are also closely entwined with the discovery layer (currently, WorldCat Local) and subsequently entwined as well with campus ILS systems. This is an area that should be paid attention to, to avoid scope creep. If the Project Team finds it must address the discovery layer, it should report that to SAG 2 (or successor group) for guidance.
2. As background, the Project Team should refer to the environmental scan completed in 2013 by the Resource Sharing Committee and Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group.
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/ILL_Environmental_%20Scan_May_2013.pdf)
3. Survey the campuses to see what additional resource sharing tools they use, and which ones fill needs not met by VDX in order to identify a full set of requirements.
4. Consider UC wide ILL survey results from the ILL CKG to see if any desired features are expressed by our users. (need pointer when current report is made available, current target is late September, 2015)
5. Gather a list of requirements from both the systemwide and campus perspectives.
6. Perform an environmental scan of available Resource Sharing applications.
7. Review products that will provide a balance between systemwide and local needs and configuration.

DELIVERABLES

- Make a recommendation(s) for a new suite of Resource Sharing services. Please note that any recommendations that involve a purchase would go through Purchasing procedures, for example, RFI, RFPs or Sole Source Justification review.

TIMELINE

Team forms in September 2015, reviews charge and membership

Gathers requirements and performs environmental scan by Dec. 31, 2015

Evaluates products and make recommendation by March. 31, 2016

MEMBERSHIP

- CDL Product Manager, Resource Sharing – Caitlin Nelson
- CDL Technical consultant – Joe Ferrie
- Chair of ILL CKG (currently, Jenny Lee) Jenny Lee, Convenor
- 2 other ILL experts from different campuses
 - Judea D'Arnaud
 - Tara Gooden
- Public services librarian – Elizabeth Salmon
- SAG 2 liaison (or successor) - TBD

Appendix C: 2013 ILL Environmental Scan

Interlibrary Loan Environmental Scan May 2013

I. EXPLANATION

Interlibrary Loan (ILL) combines software and workflow processes to ensure that interlibrary lending and borrowing are both timely and accurate – that users get the research materials they need when they need them.

The Resource Sharing Committee (RSC) and Interlibrary Loan Advisory Group (IAG) are charged through the UC Libraries' System-wide Operations and Planning Advisory Group (SOPAG). As part of their charge, each group is tasked to identify the current and future landscape for Interlibrary Loan. RSC in its charge "identifies and analyzes resource sharing innovations, strategies and trends." IAG in its charge "monitor[s] national trends in resource sharing."

There are several reasons to analyze and monitor resource sharing trends at this time:

- (1) The software currently used for consortial borrowing, OCLC's VDX product, is being retired in 2016; OCLC has not yet explained the replacement product.
- (2) Other consortia are exploring and pioneering new software options.
- (3) Vendors are announcing new products.
- (4) As more items are shared electronically, the dynamics of resource sharing are changing.
- (5) When the advisory structure for the UC Libraries changes as of July 1, 2013, RSC and IAG will cease to exist in their present forms.

The members of RSC and IAG felt this was an important moment to capture a snapshot of the Interlibrary Loan environment and set a framework for any successor groups to continue the ILL environmental scanning process.

II. PARTICIPATION AND PROCESS

The Interlibrary Loan Environmental Scan group met in March and April 2013. Members of the group came from both RSC and IAG:

Scott Hathaway, UCSB

Jennifer Lee, UCLA

Gerry Lopez, UCI

Jason Newborn, UCD

Andres Panado, UCSF

Charlotte Rubens, UCB

Leslie Wolf, CDL

The group chose as its mission to survey the ILL environment in a neutral fashion, without a bias for or against products currently used at UC Libraries. Members did not talk to vendors, examine products, or conduct user satisfaction surveys. The scan focused primarily on these key areas:

- (1) Outlining ILL trends and new software products that should be watched as a possible trigger for change in the UC Libraries;
- (2) Recording currently used software features and functions – or wished-for functionality – that might inform a product search in the future.

This report was reviewed and approved by the full membership of both RSC and IAG.

III. RECOMMENDATION

The Interlibrary Loan Environmental Scan group recommends:

- (1) The list of trends should be monitored regularly for possible triggers to action.
- (2) No action should be taken at this time to examine products and services outside the UC Libraries' current product set.
- (3) This report should be owned by the successor group(s) to RSC and IAG.
- (4) The scan should be repeated at least every year to ensure that UC maintains awareness of important trends in the Interlibrary Loan space. At some point, it will be appropriate to investigate new products that might serve the UC Libraries' changing needs.

IV. APPENDICES

The environmental surveys can be found in the Appendices below:

Appendix A: Possible Triggers for Action

Appendix B: ILL Current Functions and Tasks

Appendix C: ILL Wish List of Functions and Tasks

Appendix D: Potential Vendors of Interlibrary Loan Products and Services

Environmental Scan Appendix A: Possible Triggers for Action

#	Topic	Key Information	Comments on Potential Risks or Benefits
A-1	UC Libraries are planning to investigate a consortial ILS	As of April 2013, the UL's are planning to charge SOPAG with investigating a consortial ILS for the UC Libraries.	Moving to a Consortia ILS, or having a more tightly integrated ILL system (i.e. one that could transmit and share circ/bib data) would result in a dramatic reduction of workload and costs, as units wouldn't have to dual-enter circ transactions or bib information if the next-gen system would be able to handle that.
A-2	Other organizations are moving to a consortial ILS	<p>Orbis Cascade: http://orbiscascade.org/index/shared-ils-implementation 10/9/12: The Orbis Cascade Alliance is implementing a new library management service to be shared by all 37 members of the consortium. Following an extensive RFP process, in July 2012 the Council of library directors decided in to enter into a contract with Ex Libris for Alma (selection, acquisition, metadata management, digitization, and fulfillment) and Primo (discovery). The Alliance expects implementation to proceed in four cohorts of approximately 9 member libraries over a two-year period beginning in January 2013. Project lead: Lynn Chmelir, Shared ILS Implementation Manager, (360) 771-4555, lchmelir@orbiscascade.org We can follow the progress of the Orbis Cascade Alliance as they develop policies and implement Ex Libris ALMA & PRIMO, although we cannot link to their confidential material. Some form of "Circulation and Resource Sharing" appears as a section in the <i>Updates</i> for each week: http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/shared-ils-implementation</p>	Orbis-Cascade's move is a game-changer. They have selected a new integrated product set. UC is closely watching Orbis-Cascade.
A-3	What are other VDX consortia customers planning for the future? What systems are they looking at?	<p>The following people would be a good resource to inquire about what they're planning for their future.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Becky Reingwelski - University of Minnesota – Minitex e-ring@UMN.EDU <p>Response from Becky to Jenny Lee's email: I am concerned about the ZPortal interface for the end users. I don't think we can wait three more years for a mobile interface, etc. I am also aware of advances in ILL interfaces and workflow within other products. Our contract</p>	If we can follow how another large consortium does its analysis and decision-making, we can leverage their work in any analysis we do.

		<p>expires in 2015 and we'll need to go through an RFP process at that time. That's what will drive a change or decision to stay with OCLC.</p> <p>There aren't many options for consortial resource sharing. I expect that we would have a good response to our RFP when we put that out. Perhaps by then there will be more systems on the market.</p> <p>2. Trish Palluck - Wyoming State Library - wslill@will.state.wy.us</p> <p>Response from Trish to Jenny Lee's email:</p> <p>I would like to think that WYLD libraries will continue on with VDX until OCLC WorldShare ILL has all the functionality that we have come to appreciate in VDX. But I am concerned on how long if ever it will take for that happen.</p> <p>I realize WYLD is unique in our configuration of VDX. Requests for items that are not in their library are sent by way of an email msg to VDX. The bibliographic information and patron information is captured and the request form is auto populated from the msg. We are sending request to OCLC through ISO. When we first started this process it was working beautifully. I'm not sure what has changed but we are having more and more problems. Frequently statuses are not updated in VDX. Many requests are having to be manipulated manually in OCLC. Very frustrating. We are looking at the limited options for when VDX does go away.</p> <p>Our ILS is SIRSI/DYNIX and they really do not have plans for an ILL module. I have considered taking a look at ILLIAD. I need to see what is out there in the way of open source ILL software. We currently have a statewide group contract with OCLC for WCRS. However WCRS is considered our secondary system since the majority of our transactions are handled from VDX library to VDX library. OCLC is used only for out of state requests.</p> <p>I hate to think of the cost for having only WorldShare ILL. Guess the bottom line is we really are not sure where we are going but are investigating some options.</p>	
A-4	Greater Western Library Alliance announced selection of Relais D2D to enhance resource sharing (press release 4/18/13)	The Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA), a consortium of 33 academic research libraries located in the central and western United States has selected Relais D2D to facilitate resource sharing among the member libraries. Relais D2D (Discovery to Delivery) is a next-generation software platform from Relais International and Index Data. Patrons	This is interesting news about a newish Relais product. GWLA has an impressive list of state, private and research universities, including the U. of Arizona, U. of Colorado, etc.). This may make Relais a player, as

		from GWLA libraries will search across the member library catalogs simultaneously and request circulating items directly from any partner library.	this product develops. However, it does not appear to be an integrated library system, since it assumes existence of a catalog, but rather a document discovery and fulfillment option.
A-5	We don't know anything about the roadmap for "Son of VDX" (WorldShare ILL)	What is OCLC planning to do with the "Son of VDX" (WorldShare ILL) and how many products are they merging into one? The replacement for consortial VDX will not be implemented till 2015 or 2016.	Lack of detailed plans and explanation of how consortial VDX will be handled is of great concern.
A-6	OCLC shared some roadmap information at ALA Midwinter 2013	OCLC (Mindy and Katie) presented on their plans for transforming discovery and the roadmap for ILL. All of this is related to introducing their platform services, and by August, they will have tighter integration with Article Exchange; display links to open access resources; display supplier cost information in holdings; and support variable lender aging. As part of updating the roadmap, they will be looking at alternative workflows and fulfillment profiles, and are looking to make IFM available to content providers such as Amazon, Barnes & Noble and Better World Books.	Since all of the campus use OCLC products, it is important to keep present with their developing roadmap regarding discovery and delivery.
A-7	We learned some information about ISO at ALA Midwinter 2013	Clare MacKeigan from Relais talked about the Future of Interoperability, and the fact that a new ISO standard is developing, as USI 10160 and 10161 are very outdated (from 1993). In order to encourage widespread adoption by vendors, it needs to be kept simple, concentrate on a set of common messages, based on current web services, and "stateless," to avoid some of the problems encountered with implementation of ISO ILL v.2. Note from Charlotte Rubens: at Midwinter, Clare mentioned possible adoption in February, but the latest information from ISO does not indicate a completed vote. Whatever is decided, it will probably have some (unknown as of now) effect on our future...have a look: http://www.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/10311/N854_ILL_Standards_development.pdf	Since UC has made ISO compliance a requirement, but many vendors do not adhere, depending on how the new standards are developed and implemented, and how system vendors respond, this may or may not be good news. We need to continue to track it.
A-8	We are watching the proceedings of the 44th Annual Colorado ILL Conference April 2013	http://coill.cvlites.org/ - the conference is April 18 - 19 2013. There will be a lot of discussion on the future of ILL. We should review the meeting proceedings when they are published.	
A-9	Shared print initiatives are changing our needs (WEST may be only one of many programs)	We are already seeing the effects of the developing WEST agreement on ILL Units, as we need to be able to efficiently discern which materials may be only copied, scanned or loaned. In addition, we need to be able to know at the point of requesting or receiving a request, what the specifics of	Any collaborative agreements will affect ILL (and Circulation) workflows and effectiveness, and may also affect revenue, depending on the agreement.

		<p>the agreement with the other library are, so we can efficiently interact in a timely manner, whether lending or borrowing.</p> <p>In addition, policies and procedures regarding not only request fulfillment, but replacement, etc. must be easily discernible and effectively implemented for UC to gain the advantages such collaborations can bring. Finally, a new ILS should be able to provide statistics for WEST, and any other new initiatives, that use our resource sharing services.</p>	
A-10	Campuses are already using Patron Driven Acquisition, Purchase on Demand or Just in Time Purchasing	<p>1. Alibris is already in use and has the advantage of very easy integration with existing ILL workflows.</p> <p>2. Tighter integration or exportation with local purchasing plans is desirable</p> <p>1. Solutions like Alibris, because they are entirely divorced from the standard library acquisitions process present a risk of duplication, particularly in light of increasing use of highly automated purchasing plans. A solution that allows both tight integration with acquisitions and the speed and user-request-centric approach of ILL is desirable.</p> <p>2. Another problem with Alibris as a solution is the issue of funding. Alibris requests route the cost into the ILL budget. To use a similar solution for more expensive publications it would be necessary to have greater flexibility for funding.</p> <p>3. YBP eliminates a lot of the concerns of buying with Alibris (duplication, allows you to see what the consortia who use YBP has purchased, what was slipped, etc.</p>	As the UC system moves toward a unified purchasing strategy in the area of monographs, it will increasingly become appropriate to initiate purchasing based on immediate patron demand. ILL is the place where such demand surfaces and has traditionally been filled.
A-11	UC is looking at Publisher or Commercial based article and document delivery	<p>ILL units have been finding that if a journal is too expensive for the UC system it is often too expensive for everyone – so no one has it to loan or copy articles. The same reasoning extends to titles licensed with embargo periods (electronic access to issues more the 6 or 12 months old, etc.). Purchase on demand for scholarly articles direct from the publisher or from a commercial provider might fill this need. However most campuses frown on the use of departmental credit cards for small purchases. The accountability infrastructure is too heavy for the traffic rate of ILL or document delivery. There are a couple of projects that might bridge this gap.</p> <p>1. Copyright clearance center's "Get-It-Now" program</p> <p>2. deepdyve.com</p>	As the UC system moves toward more aggressive price negotiations (and therefore more aggressive value assessment) in the area of journal subscriptions, it will increasingly be necessary to provide reliable, piecemeal access to the articles of certain scholarly journals.
A-12	We need to work with vendors, standards organizations or others to develop a universal reader or program of	We may have the permissions to “lend” ebooks, but very little of it happens because it is so difficult and labor-intensive, often requiring we print or send a chapter at a time, essentially requiring electronic re-binding or constructing of a work.	We should be leveraging the amount we are spending on purchasing ebooks to allow us to lend them (grant access) as we can any physical book we purchase, in accord with

	some kind to allow simple, efficient "borrowing" and "lending" of ebooks (i.e. granting access), irrespective of the ebook vendor.	<p>We need to be able to easily identify the books for which we have permission (i.e. within the received request) and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have an easy way to grant access to ("lend" or "borrow") an electronic item for a designated amount of time 2. Be able to send the item (or directions for access) to our patron without making them load a different reader, depending on the item's vendor's format 3. Be able to renew or extend the amount of time the patron can view the item, if agreeable with the "lender" or as a lender, be able to terminate the ability to read it after the "due date." <p>In other words, we have to make it as easy to "lend" and "borrow" ebooks as it is to do so with physical items (or actually easier and less expensive, since it would not involve packaging and mailing a physical item).</p>	the "Fair Use" doctrine and complying with copyright law.
A-13	RUSA STARS is generating new ideas about Rethinking Resource Sharing	<p>We should be looking at materials and ideas being generated by colleagues outside of the UC's, to see if there are any ideas we are not already implementing which would benefit our users. Re-visit the Rethinking Resource Sharing/STARS Checklist:</p> <p>http://rethinkingresourcesharing.org/?page_id=23</p> <p>Beth Posner (Head of ILL Services, CUNY Graduate Center) gave a solid presentation at the 2012 NW ILL Conference on RUSA STARS. May be worth taking a look:</p> <p>http://www.nwill.org/sites/default/files/nwillrsc@nwill.org/sites/nwill.org/html/conferences/2012/Checklist-BethPosner_1.pptx</p>	
A-14	These are some relevant conferences to watch	<p>ALA Midwinter and Annual</p> <p>Northwest ILL Conference (September)</p> <p>Colorado ILL Conference (April)</p> <p>Roundup of conferences:</p> <p>http://www.shareill.org/index.php?title=Conferences</p>	

Environmental Scan Appendix B: ILL Current Functions and Tasks

Representatives from the ten University of California campus, and the two RLF, ILL units voted High, Medium, or Low on the importance of the current tasks and functions available in VDX. The accumulative votes have been recorded. Some reps voted "Not Applicable" if the task or function was perceived as not affecting the units' workflow. The "N/A" votes were not recorded in the total.

#	BORROWING	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
B-1	Receive data input from REQUEST and UC-eLinks, create ILL request and potential rota/lender string based on Melvyl holdings and REQUEST algorithms.	10	0	0
B-2	Automatic interaction/ILL transaction with OCLC when UC suppliers not available.	10	0	0
B-3	Filter building / filter saving.	10	0	0
B-4	Printable, formattable reports for statistical collection, or based on disposition of requests(Standard Book Band, Received List, Returned List, etc).	10	0	0
B-5	Check/respond to messages between local campus and other UC campuses.	10	0	0
B-6	Patron alerting (ability to send formatted emails directly from system to patron—staff initiated or driven by disposition of requests).	10	0	0
B-7	Perform regular statistics (interface with statistical application such as jReports).	10	0	0
B-8	Real time messaging with OCLC via ISO or related/replacement protocols.	9	1	0
B-9	Receive articles from lending institutions and forward to campus borrowers (document delivery).	9	1	0
B-10	Categorical work queue based on status and/or disposition of requests.	8	2	0
B-11	Consortia: ILL transactions amongst UC libraries without using intermediate database/system such as OCLC (i.e., consortial database).	7	3	0
B-12	Patron interaction with ILL system (ability to query and monitor their own requests, submit renewal requests, etc).	7	3	0
B-13	Search bibliographic/holdings databases (such as Melvyl) and create new requests by importing records from these databases.	4	6	0

#	LENDING	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
B-14	Receive/print "picklist" (new lending requests only).	12	0	0
B-15	Receive incoming borrowing requests from OCLC/i.e. interface with OCLC.	11	0	1
B-16	Check/respond to messages between local campus and other UC campuses.	10	2	0
B-17	Categorical work queue based on status and/or disposition of requests.	9	3	0
B-18	Document delivery.	9	3	0
B-19	DOCFIND RESPONDER: search local holdings for incoming OCLC borrowing requests and direct to correct ILL unit (for brokering campuses).	6	5	0
B-20	Check email and process new local document delivery requests (e.g. at UCSF, it will be Document Express).Forward to Borrowing, if necessary.	3	7	1
B-21	Resend articles due to a variety of reasons (not received, bad email, bad transmission, etc.).	0	12	0

Environmental Scan Appendix C: ILL Wish List of Functions and Tasks

Representatives from the ten University of California campus, and the two RLF, ILL units voted High, Medium, or Low on the importance or desirability of potential features of systems that affect ILL processing or patron experience. Some reps voted "Not Applicable" if the task or function was perceived as not affecting the units' workflow. The "N/A" votes were not recorded in the total.

#	TASK OR FUNCTION	CATEGORY	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW
C-1	Greater flexibility in patron alerting: ability to create complete ad hoc message, send attachment with message, CC another email address.	ILL	11	0	0
C-2	Ability to work in conjunction with ILS/local circulation interface (NCIP? Or whatever may be in place).	ILL / ILS	11	1	0
C-3	Built in acquisitions function or reporting (part of enhance statistical reporting?).	ILL / STATISTICS	11	1	0
C-4	Enhanced filter building/filter saving— filters for stats, copyright reports, etc.	ILL / STATISTICS	11	1	0
C-5	Ability for patrons to request multiple requests at one time.	REQUEST	10	2	0
C-6	A more dynamic, intelligent and flexible statistical package is required. In addition to our ILL reporting responsibilities we need to be able to handle reports for copyright compliance and for our collection development librarians. Also, special initiatives (WEST as an example) will need to rely on our statistical reports as well.	STATISTICS	10	1	1
C-7	ILL system able to interface with OCLC Article Exchange.	ILL	9	3	0
C-8	Enhanced document delivery capabilities: built in scanning software; ability to send attachment to desired email address or IP (lender delivery to non-UC locations), or FTP retrieval for patrons or campuses outside the UC community.	ILL	9	3	0
C-9	Invoicing (ability to create invoices directly from the ILL management system).	ILL	8	3	0
C-10	Improved location finding in Availability Query, limit or improve searching across series titles; capability to recognize online journals.	REQUEST	8	4	0
C-11	ILL system able to interface with Docline/Lonesome Doc services.	ILL	4	3	3
C-12	Ability for borrowing libraries (that do not use OCLC ILL or are not part of the UC consortia) to fill out and submit a request form that upon submission would input a request to the potential lenders within the UC consortia. NOTE: current example is the Canadian	ILL	3	8	1

	"Colombo ILL" system: http://www.mcgill.ca/library/library-using/otherloans/colombo				
C-13	Ability to forward ILL requests by either directly sending formatted email requests to target libraries, or perhaps interfacing with other consortia systems (for instances when potential lenders do not use OCLC ILL).	ILL	2	10	0
C-14	Ability to securely store patron credit card or recharge information	ILL	1	5	5

Environmental Scan Appendix D: Potential Vendors of Interlibrary Loan Products and Services

1. Clio

<http://www.cliosoftware.com/>

2. Evergreen

<http://evergreen-ils.org/>

3. ExLibris

<http://www.exlibrisgroup.com/>

4. ILLiad/Odyssey

<http://www.atlas-sys.com/illiad/>

<http://www.atlas-sys.com/odyssey/>

5. Innovative Interfaces, Inc.

<http://www.iii.com/>

6. OCLC WordShare ILL (successor to VDX) (successor to WCRS)

<https://www.oclc.org/support/training/portfolios/resource-sharing/worldshare-ill.en.html>

7. OCLC WorldShare Management Services (WMS)

<https://www.oclc.org/worldshare-management-services.en.html>

8. Relais

<http://www.relais-intl.com/>

Appendix D: Final List of Requirements

Note: Requirements pertaining to VDX only were taken off the final list. Some requirements were moved to technical or system requirements.

General Requirements		
I. Types of Processes		
A	1	Types of processes: System directly supports CNR materials (usually digital copies, possibly paper copies).
A	2	Types of processes: System directly supports physical loans.
A	3	Types of processes: System directly supports borrowing and lending of ebooks.
A	4	Types of processes: System directly supports borrowing and lending of electronic articles.
II. Consortial Requirements		
A	1	Consortial Reqs: System supports ILL transactions amongst UC libraries without using intermediate database/system such as OCLC (i.e., consortial database).
A	2	Consortial Reqs: System is able to check UC-system availability before checking worldwide availability.
III. General System Requirements		
A	1	General Reqs: System is under active development, with plans for active development.
A	2	General Reqs: System has an active user community (active listservs, forums, or other communication tools; active development partners).
A	3	General Reqs: Tutorials, wikis, or other training tools are provided to users.
A	4	System has the capability for consumer-developed add-ons and customizations.
Hosting / Management		
B	1	Hosting / Management: System is hosted in the cloud by vendor / provider. (CDL does not locally host.)
B	2	Hosting / Management: Local installation of the client software is unnecessary; admin user interface is available via the web.
B	3	Hosting / Management: Vendor support staff (including development staff as appropriate) are available for regular meetings with CDL staff.
Migration Support		
C	1	Migration: Vendor staff (development staff in particular) are available for support in migration from VDX to new system.

Technical Requirements		
IV. System Use		
A	1	System Use: System allows multiple (40 plus) instances to be in use simultaneously (various people doing different actions).
A	2	System Use: Article delivery system can accommodate large electronic files.
A	3	System Use: Placing a request: System can process both ILL and DDS requests.
Administration		
B	1	User Accounts: System supports multiple levels of privileges for different users (e.g. admins can create / modify / delete requests while non-privileged users (students) can only create).
B	2	User Accounts: An administrative user can create / modify / delete other accounts; campus admin users can create accounts at their campus level.
B	3	User Accounts: An admin user can lock/save request so only one user can edit it at a time.
B	4	User Accounts: System provides an admin interface for modifying campus messaging and configuration.
Locations		
C	1	Locations: System supports multiple unit locations per campus.
C	2	Locations: System supports the addition of virtual / "dummy" locations (for ad hoc / testing / special projects).
Requests		
D	1	Requests: System allows batch updating of requests.

Filtering and Searching		
E	1	Filtering and Searching: System has a robust mechanism for customizing, filtering, and sorting queries for requests.
E	2	Filtering and Searching: System has ability to save and edit filtered data searches (analogous to "saved searches" in VDX).
E	3	Filtering and Searching: System has ability to dynamically compile results of a saved filtered data search into a displayed work queue (analogous to "published searches" in VDX).
E	4	Filtering and Searching: System allows for diacritics, non-western fonts, and irregular formats in searches. (e.g. as seen in Arabic, Armenian, or CJK titles).
Communication		
F	1	Communication: System has a flexible / customizable institution & patron alerting feature.
F	2	Communication: Lending staff can send ad hoc outgoing messages.
F	3	Communication: Lending staff can send attachment with an outgoing message.
F	4	Communication: Lending staff can CC another email address on an outgoing message.
F	5	Communication: Staff can send messages to local DDS patrons.
F	6	Communication: Text messages can be sent directly from the system to patrons (automatic or ad hoc).
F	7	Communication: Formatted emails can be sent directly from system to patron (automatic or ad hoc).
F	8	Communication: Staff can respond to Conditional messages received from OCLC.
F	9	Communication: System enables communication in OCLC while the request is live, without breaking the ISO.
F	10	Communication: Staff can create an unlimited number of alerts.
V. System Tech Requirements		
Accessibility / Compatibility		
A	1	Accessibility / Compatibility: System follows accessibility design best practices (e.g. accommodates visual, hearing, and motor impairments in users).
A	2	Accessibility / Compatibility: System is Unicode compliant (e.g. correctly processes characters from Asian languages).
A	3	Accessibility / Compatibility: System is compatible with Windows and Mac operating systems for local installations, if necessary.
A	4	Accessibility / Compatibility: System is compatible with the latest versions of Internet Explorer, Chrome, and Firefox.
Security		
B	1	Security: The retention and storage of patron data is done in compliance with UC policy.
B	2	Security: The vendor commits to maintaining data security to the latest industry standards.
VI. Systems Integration / Interoperability		
A	1	Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with OCLC Article Exchange.
A	2	Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with Docline/Loansome Doc services (DDS).
A	3	Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with RapidILL.
A	4	Interoperability: System exposes an API for retrieving information about patron requests, including their status.
A	5	Interoperability: System exposes an API or accepts structured email submitting requests.
A	6	Interoperability: System supports ISO-ILL 10160/10161.
A	7	Interoperability: Borrowing libraries which do not use OCLC ILL and are not part of the UC consortia can submit a request which would come in to potential lenders within the UC consortial system. (ALA Requests)
A	8	Interoperability: Staff can forward ILL requests out to potential lenders who do not use the UC consortial system or the OCLC ILL system (e.g. by either directly sending formatted email requests to target libraries, or perhaps interfacing directly with an external system).
A	9	Interoperability: Ability to override ISO-locked requests.
Billing Interoperability		
B	1	Interoperability-Billing: System communicates IFM payments to OCLC.
B	2	Interoperability-Billing: IFM reports to consolidate with OCLC's IFM report.
B	3	Interoperability-Billing: Ability to pay via EFTS.
Circulation Interoperability		
C	1	Circ Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with ILS/local circulation interface.

C	2	Circ Interoperability: Specifically, the shipped action in ILL system and Check-out action in local circ system should be coordinated to reduce re-keying (e.g. with NCIP standard or API based communication).
C	3	Circ Interoperability: Specifically, the check-in action in ILL system and Check-in action in local circ system should be coordinated to reduce re-keying (e.g. with NCIP standard or API based communication).
C	4	Circ Interoperability: System supports NCIP or API based production of temporary circulation records within the local circulation system.
C	5	Circ Interoperability: System supports report- or extraction-based production of temporary circulation records with the local circulation system.
C	6	Circ Interoperability: System includes robust internal patron circulation tools (check-out, check-in, overdue, etc.) within the ILL management software.
C	7	Circ Interoperability: System supports efficient receiving updates for campuses that manage arriving returnable materials in Batches or individually.
C	8	Circ Interoperability: System supports automated renewal of loan via ILS integration.

VII. Lending

Lending Request Handling

A	1	Lending staff can set the required fields on lending requests: (for example, Request date/time, Expiration Date, ILL number, citation information, name/address/email/OCLC symbol of borrowing library, max cost, payment type (e.g. IFM), a prominent notes field.)
A	2	System can search local holdings and direct to owning library.
A	3	Printed requests include all relevant bibliographic details (ISSN/ISBN, author, title, volume, etc.), item notes, service details, and delivery details.
A	4	Lending staff can select a 'shipped' date that is in the future.
A	5	Lending staff can reprint entire batch of requests, or a single item in a format consistent with a fresh request.
A	6	Lending staff can indicate conditions for a loan (building use only, no renewals, etc.) via a menu.
A	7	System allows "unship" on requests.
A	8	Automatic request actioning programmable at each unit, such as overdue actioning at a certain point.
A	9	System allows staff to monitor work queues, and to notify borrowers of overdues, recalls, not received, etc.

Deflection

B	1	Deflection: System supports deflection (automatically not supplied if item not available for ILL).
B	2	Deflection: paths and conditions are customizable by campus.
B	3	Deflection: is customizable by workflow (borrowing or lending.)
B	4	Deflection: Requests that cannot be filled because of circ status (i.e. charged out, missing) are automatically deflected from that lender.

Picklist Issues

C	1	Picklist: Requests can be sorted by call # or barcode # order.
C	2	Picklist: Requests can print 1 per page.
C	3	Picklist: Requests come printed with barcode for RLF requests in a field that can be formatted.
C	4	Picklist: Print mechanism for working pickslips must offer BOTH robust options for customization AND a well formatted and usable out-of-the-box default.

Brokering

D	1	Brokering: System can route requests to different ILL units within a single institution.
D	2	Brokering: Each ILL unit can respond to the request before the response is sent back to OCLC.
D	3	Brokering: ILL units will have the ability to manipulate the lender lists as needed.

Conditionals

E	1	Conditionals: Ability to send Conditionals.
E	2	Conditionals: Customizable list of conditional types.

E	3	Conditionals: Free text for notes.
Sending Electronic Documents		
F	1	Electronic Documents: Lending staff can resend electronic documents.
F	2	Electronic Documents: Lending staff can specify / customize reasons for resending electronic documents.
F	3	Electronic Documents: System can send electronic document to external location for pick-up (e.g. email address, IP (lender delivery to non-UC locations), or FTP retrieval for patrons or campuses outside the UC community.
F	4	Electronic Documents: Ability to batch update items to shipped.
F	5	Electronic Documents: Lending staff can see that a transmitted electronic document has been viewed by the requesting institution or patron.
F	6	Electronic Documents: System has built-in scanning software.
Monetary Issues		
H	1	Monetary: Invoicing (ability to create invoices directly from the ILL management system).
H	2	Monetary: Ability to extract invoice/invoice data for local billing systems.
H	3	Monetary: Ability to archive and search invoices & statements using a range of parameter - date, customer, payment type.
H	4	Monetary: Ability to run financial reports - monthly, quarterly, and yearly IFM & non-IFM activity, etc.
Check-in of Item		
I	1	Check-in: Lending staff can reverse a check-in transaction (e.g. to correct an error).
I	2	Check-in: Lending staff can check-in items loaned from multiple units on one campus.
I	3	Check-in: Lending staff can batch check-in items (as opposed to one at a time).
I	4	Check-in: Lending staff can notify borrower that returned items are damaged or incomplete, before the request is completed.

VIII. Borrowing

Borrowing Request Handling

A	1	System can send borrowing requests via email (e.g. to a non-WSILL system).
A	2	System can receive electronic articles from lending institutions and notify campus borrowers of availability.
A	3	Borrowing staff can add a local loan period (for patron) distinct from lender loan period.
A	4	System can search across multiple bib records at one time and create a lending string from the multiple records.
A	5	System can automatically assign lenders multiple times in one transaction.
A	6	Borrowing staff can view a list of the lenders that have already responded to the request.
A	7	System can use borrowing unit's constant data and custom holdings/paths to route requests. (e.g. using OCLC Direct Request).
A	8	Borrowing staff can search bibliographic/holdings databases (such as Melvyl) and create new requests by importing records from these databases.
A	9	Ability to choose different delivery methods (British Lending Library requires Encrypted Download; a few German libraries require MyBib eL).
A	10	Ability to accept filled requests delivered via Article Exchange or as a file.
A	11	Borrowing staff can duplicate a request instead as needed.
A	12	System supports robust production of supporting paperwork (bookbands, bookslips, etc.) within the receiving workflow.
A	13	Bookbands / bookslips / etc. contain pass-through of notable lending restrictions and requirements.
A	14	User-generated notes can be printed on the bookbands.
A	15	System allows local due date to remain unchanged after a renewal has been obtained, until mediated by staff.

Monetary Issues

B	1	Monetary: Ability to securely store billing or recharge information.
B	2	Monetary: Ability to change max cost while request is live.

IX. DDS

DDS Request Handling

A	1	System supports processing borrowing and lending requests from the same campus (that is, processing of DDS requests within ILL system).
A	2	System enables management of fee-based DDS operations (tracking of deposit account charges, deposits, balances, etc.).
A	3	System enables the gathering of statistical data on DDS activity, as a separate category from ILL statistics.
A	4	System authenticates DDS eligibility (e.g. by querying the ILS).
A	5	Staff can run statements of DDS activity by custom fields (e.g. patron or account name).
A	6	DDS requests are managed as a separate workflow within the system.
A	7	When printing bookstraps, system flags patrons who are DDS eligible.

DDS Request Creation

B	1	DDS Request Creation: System supports integration with various manual and automated DDS processing systems.
B	2	DDS Request Creation: Specifically, system supports manual creation of requests by staff.
B	3	DDS Request Creation: Specifically, system supports requests that originate in Melvyl Request.
B	4	DDS Request Creation: Specifically, system supports requests that originate within the OPAC (e.g. 'Request' button in item records).
B	5	DDS Request Creation: Specifically, system supports integration via email with mediated workflows.

X. Patron Experience and Patron Request Processing

General

A	1	General: Patron request mechanism and management mechanism (currently My ILL Requests) should be integrated / in the same application.
A	2	General: System should be maintained centrally for the entire UC system, although it may expose an administrative interface that is used by campus staff.
A	3	General: System should be configurable and extensible, allowing for campus-specific options.
A	4	General: Patron can login to request interface using their home campus ILS credentials or their campus network credentials in a single-sign-on system.

Patron request ordering

B	1	Patron request ordering: System can automatically detect home campus of patron (e.g. based on IP address), or have patron choose identity provider in single-sign-on system.
B	2	Patron request ordering: System can allow patrons to manually select home campus ,or have patron choose identity provider in single-sign-on system.
B	3	Patron request ordering: System supports authorization with and without PIN/password based on campus configuration.
B	4	Patron request ordering: System enhances ILS authorization through additional configurable rules (e.g. max fines owed).
B	5	Patron request ordering: System authorizes patron using campus ILS or other system, checking for blocks and DDS qualification.
B	6	Patron request ordering: Supports messaging customizable for individual campuses (e.g. confirmation emails, on-screen message).
B	7	Patron request ordering: System provides an interface for user login with configurable patron profile.

B	8	Patron request ordering: System can process incoming OpenURL (version 0.1 and 1.0) from multiple systems (Worldcat Local, PubMed, UC-eLinks).
B	9	Patron request ordering: System searches aggregated UC holdings and availability, and creates potential rota / lender string based on that availability.
B	10	Patron request ordering: System is able to differentiate between lending and non-lending item locations to determine availability.
B	11	Patron request ordering: System can load balance UC rota based on configurable policy.
B	12	Patron request ordering: System verifies incoming citation completeness and enables the patron to provide additional information on incomplete citations before processing request.
B	13	Patron request ordering: System checks for availability of direct links to digital items and gives the patron the option to choose that instead of placing a request.
B	14	Patron request ordering: System warns patrons when they are off-network and linking to a licensed resource.
B	15	Patron request ordering: Patron request interface includes the contact info of the pickup location.
B	16	Patron request ordering: Patron request interface provides map and directions to pickup location.
B	17	Patron request ordering: System enables patrons to request multiple items at one time without having to re-enter patron data.
B	18	Patron request ordering: System enables override of DDS restrictions by patrons without DDS, if they claim item is not held; requests are mediated at the borrowing location.
B	19	Patron request ordering: System can route requests to manual review (the borrowing location for mediation) based on defined criteria (e.g. Z39.50 timeouts).
B	20	Patron request ordering: Patron request system can route request to arbitrary back-end system (e.g. ILS system or email to DDS).
B	21	Patron request ordering: Patron request system enables users to send free-form notes with their request.
B	22	Patron request ordering: Patron request interface enables patrons to specify particular volumes, microfilm reels, date range, or chapter in dedicated fields on the request form.
Patron request management		
C	1	Patron request management: Patron can see their current requests with status.
C	2	Patron request management: Patron can opt to see a history of their requests.
C	3	Patron request management: Patron can cancel request.
C	4	Patron request management: Patron can request renewals.
C	5	Patron request management: Patron can download digital copies.
C	6	Patron request management: Patron can make an inquiry that results in an email sent to ILL staff that includes relevant patron and request data.
C	7	Patron request management: System can notify the patron when checked-out ILL books are coming due.
C	8	Patron request management: System provides an ETA for incoming ILL books....
C	9	Patron request management: Staff can configure / customize the display of request statuses for clarity (e.g. wording, font, color).
C	10	Patron request management: Patron ILL requests can be displayed in the same interface as home campus circulation checkouts (OPAC).
C	11	Patron request management: Patron can see which institution the requested materials are coming from.
C	12	Patron request management: System includes a robust and customizable request search feature.

XI. Reporting / Statistics

A	1	Reports/Stats: The system includes a dynamic, intelligent and flexible statistical package (e.g. advanced dynamic filtering options of request and bibliographic data fields, not limited to Request Date, Date Part, Year, Copyright compliance (i.e. CCG, CCL), Title, page numbers, library location etc, and ability to customize date ranges with date operators such as earlier than, later than, equal to, between inclusive.)
A	2	Reports/Stats: A staff user can generate user-created customized Copyright Compliance reports.
A	3	Reports/Stats: A staff user can generate user-created customized Collection Development reports.
A	4	Reports/Stats: A staff user can generate user-created customized reports for special initiatives (e.g. WEST).
A	5	Reports/Stats: The system includes a built-in acquisitions function for reporting.
A	6	Reports/Stats: The system allows saving and editing of user-created report filters for future use.
A	7	Reports/Stats: A staff user can custom format and print reports.
A	8	Reports/Stats: The system has the ability to read diacritics and symbols and convert them to base letters.
A	9	Reports/Stats: The system allows access to structured data through download or other automated process (as opposed to manual downloading of data, or web-only presentation of data, or screen-scraping, etc.) (e.g. interface with statistical application such as jReports).

Appendix E: RFI Questions and Rankings

Vendors

Clio Software: Clio System & ClioBasic (<http://www.cliosoftware.com>) *

Atlas: ILLiad (<http://www.atlas-sys.com/illiad>) (Marketed through OCLC)**

Innovative: INN-REACH (<https://www.iii.com/products/innreach>)

Relais: Relais ILL & Relais D2D (<http://www.relais-intl.com>)

Rapid: Rapid ILL (<http://rapidill.org>)

IDS Project: various products (<http://www.idspj.org>)

Auto-graphics: SHAREit (<http://www4.auto-graphics.com/products-shareit-inter-library-loan-ill.asp>)

*Did not respond to RFI.

**OCLC submitted information for ILLiad and VDX. OCLC did not submit information for WorldShare ILL.

RFI Questions

1. Please describe the basic Interlibrary Loan functionality of your system – what fundamental services does your system provide?
2. Please describe the installation of or access to your ILL system – is it vendor-hosted? Locally installed? If locally installed, what are its system requirements?
3. Please describe your system architecture. What components are there in the system, what are their functions, and how are they integrated?
4. Please describe your user base, and please describe the customer support, documentation, forums, and training you have in place for these users.
5. Please describe any user communities that provide mutual support for use of your product, and any conferences, forums, and email lists that are actively used.
6. Please describe how your ILL system facilitates consortial lending and borrowing, among institutions that have a different ILS, with particular attention to prioritizing consortial availability before worldwide availability. Address whether your system uses a single shared database to store consortial ILL data.
7. Please describe the interoperability of your system with other products, including, but not limited to:
 - a) Other ILL systems
 - b) ILSes
 - c) Billing systems
 - d) Document scanning systems
 - e) Electronic document delivery systems
8. What national / international standards and protocols is your system compatible with, and what is the function that they serve in your system?
9. Please describe any web-based APIs that your system exposes, as well as any other integration points that could be accessed by an external system.
10. System tour:
 - a) Please describe your lending interface and workflows.

- b) Please describe your borrowing interface and workflows.
 - c) Please describe the patron / user interface and request workflow.
11. Please describe the reports and statistics available from within your system, with particular attention to custom-generated reports and flexible data manipulation.
12. Does your system allow for custom add-ons, custom feature development, or configuration-based customization? If so, please elaborate.
13. Does your system facilitate document delivery services – that is, lending and borrowing requests within the same campus? If so, please elaborate.
14. How do you support the migration / transition of customers from their current system to your system?
15. What is the administrative model of your system, and what roles are possible? Do you support tiered administrative access in some way?
16. What kinds of messaging support do you offer for both staff users (communication between institutions) and patrons?
17. Please describe the system's support for standard patron authorization and authentication methods (e.g. do you support Shibboleth? authentication with external systems?)
18. Please describe your product's support for integration with the following ILS, using NCIP or other means, and any notable limitations to interoperability with these products:
- a) Innovative Millennium
 - b) Innovative Sierra
 - c) Ex Libris Aleph
 - d) Ex Libris Voyager
 - e) Ex Libris Alma
 - f) OCLC WMS
19. Please describe your product's support for integration with Ex Libris SFX.
20. How actively is your product being developed? What new development and enhancements are on your product's current roadmap? Do you have plans to replace the product with a new product?

RFI Response Score Card

Rating System					
1 - Did not demonstrate any ability to satisfy this requirement					
3 - Marginally demonstrated ability to satisfy this requirement					
5 - Demonstrated ability to some aspects of this requirement					
7 - Demonstrated ability to satisfy all aspects of this requirement					
10 - Exceed ability to satisfy this requirement					
RFP Ref	Category/Criteria	Max Points	Bidder Auto-Graphics	Bidder Relais	Bidder OCLC
1	Describe the basic Interlibrary Loan functionality of your system – what fundamental services does your system provide.	10	7	7	10
2	Describe the installation of or access to your ILL system – is it vendor-hosted? Locally installed? If locally installed, what are its system requirements? PREFERRED: 1. Cloud solution 2. Mixed solution 3. Local solution	10	7	5	5
3	Describe your system architecture. What components are there in the system, what are their functions, and how are they integrated? PREFERRED: Open systems; extensible.	10	5	7	7
4	Describe your user base, and please describe the customer support, documentation, forums, and training you have in place for these users. PREFERRED: Many customers (of large academic institutions / consortia), robust customer support / documentation.	10	5	5	7
5	Describe any user communities that provide mutual support for use of your product, and any conferences, forums, and email lists that are actively used. PREFERRED: Robust community support	10	7	5	10
6	Describe how your Integrated Library System (ILL) facilitates consortial lending and borrowing, among institutions that have a different ILS, with particular attention to prioritizing consortial availability before worldwide availability. Address whether your system uses a single shared database to store consortial ILL data	10	5	7	3
7	Describe the interoperability of your system with other products, including, but not limited to: PREFERRED: Yes, interoperability, and robust support				
	a) Other ILL systems	10	5	5	10
	b) ILSes	10	3	7	3
	c) Billing systems	10	1	5	5
	d) Document scanning systems	10	1	3	7
	e) Electronic document delivery systems	10	1	1	7
8	What national / international standards and protocols is your system compatible with, and what is the function that they serve in your system? PREFERRED: NCIP, ISO-ILL	10	5	7	5
9	Describe any web-based APIs that your system exposes, as well as any other integration points that could be accessed by an external system. PREFERRED: Existence of APIs and integration points at all (type: patron API, for example)	10	3	5	10

RFP Ref	Category/Criteria	Max Points	Bidder Auto-Graphics	Bidder Relais	Bidder OCLC
10	System tour: PREFERRED: Intuitive and highly usable workflows; flexible a) describe your lending interface and workflows. b) describe your borrowing interface and workflows. c) describe the patron / user interface and request workflow.	10	7	5	10
11	Describe the reports and statistics available from within your system, with particular attention to custom-generated reports and flexible data manipulation. PREFERRED: Copyright compliance, basic stats, bonus for customization	10	7	7	7
12	Does your system allow for custom add-ons, custom feature development, or configuration-based customization? If so, please elaborate. PREFERRED: Does allow, to what extent.	10	5	5	10
13	Does your system facilitate document delivery services – that is, lending and borrowing requests within the same campus? If so, please elaborate. PREFERRED: Existence of feature, to what extent. Bonus ILS integration.	10	1	5	7
14	How do you support the migration / transition of customers from their current system to your system? PREFERRED: Existence of migration support; experience in migration	10	7	7	3
15	What is the administrative model of your system, and what roles are possible? Do you support tiered administrative access in some way? PREFERRED: Existence of multiple permission levels, (campus based, location based, system based) to what extent	10	10	3	7
16	What kinds of messaging support do you offer for both staff users (communication between institutions) and patrons? PREFERRED: Automated as part of workflows; templates.	10	7	5	5
17	Describe the system's support for standard patron authorization and authentication methods (e.g. do you support Shibboleth? authentication with external systems?) PREFERRED: ILS integration and shibboleth	10	5	3	5
18	Describe your product's support for integration with the following ILS, using NCIP or other means, and any notable limitations to interoperability with these products: PREFERRED: Maximum integration; Make a request / create the bib record / checkout-checkin / renewal a) Innovative Millennium b) Innovative Sierra c) Ex Libris Aleph d) Ex Libris Voyager e) Ex Libris Alma f) OCLC WMS	10	3	7	3
19	Describe your product's support for integration with Ex Libris SFX. PREFERRED: Can patron interface find electronic items	10	5	5	7
RFP Ref	Category/Criteria	Max Points	Bidder Auto-Graphics	Bidder Relais	Bidder OCLC

20	How actively is your product being developed? What new development and enhancements are on your product's current roadmap? Do you have plans to replace the product with a new product? PREFERRED: It is actively developed, it has regular enhancement updates, no plans to replace.	10	5	7	7
Total Points		240	117	128	160
Percentage of total available points		%	48.75%	53.33%	66.67%

Appendix F: Project Timeline

Week	Task	Due Date	Members / Participants
Oct 26-30	Request initial information on systems in current use and for future interest	11/6/15	Tara
	Begin compiling list of current systems / technologies	11/6/15	Elizabeth
	Create framework for Requirements	11/6/15	Joe, Caitlin
Nov 2-6 (mtg)	Decide to go forward with framework for requirements or if not revise	11/6 meeting	TEAM
	Format a document for allowing campuses to add their own requirements (Google spreadsheet?)		
	ILL Survey wishes / recommendations to go into the Requirements doc	11/18/15	Caitlin, Judea
	Clean up potential systems document	11/18/15	Tara, Jenny, Elizabeth
Nov 9-13	Cleanup requirements from 2013 format and put into cleaner format; review document for craziness; add any really obvious requirements	11/13/15	TEAM
Nov 16-20 (mtg)	Discuss any problematic aspects of the requirements doc (Nov 16-19)	11/20 meeting	TEAM
	Have a requirements doc ready to go	11/20/15	TEAM
	Finalize cleanup of requirements doc, and transfer format into Excel sheet	11/20/15	Caitlin
	Do write-up of		
	<i>Decide first cut list of systems for consideration?</i>	11/20 meeting	
Nov 23-27 (Thanksgiving)	Team to review Excel sheet of requirements (due by morning)	11/23/15	TEAM
	Send req document with write up to campuses Nov 23rd (deadline Dec 4th)	11/23/15	Jenny
Nov 30-Dec 4 (mtg)	<i>Decide on how we want to do voting</i>	12/4 meeting	
	<i>Decide on how we want to evaluate the requirements: set up test systems / sandboxes? Recruit campus folks for testing?</i>	12/4 meeting	
Dec 7-11	Follow-up interviews one per campus on requirements		TEAM
	Follow up with RLFs	12/10/15	Caitlin

	Aggregate responses to requirements into one document	12/11/15	Jenny
	Schedule interviews with campuses for Dec 15 / 16 / 17		Jenny
	Review requirements, submit comment and questions by email to group		TEAM
Dec 14-18 (mtg)	Review requirements submitted by institutions; clean up and merge requirements	12/18 meeting	
	Finalize list of requirements and prepare for priority voting	12/18 meeting	
	Interview campuses about requirements	12/17/15	TEAM
	Report back on discussion with peer institutions	12/18 meeting	TEAM
	Decide on format and style for voting on requirements	12/18 meeting	TEAM
Dec 21-23 (short week)	First pass cleanup of requirements	12/23/15	Caitlin
	Investigate Google forms for voting collection	1/6/15	TEAM
Dec 30- Jan 4 (Holidays)			
Jan 4-8 (mtg)	Confirm plan / guidance from DOC / SAG2		
	Report back from discussion with peer institutions	1/8/15	TEAM
	Write to ILL-L list asking for feedback about non-ILLiad systems (DONE)	1/8/16	Caitlin
	Write to Ralph and ask about VDX customers (DONE)	1/8/16	Caitlin
	Second pass cleanup of requirements	1/8/15	TEAM
Jan 11-15	Jan 14: Send out list of requirements for voting, deadline EOD Jan 21st		
	Put into Qualtrics	EOD 14th	Jenny, Elizabeth
	Team to do req review	EOD 12th	TEAM
	Report committee update to UCVDX-L	1/22/16	Jenny, Caitlin
	CDL to do req review (DONE)	EOD 11th	Joe, Caitlin
Jan 18-22 (mtg)	Deadline for Req voting	1/21/16	UC inst
	Decide on the shape of the next phase team - who do we need?		
Jan 25-29	Get feedback from peer institutions	1/29/16	TEAM
	Tally votes and finalize list of reqs	1/29/16	

	Check in with Sarah Troy	1/26/16	
Feb 1-5 (mtg)	Invite purchasing folks for Feb 5th meeting?		Jenny
	Have a list of vendors to contact for RFI (by meeting)	2/5/16	TEAM
	Send the vendor list to Tom & Bala		Caitlin
	Ask purchasing people what information they need from us to move forward (Tom & Bala)		
Feb 8-12	Get Tom & Bala the revised questions, scored requirements, hard requirements	2/12/16	
Feb 15-19 (mtg)	Tom & Bala join us for the meeting call	2/19/16	TEAM, Purchasing
Feb 22-26	Write up update with list of RFI vendors and questions	2/26/16	Jenny
	Send Sarah Troy email about extension		Jenny
	Bala will get in contact with team	2/26/16	Purchasing
Feb 29-Mar 4 (mtg)	Look at the requirements list, and see (a) what can be taken out all together, (2) what can be combined or rephrased, (3) do you sense any gaps.	3/4/16	TEAM
Mar 7-11			
Mar 14-18 (mtg)			
Mar 21-25	Receive answers from RFI	3/23/16	Bala
Mar 28-Apr1 (mtg)	Work on cleaning up requirements	ongoing	TEAM
	Rate the RFI questions for discussion at meeting	4/1/16	TEAM
	Send more questions to Relais about Relais ILL - DONE	4/1/16	Jenny
April 4-8	Send our survey results to CKG - contextualize with highlights	4/8/16	Caitlin
April 11-15 (mtg)	Have a good idea of what systems we are recommending		
	Have an outline of the report written and shared to team	4/13/16	Caitlin, Elizabeth
April 18-22	Have done some work on requirements - make edits, comments, etc.	4/22/16	TEAM
April 25-29 (mtg)	Draft Review	4/29/16	TEAM
May 2-6 (mtg)	Draft Review	5/6 meeting	TEAM

May 9-13 (mtg)	Send Draft to Sarah Troy / Patti Martin for review, comments due 5/12	5/1/16	Jenny
	Draft Review	5/13/16	TEAM
May 16-20	Draft Review - Appendices	5/16 meeting	TEAM
	Finalize Draft Narrative, create Exec Summary	5/17/16	Caitlin
	Sarah & Patti review (as needed)	5/18/16	
	Final Draft no new content	5/18/16	TEAM
	Copyediting of main report	5/19/16	Judea
	Copyediting of appendices	5/19/16	Elizabeth, Jenny
	Final formatting and PDF-izing	5/20/16	Jenny
	Report due to DOC	5/20/16	
May 23-27	Report on the agenda for DOC	5/27/16	

Appendix G: 2015 ILL User Satisfaction Survey Analysis Report

ILL Survey Analysis Report

Context

Nine campuses administered the 2015 Interlibrary Loan User Satisfaction Survey for a three week period from April 20, 2015 to May 8, 2015. This was the third iteration of this survey in recent years; the previous having been run in 2012 and 2009. In an ongoing effort to improve user experience with Interlibrary Loan service, Common Knowledge Group (CKG) for Resource Sharing developed the user satisfaction survey to collect data directly from our patrons about their needs and preferences. The intention is to use the results of the survey to help us identify actionable items that ILL units can use to change their procedures and/or policies to better serve their patrons.

Methodology

CDL pull lists of ILL user's email addresses from our Interlibrary Loan system for each of the participating campuses. A total of 25,826 invitations were sent out to patrons via e-mail. Various campuses used additional methods to advertise the survey such as placing invitation bookmarks in ILL books as well as having the survey linked from their ILL webpage. A total of 5364 users participated in the survey and a total of 2769 suggestions and comments were collected in response to the open-ended questions we are hoping to suggest tangible changes to our interlibrary loan services to meet our patron's wants/needs. The survey was comprised of 8 ILL questions and 2 local document delivery questions. Campuses with multiple ILL units had an extra question added to their survey (as question # 3). This extra question inquired about which particular campus ILL unit the patron used. The 2 document delivery questions were optional so they will not be included in this report.

CAMPUS	EMAIL INVITATIONS SENT	SURVEY RESPONSES	RESPONSE RATE	CAMPUS USED OTHER PROMOTIONS?
UCB:	2844	733	25.77%	Bookmarks, link from ILL webpage
UCD:	2588	588	22.72%	None
UCI:	3157	486	15.39%	Bookmarks, link from ILL webpage
UCLA:	5703	1452	25.46%	Bookmarks, link from ILL webpage
UCM:	1370	247	18.03%	Bookmarks, link from ILL webpage
UCR:	1795	399	22.23%	Bookmarks
UCSB:	3944	725	18.38%	None
UCSD:	3362	468	13.92%	Bookmarks, link from ILL webpage and library home page, and digital signs
UCSF:	1063	266	25.02%	Bookmarks

PRAISE

STATEMENT: Overall, my campus library's ILL service meets my need.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion-Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
UCB:	33.89%	48.41%	9.83%	5.75%	2.12%
UCD:	45.19%	44.10%	5.99%	3.63%	1.09%
UCI:	35.60%	44.40%	9.67%	6.81%	3.52%
UCLA:	44.80%	45.02%	6.95%	2.78%	0.43%
UCM:	39.68%	37.25%	9.31%	2.42%	2.02%
UCR:	48.88%	36.59%	4.76%	2.76%	0.50%
UCSB:	42.90%	42.21%	5.24%	3.72%	0.14%
UCSD:	38.89%	42.52%	6.62%	3.63%	0.21%
UCSF:	39.47%	37.59%	7.14%	4.89%	1.50%
Median:	39.80%	40.70%	7.00%	3.89%	1.22%

Out of 5364 users who took the survey, 87.4% were overall satisfied with the service from all the participating campuses.

Out of 2769 comments received, 1244 were all praises of how happy everyone was with our services. This is 45% of the total number of comments received. Each campus had their fair share of glowing praises.

UNFILED REQUESTS & TURNAROUND ISSUES

STATEMENT: I receive adequate information about the status of my requests.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion-Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
UCB:	13.37%	30.42%	25.38%	17.19%	3.54%
UCD:	18.03%	30.44%	31.63%	10.37%	2.21%
UCI:	19.55%	31.48%	24.28%	13.37%	4.73%
UCLA:	18.83%	37.33%	24.86%	10.26%	1.72%
UCM:	25.10%	28.34%	25.06%	7.70%	2.43%
UCR:	24.81%	32.58%	21.05%	13.03%	2.01%
UCSB:	21.24%	37.93%	21.10%	11.59%	1.79%

UCSD:	26.08%	29.70%	27.99%	8.76%	1.71%
UCSF:	20.68%	28.95%	29.67%	8.65%	1.88%
Median:	20.85%	31.91%	25.67%	11.21%	2.45%

STATEMENT: My ILL requests are filled in a timely fashion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion-Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
UCB:	28.65%	39.56%	11.87%	8.73%	1.91%
UCD:	39.29%	41.50%	7.14%	3.40%	2.21%
UCI:	35.54%	39.96%	10.59%	8.83%	5.07%
UCLA:	34.62%	47.12%	7.02%	4.48%	0.96%
UCM:	39.68%	33.60%	10.53%	4.45%	1.21%
UCR:	45.61%	36.60%	6.77%	4.51%	0.75%
UCSB:	37.52%	43.31%	7.03%	4.55%	1.52%
UCSD:	38.00%	45.60%	8.60%	5.10%	2.80%
UCSF:	39.47%	35.71%	8.27%	4.89%	1.88%
Median:	37.33%	36.25%	8.57%	5.37%	2.00%

78.43% of users agree that they receive adequate information about the status of their requests.

82.15% of users agree that ILL requests are filled in a timely manner.

Of the 2768 comments received, 243 were unfilled requests and turn-around time. Here are some of the comments that are common amongst all the campuses.

1. More information on requests being cancelled.
2. Takes too long to get items especially articles. (Patrons feel article should take less than 1 day)
3. Never heard back on requests.
4. Incorrect items received.
5. More timely updates.

Recommendations:

1. Include more information on requests being cancelled.
2. Provide status reports in a timely manner.
3. Clean up old requests in our queues that did not get auto-completed for various reasons.

NOTE: Same as the previous survey.

LOAN PERIODS

STATEMENT: ILL loan periods are reasonable.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion-Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
UCB:	21.96%	39.84%	13.92%	12.69%	1.77%
UCD:	31.12%	42.35%	13.61%	5.23%	0.51%
UCI:	28.40%	37.86%	12.55%	9.88%	4.73%
UCLA:	42.01%	40.50%	7.09%	3.24%	0.96%
UCM:	35.63%	29.55%	11.74%	8.91%	2.83%
UCR:	39.85%	39.35%	8.77%	5.01%	0.50%
UCSB:	36.55%	40.14%	7.82%	7.31%	2.07%
UCSD:	26.71%	40.17%	14.53%	7.91%	1.50%
UCSF:	30.83%	33.46%	19.92%	3.76%	1.50%
Median:	32.56%	38.14%	12.22%	7.10%	1.82%

82.92% of users agree that loan periods are reasonable.

Of the 2768 comments, 157 were comments on loan periods.

Here are the most common responses for all the campuses.

1. Loan periods are too short.
2. Loan periods vary too much (1 year to 2 weeks).

Recommendation:

1. Look into giving users a longer due date.

NOTE: Same as the previous survey.

MYILL

QUESTION: "Have you used the "My ILL Requests" web site to check the status of your interlibrary loan (ILL) request?"

	Yes, I use it regularly	Yes, I use it occasionally	Yes, I use it & was unsatisfied, so no longer use it	Yes, I visited it, but was unsure how to use it	No, I've not used it before	No, I've never heard of 'My ILL Requests
UCB:	11.90%	33.80%	2.50%	3.40%	21.90%	26.60%
UCD:	9.60%	26.40%	1.90%	3.70%	28.50%	29.80%
UCI:	20.20%	45.10%	2.10%	5.30%	15.40%	12.00%
UCLA:	18.50%	43.80%	1.70%	5.60%	18.50%	12.00%

UCM:	16.80%	47.50%	1.70%	4.20%	21.00%	8.80%
UCR:	23.20%	46.90%	2.60%	5.10%	13.80%	8.40%
UCSB:	25.80%	45.90%	2.00%	2.80%	15.40%	8.20%
UCSD:	23.30%	40.10%	0.70%	3.30%	17.60%	15.00%
UCSF:	7.40%	23.30%	0.80%	3.10%	30.20%	35.30%
Mean:	17.41%	39.20%	1.78%	4.06%	20.26%	17.34%

Out of 2768 comments received, 282 were about MY ILL Requests. This is 10% of the comments.

The following are the top 8 issues addressed in users' comments.

1. Why can't there be just one login for ILL, library system and campus system.
2. The statuses of the requests are not clear or not very helpful.
3. Why can't patrons get an idea when ILL requests will become available?
4. Patrons did not know that this interface existed.
5. Many books that have already been returned are still on their list.
6. Can the ILL information be incorporated with their campus information? Why is it separated?
7. Renewing a request is confusing. There is no indication that a renewal was submitted which results in patrons requesting multiple renewal requests.
8. Difficult to navigate and find things when patrons have many ILLs. Not very user-friendly.

Recommendation:

1. Work with CDL to see if the statuses that display to the patron can be clearer.
2. Eliminate completed ILL request from displaying to the patron.
3. Campuses clean up their queue and complete requests that are done.

NOTE: Same issues as the previous survey. (A cleanup project has begun to eliminate the old requests)

REQUEST

STATEMENT: Forms used to request ILL materials are easy to use.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion-Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
UCB:	19.65%	44.88%	15.28%	10.10%	0.68%
UCD:	24.49%	45.24%	12.07%	9.86%	1.87%
UCI:	26.54%	45.27%	11.73%	8.85%	1.23%
UCLA:	27.96%	45.52%	11.78%	8.13%	0.83%
UCM:	36.44%	37.65%	9.72%	6.07%	0.81%
UCR:	34.09%	41.60%	9.77%	7.52%	1.25%

UCSB:	30.76%	46.76%	8.26%	7.72%	0.97%
UCSD:	31.41%	43.16%	11.97%	3.63%	1.07%
UCSF:	25.56%	38.35%	16.92%	8.65%	0.75%
Median:	28.54%	43.16%	11.94%	7.84%	1.05%

An average of 83.64% of our users agrees that the forms are easy to use.

Of the 2768 comments received, 137 comments were in reference to Request.

Following are the top 5 comments:

1. It would be nice if library card can be entered once when requesting multiple requests.
2. Request form is confusing with too many steps.
3. Requesting articles/chapters are confusing.
4. Difficult to request different formats.
5. Not user friendly.
6. Notes field need to be bigger.

Recommendations:

1. Work with CDL to see if any of these issues can be resolved.

NOTE: Same issues as the previous survey.

CAMPUS ILL WEBPAGES

The difficulties of finding the campus ILL Webpages came up for numerous campuses. Users are finding it difficult to get to the ILL page from the library's home page. Users from different campuses had difficulty finding the ILL page from their library's home pages.

NOTICES

There were 78 comments from users to receive an email notice when ILL books are becoming due so the items can be renewed or returned.

WISH LIST

There were many items that patrons wanted changed, added or enhanced. Of the 1922 comments, 141 were wish list items.

Following are the top 10 wish list item:

1. A centralized place for local and ILL books with one login.
2. Make Request more user friendly.
3. Allow ILL of reserve books.
4. An estimated delivery time or where the book is coming from.
5. Improve turn-around time, especially articles.
6. More or add Branch pickup locations.
7. Allow alumni patrons to request ILL.
8. Allow textbooks for ILL.
9. Allow ILL for non-circulating items.
10. Add "Note to self" on Request that will print on the book band.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. There were issues related to ILL renewals. Comments like: Allow books to be renewed; never heard back on a renewal requests; took a long time to get a response ...
2. Some issues with PDF qualities.

Interesting comments:

"It took me about a week to get my book, but after that I was pleased to know I could have it for a year."

"Maybe it's just me, but I find the online menus to request ILL materials super confusing and counterintuitive -- even tho I've done it often, I still get confused. The whole system is cumbersome - you have to input the same info over and over, new windows open up and then stay open. We need a system that KEEPS you signed in, that allows you to set a pickup as your default, that makes sending email automatic, so each order doesn't dozens of steps. Partly because the ILL ordering system is so not user-friendly, I find it almost impossible to get undergrad students to use it."

"The response times are slow. We should have all the articles available electronically at all times. When one person requests something once and it gets copied by ILL, it should be uploaded so that people in the future don't have to do an ILL request, it should just be available."

"There were twice I waited for over 10 days to get the book."

"The time it takes to fulfill requests has gone way up to unacceptable lengths. This is particularly frustrating due to the number of materials held off site (SRLF). Timing is key."

"Loan periods are short. Books sometimes take a long time to arrive."

CHANGES/INVESTIGATIONS RESULTING FROM SURVEY RESPONSES

UCLA:

Biomed Library modified their article email notice to include instructions on how to log into My ILL Requests based on the comments.

YRL Library changed the progress status report from weeks to 1 week.

UCB:

UCB had many complaints about ILL emails going into SPAM mail due to campus changing to Gmail addresses. Currently working with Google to get this issues corrected.

CDL:

CDL investing the possibility of one login for multiple ILL requests.

CONCLUSION

What conclusions can we draw from this survey data?

We as UC ILL staff and managers can be reassured that our services are viewed positively – with an average overall favorable response rate of 87.4%. Various kinds of praise made up 45% of total comments received.

We can be reassured that quality across campuses is reasonably consistent with a spread of only 10% between the locations with the lowest and highest rate of favorable response.

One stated purpose for this survey is to identify parts of the user experience where action can be taken to improve service and user satisfaction. It is telling that our positive response rate for overall satisfaction is higher than the positive response rate for any of the specific components we measured:

Overall 87.5%, Timely fulfillment 82.15%, Request interface 83.64%, and Loan periods 82.92%.

Report respectfully submitted by: Jenny Lee (**Chair**) (UCLA), Alicia Amador (UCLA), Dolly Lopez (UCM)

Appendix H: UC Supplementary Tools and Equipment

Systems Used		Campus		Scanners Used	Campus
Clio	(Request, management, invoicing)	UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA		Bookeye 4	UCB, UCD, UCLA, SRLF, UCSD, UCSC, NRLF
Millennium	(ILS)	UCB, UCI, UCR, NRLF		iVina flatbed	UCB, NRLF
WSILL products		All		ScanPro 2000 microform scanner	UCB, NRLF
Docline	(ILL Management/Request)	UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCSD, UCSF		MicroCopy Scanner	UCD
BSCAN	(Bookeye Scanner Software)	UCB, USD, UCSC, NRLF		Minolta 7000 Overhead Scanner	UCD
Article Exchange		All		Zeutschel Omniscan 12000	UCI
VIN	(Vet Information Network)	UCD		HP Scanner	UCLA, SRLF
Voyager	(ILS)	UCLA, SRLF		Fujitsu Scanner with Adobe Acrobat	UCLA, SRLF
Relais	(ILL article management)	UCLA, SRLF		Copibook scanner with ILRISA software	UCLA, SRLF
Worldcat Discovery		UCLA, SRLF, UCI, UCR		Mekel microfilm	UCLA, SRLF
Ex Libris/Aleph	(ILS)	UCSB, UCD		Zeta Scanner	UCI, UCR
We-Transfer	(large document delivery)	UCD		Minolta PS5000C	UCR
Macro-Express		UCD		FreeFlow Lite scanning software	UCSD
Invoice Buddy	(locally developed)	UCD			
BANNER	(accounts receivable)	UCD			
QuickDoc/EFTs		UCSF			

Appendix I: Requirements Voting Instructions

Voting Instructions

This document lists the requirements and wishlist items for a future ILL suite of systems, based on your previous feedback.

Please vote for the requirements that you think are the highest priority when choosing a new system

Voting will be handled by assigning points to requirements - you can assign any number of points to a requirement, from zero to the maximum number allocated. Each section has a total maximum number of points you can "spend," and you cannot exceed this max.

Hypothetical Example:

"Cat Requirements" section has a total of 3 items, and 9 possible points to allocate.

A1. System must come with a basket of kittens.

A2. An admin user is able to send an ad hoc message to local veterinarians.

A3. The cat request interface is integrated with the lending request interface.

If you think they are all equally important, you can allocate 3 points each to each item.

If you want to prefer one over the others, you can distribute your points: A1=5, A2=2, A3=2

If you want to put all your points on only one requirement, you can do so: A1=9, A2=0, A3=0

The total number of points from all campuses will be added up and the requirements will be sorted in priority order of highest number of points to lowest number of points. No requirements will be dropped, but low ranking requirements will fall to the bottom.

If you have any comments / questions, please feel free to add those in such a way so that we can tell what is a comment and what is a requirement. We welcome your narrative feedback!

Thank you very much!

Appendix J: Compiled Requirements Survey Responses

Total ratings include responses from 10 UC campuses plus NRLF and SRLF. The last two columns reflect ratings calculated without RLF responses.

General Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	% Rating
2A2. Consortial Reqs: System is able to check UC-system availability before checking worldwide availability.	73	12%		63	12%
1A2. Types of processes: System directly supports physical loans.	63	10%		45	9%
1A1. Types of processes: System directly supports CNR materials (usually digital copies, possibly paper copies).	50	8%		43	8%
2A1. Consortial Reqs: System supports ILL transactions amongst UC libraries without using intermediate database/system such as OCLC (i.e., consortial database).	48	8%		38	7%
1A4. Types of processes: System directly supports borrowing and lending of electronic articles.	46	8%		43	8%
3C1. Migration: System allows for the conversion of files from currently used system (VDX, Clio, etc.)	42	7%		32	6%
3A4. General Reqs: System has the capability for consumer-developed add-ons and customizations.	39	6%		26	5%
3C2. Migration: Vendor staff (development staff in particular) are available for support in migrating materials from VDX to new system.	34	6%		26	5%
3A1. General Reqs: System is under active development, with plans for active development for the next 5 years.	31	5%		28	5%
3B4. Hosting / Management: Local installation of the software is unnecessary; admin user interface is available via the web.	28	5%		27	5%
1A3. Types of processes: System directly supports borrowing and lending of ebooks.	28	5%		27	5%
3B2. Hosting / Management: CDL has query access to the system database.	26	4%		18	4%
3B3. Hosting / Management: CDL has read access to the system logs.	24	4%		18	4%
3B1. Hosting / Management: System is hosted in the cloud by vendor / provider. (CDL does not locally host.)	23	4%		22	4%
3A2. General Reqs: System has an active user community (active listservs, forums, or other communication tools; active development partners)	19	3%		18	4%

3A3. General Reqs: Tutorials, wikis, or other training tools are provided to users.	19	3%		18	4%
3B5. Hosting / Management: Vendor support staff (including development staff as appropriate) are available for regular meetings with CDL staff.	19	3%		18	4%
Leftover Points	0	0%		0	0%

Technical Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	% Rating
4D3. Requests: System allows batch updating of requests	79	4%		51	3%
6C1. Circ Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with ILS/local circulation interface	75	4%		65	4%
6B1. Interoperability-Billing: System communicates IFM payments to OCLC	71	4%		56	4%
6A1. Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with OCLC Article Exchange	69	4%		59	4%
4E1. Filtering and Searching: System has a robust mechanism for customizing, filtering, and sorting queries for requests	64	3%		49	3%
4A2. System Use: Article delivery system can accommodate large electronic files	61	3%		51	3%
6B2. Interoperability-Billing: IFM reports to consolidate with OCLC's IFM report	60	3%		45	3%
4E4. Filtering and Searching: System allows for diacritics, non-western fonts, and irregular formats in searches. (e.g. as seen in Arabic, Armenian, or CJK titles)	54	3%		39	3%
4A1. System Use: System allows multiple instances to be in use simultaneously (various people doing different actions)	53	3%		40	3%
4A3. System Use: Placing a request: System can process both ILL and DDS requests	53	3%		40	3%
4D2. Requests: Requests have the same transaction number for both borrower and lender	53	3%		38	2%
4F9. Communication: System enables communication in OCLC while the request is live, without breaking the ISO	53	3%		39	3%
6C2. Circ Interoperability: Specifically, the shipped action in ILL system and Check-out action in local circ system should be coordinated to reduce re-keying (e.g. with NCIP standard or API based communication)	45	2%		40	3%
6C6. Circ Interoperability: System includes robust internal patron circulation tools (check-out, check-in, overdue, etc.) within the ILL management software	44	2%		41	3%

6C3. Circ Interoperability: Specifically, the check-in action in ILL system and Check-in action in local circ system should be coordinated to reduce re-keying (e.g. with NCIP standard or API based communication)	43	2%		38	2%
4F1. Communication: System has a flexible / customizable institution & patron alerting feature	40	2%		37	2%
4F2. Communication: Lending staff can send ad hoc outgoing messages	40	2%		32	2%
4E2. Filtering and Searching: System has ability to save and edit filtered data searches (analogous to "saved searches" in VDX)	39	2%		34	2%
6C5. Circ Interoperability: System supports report- or extraction-based production of temporary circulation records with the local circulation system	39	2%		39	3%
6C4. Circ Interoperability: System supports NCIP or API based production of temporary circulation records within the local circulation system	39	2%		39	3%
4B4. User Accounts: System provides an admin interface for modifying campus messaging and configuration	36	2%		35	2%
5B2. Accessibility / Compatibility: System is Unicode compliant (e.g. recognizes characters from Asian languages)	36	2%		31	2%
4C1. Locations: System supports multiple unit locations per campus	34	2%		26	2%
6C7. Circ Interoperability: System supports efficient receiving updates for campuses that manage arriving returnable materials in Batches or individually	34	2%		34	2%
6B3. Interoperability-Billing: Ability to pay via EFTS	34	2%		34	2%
4F7. Communication: Formatted emails can be sent directly from system to patron (automatic or ad hoc)	33	2%		23	1%
5B4. Accessibility / Compatibility: System is compatible with the latest versions of Internet Explorer, Chrome, and Firefox	33	2%		24	2%
4F8. Communication: Staff can respond to Conditional messages received from OCLC	31	2%		26	2%
6A7. Interoperability: Borrowing libraries which do not use OCLC ILL and are not part of the UC consortia can submit a request which would come in to potential lenders within the UC consortial system	31	2%		21	1%
4D1. Requests: Campus staff cannot change the status of a request that belongs to another campus	30	2%		21	1%
6A9. Interoperability: If the system is a non-OCLC product, and iso-compliant, a staff user can edit/overwrite "iso-locked" fields OCLC request fields (such as copyright compliance and maxcost) with updated data or break the "iso-lock" completely	30	2%		30	2%

4E3. Filtering and Searching: System has ability to dynamically compile results of a saved filtered data search into a displayed work queue (analogous to "published searches" in VDX)	28	1%		23	1%
4F3. Communication: Lending staff can send attachment with an outgoing message	28	1%		21	1%
4C2. Locations: System supports the addition of virtual / "dummy" locations (for ad hoc / testing / special projects)	26	1%		23	1%
6A2. Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with Docline/Loansome Doc services	26	1%		26	2%
6A8. Interoperability: Staff can forward ILL requests out to potential lenders who do not use the UC consortial system or the OCLC ILL system (e.g. by either directly sending formatted email requests to target libraries, or perhaps interfacing directly with an external system)	26	1%		26	2%
4B2. User Accounts: An administrative user can create / modify / delete other accounts; campus admin users can create accounts at their campus level	25	1%		22	1%
4B3. User Accounts: An admin user can lock/save request so only one user can edit it at a time.	25	1%		22	1%
4B1. User Accounts: System supports multiple levels of privileges for different users (e.g. admins can create / modify / delete requests while non-privileged users (students) can only create)	22	1%		14	1%
6A5. Interoperability: System accepts structured email for submitting requests	22	1%		22	1%
5B3. Accessibility / Compatibility: System is compatible with Windows and Mac operating systems for local installations, if necessary	21	1%		21	1%
4F10. Communication: Staff can create an unlimited number of alerts	19	1%		19	1%
5C1. Security: The retention and storage of patron data is done in compliance with UC policy	19	1%		14	1%
5A1. General Tech Req: System is not JAVA based	18	1%		13	1%
5C2. Security: System protects patron information by employing strong data encryption software, and the vendor commits to maintaining data security to the latest industry standards	18	1%		13	1%
6A6. Interoperability: System supports ISO-ILL 10161	18	1%		13	1%
4F5. Communication: Staff can send messages to local DDS patrons	17	1%		17	1%
6A4. Interoperability: System exposes an API for retrieving information about patron requests, including their status	17	1%		17	1%

4F4. Communication: Lending staff can CC another email address on an outgoing message	15	1%		14	1%
Leftover Points	13	1%		13	1%
4F6. Communication: Text messages can be sent directly from the system to patrons (automatic or ad hoc)	12	1%		12	1%
5B1. Accessibility / Compatibility: System follows accessibility design best practices (e.g. accommodates visual, hearing, and motor impairments in users)	12	1%		9	1%
6A3. Interoperability: System is able to interoperate with RapidILL	9	0%		9	1%

Lending Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	%Rating
7A7. Request Handling: Printed requests include all relevant bibliographic details (ISSN/ISBN, author, title, volume, etc.), item notes, service details, and delivery details	64	4%		47	3%
7G1. Monetary: Invoicing (ability to create invoices directly from the ILL management system)	63	4%		60	4%
Leftover Points (Davis)	63	4%		63	4%
7A16. Request Handling: System allows “unship” on requests	61	3%		46	3%
7B4. Deflection: Requests that cannot be filled because of circ status (i.e. charged out, missing) are automatically deflected from that lender	59	3%		48	3%
7A14. Request Handling: Lending staff users can change the service type (CNR or Loan) from the original requested type without the need to submit a new request	57	3%		50	3%
7H4. Check-in: Lending staff can batch check-in items (as opposed to one at a time)	56	3%		41	3%
7A1. Request Handling: Lending staff can set the required fields on lending requests: (for example, Request date/time, Expiration Date, ILL number, citation information, name/address/email/OCLC symbol of borrowing library, max cost, payment type (e.g. IFM), a prominent notes field)	52	3%		43	3%
7A4. Request Handling: System can search local holdings and direct to owning library	52	3%		49	3%
7E2. Conditionals: Customizable list of conditional types	49	3%		44	3%
7A10. Request Handling: Lending staff can reprint entire batch of requests, or a single item in a format consistent with a fresh request	48	3%		36	2%
7A11. Request Handling: System can ship electronic non-returnables securely, within the same system	48	3%		43	3%

7G4. Monetary: Ability to run financial reports - monthly, quarterly, and yearly IFM & non-IFM activity, etc.	46	3%		43	3%
7A3. Request Handling: RLF barcodes are available for all volumes in a monographic set	44	2%		16	1%
7A18. Request Handling: System allows staff to monitor work queues, and to notify borrowers of overdue, recalls, not received, etc.	44	2%		29	2%
7B1. Deflection: System supports deflection (automatically not supplied if item not available for ILL)	43	2%		30	2%
7A2. Request Handling: RLF barcodes are available in a request for the specific serial volume needed (vs. having the barcode for only the first volume in the list)	42	2%		16	1%
7H2. Check-in: Lending staff can reverse a check-in transaction (e.g. to correct an error)	41	2%		36	2%
7G2. Monetary: Ability to extract invoice/invoice data for local billing systems	39	2%		36	2%
7E3. Conditionals: Free text for notes	38	2%		33	2%
7A15. Request Handling: Lending staff can recall item during the life of the loan	35	2%		30	2%
7C1. Picklist: Printout shows all information contained on the request in the system and vice versa. (i.e. all information included on the OCLC request, Group Affiliation, Ship Via)	35	2%		32	2%
7C4. Picklist: Requests come printed with barcode for RLF requests in a field that can be formatted	35	2%		12	1%
7A13. Request Handling: Lending staff can indicate conditions for a loan (building use only, no renewals, etc.)	34	2%		24	2%
7F1. Electronic Documents: Lending staff can resend electronic documents	34	2%		31	2%
7E1. Conditionals: Ability to send Conditionals	33	2%		28	2%
7A12. Request Handling: System can send more than one document at a time (in other words if we're sending a document via AE within VDX to fulfill a particular request, that we can send more than one PDF at a time so we can include the supplement PDFs in the same transmission)	32	2%		31	2%
7C5. Picklist: Print mechanism for working pickslips must offer BOTH robust options for customization AND a well formatted and usable out-of-the-box default	32	2%		32	2%
7A6. Request Handling: Lending staff can edit and/or add in new reasons for Non-supply for Returnables and non-Returnables	31	2%		26	2%
7G3. Monetary: Ability to archive and search invoices & statements using a range of parameter - date, customer, payment type	31	2%		28	2%

7A8. Request Handling: Printed request displays a 'string' of possible lenders (request history is available: list of all lenders in order)	30	2%		28	2%
7B2. Deflection: Paths and conditions are customizable by campus	28	2%		25	2%
7C3. Picklist: Requests can print 1 per page	28	2%		25	2%
7F3. Electronic Documents: System can send electronic document to external location for pick-up (e.g. email address, IP (lender delivery to non-UC locations), or FTP retrieval for patrons or campuses outside the UC community)	28	2%		23	2%
7H1. Check-in: Lending staff can check-in item when loan is returned and this check-in action immediately completes the request	28	2%		23	2%
7H5. Check-in: Lending staff can notify borrower that returned items are damaged or incomplete, before the request is completed	27	2%		22	1%
7F4. Electronic Documents: Ability to batch update items to shipped	25	1%		22	1%
7A17. Request Handling: Automatic request actioning as programmed, such as overdue actioning at a certain point	24	1%		21	1%
7A5. Request Handling: Lending staff can download/print requests from UC locations separate from those of non-UC location (current)	23	1%		22	1%
7C2. Picklist: Requests can be sorted by call # or barcode # order	22	1%		21	1%
7F7. Electronic Documents: Current "Received Electronically" status modified to more appropriate status such as "Shipped - Electronically"	22	1%		22	1%
7B3. Deflection: Is customizable by workflow (borrowing or lending)	21	1%		20	1%
7A9. Request Handling: Lending staff can select a 'shipped' date that is in the future	19	1%		19	1%
7D1. Brokering: System can route requests to different ILL units within a single institution	18	1%		18	1%
7F6. Electronic Documents: System has built-in scanning software	16	1%		16	1%
7D2. Brokering: Each ILL unit can respond to the request before the response is sent back to OCLC	14	1%		14	1%
7F2. Electronic Documents: Lending staff can specify / customize reasons for resending electronic documents	14	1%		13	1%
7F5. Electronic Documents: Lending staff can see that a transmitted electronic document has been viewed by the requesting institution or patron	14	1%		11	1%
7H3. Check-in: Lending staff can check-in items loaned from multiple units on one campus	13	1%		13	1%

7D3. Brokering: ILL units will have the ability to manipulate the lender lists as needed	9	1%		9	1%
--	---	----	--	---	----

Borrowing Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	% Rating
8B2. Monetary: Ability to change max cost while request is live	61	9%		36	6%
Leftover Points (NRLF)	60	9%		0	0%
8A3. Request Handling: Borrowing staff can add a local loan period (for patron) distinct from lender loan period	55	8%		30	5%
8A2. Request Handling: System can receive electronic articles from lending institutions and notify campus borrowers of availability	50	8%		50	8%
8A7. Request Handling: Borrowing staff can view a list of the lenders that have already responded to the request	40	6%		40	7%
8C1. Conditionals: If System is "iso-compliant" and a non-OCLC product, ability to overwrite/edit "iso-locked" OCLC fields (such as copyright compliance and maxcost) with required data that lender needs when answering conditionals	38	6%		38	6%
8A9. Request Handling: Borrowing staff can search bibliographic/holdings databases (such as Melvyl) and create new requests by importing records from these databases	35	5%		35	6%
8A4. Request Handling: System can search across multiple bib records at one time and create a lending string from the multiple records	34	5%		34	6%
8A8. Request Handling: System can use borrowing unit's constant data and custom holdings/paths to route requests. (e.g. using OCLC Direct Request)	34	5%		34	6%
8A11. Request Handling: Ability to accept filled requests delivered via Article Exchange or as a file	34	5%		34	6%
8A14. Request Handling: System supports robust production of supporting paperwork (Bookbands, Bookslips, etc.) within the receiving workflow	34	5%		34	6%
8A12. Request Handling: System allows staff to enter multiple patron requests without having to re-enter patron data each time	33	5%		23	4%
8A1. Request Handling: System can send borrowing requests via email (e.g. to a non-WSILL system)	30	5%		30	5%
8A5. Request Handling: System can automatically assign lenders multiple times in one transaction	29	4%		29	5%

8A13. Request Handling: Borrowing staff can duplicate a request when dealing with multiple articles from the same journal/book title. (For example; a request copy feature that allows one to modify the article citation)	28	4%		28	5%
8A15. Request Handling: Bookbands / Bookslips / etc. contain pass-through of notable lending restrictions and requirements	28	4%		28	5%
8A17. Request Handling: System allows local due date to remain unchanged after a renewal has been obtained, until mediated by staff	24	4%		24	4%
8A6. Request Handling: Ability for borrowing staff to attach file & send to patron when the request is in Idle or Not Supplied	22	3%		22	4%
8A16. Request Handling: User-generated notes can be printed on the bookbands	20	3%		20	3%
8A10. Request Handling: Ability to choose different delivery methods (British Lending Library requires Encrypted Download; a few German libraries require MyBib eL)	18	3%		18	3%
8B1. Monetary: Ability to securely store billing or recharge information	13	2%		13	2%

Document Delivery Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	% Rating
Leftover points (NRLF, UCSC)	72	20%		36	11%
9A1. Request Handling: System supports processing borrowing and lending requests from the same campus (that is, processing of DDS requests within ILL system)	55	15%		45	14%
9B1. Request Creation: System supports integration with various manual and automated DDS processing systems	42	12%		42	13%
9B2. Request Creation: Specifically, system supports manual creation of requests by staff	38	11%		28	9%
9B4. Request Creation: Specifically, system supports requests that originate within the OPAC (e.g. 'Request' button in item records)	37	10%		27	8%
9B3. Request Creation: Specifically, system supports requests that originate in Melvyl Request	33	9%		33	10%
9A4. Request Handling: System authenticates DDS eligibility (e.g. by querying the ILS)	30	8%		30	9%
9A3. Request Handling: System enables the gathering of statistical data on DDS activity, as a separate category from ILL statistics	28	8%		25	8%
9A6. Request Handling: DDS requests are managed as a separate workflow within the system	25	7%		25	8%

9A5. Request Handling: Staff can run statements of DDS activity by custom fields (e.g. patron or account name)	23	6%		23	7%
9A2. Request Handling: System enables management of fee-based DDS operations (tracking of deposit account charges, deposits, balances, etc.)	21	6%		18	6%
9B5. Request Creation: Specifically, system supports integration via email with mediated workflows	21	6%		21	6%
9A7. Request Handling: When printing bookstraps, system flags patrons who are DDS eligible	7	2%		7	2%

Patron Request Processing Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	% Rating
Leftover Points (NRLF, Davis)	124	9%		4	0%
10B17. Patron request ordering: System enables patrons to request multiple items at one time without having to re-enter patron data	87	7%		67	6%
10B5. Patron request ordering: System authorizes patron using campus ILS or other system, checking for blocks and DDS qualification	77	6%		77	6%
10C13. Patron request management: System includes a robust and customizable request search feature	70	5%		50	4%
10B9. Patron request ordering: System searches aggregated UC holdings and availability, and creates potential rota / lender string based on that availability	57	4%		57	5%
10C5. Patron request management: System supports automated renewal of loan via ILS integration	54	4%		54	5%
10B13. Patron request ordering: System checks for availability of direct links to digital items and gives the patron the option to choose that instead of placing a request	49	4%		29	2%
10A3. General: System should be configurable and extensible, allowing for campus-specific options	47	4%		37	3%
10C8. Patron request management: System can notify the patron when checked-out ILL books are coming due	46	3%		41	3%
10A1. General: Patron request mechanism and management mechanism (currently My ILL Requests) should be integrated / in the same application	45	3%		45	4%
10A2. General: System should be maintained centrally for the entire UC system	41	3%		31	3%

10C1. Patron request management: Patron can see their current requests with status	41	3%		36	3%
10C4. Patron request management: Patron can request renewals	41	3%		36	3%
10B21. Patron request ordering: Patron request system enables users to send notes with their request	37	3%		32	3%
10B11. Patron request ordering: System can load balance UC rota based on customizable policy	35	3%		35	3%
10C3. Patron request management: Patron can cancel request	35	3%		30	3%
10B6. Patron request ordering: Supports messaging customizable for individual campuses (e.g. confirmation emails, on-screen message)	32	2%		32	3%
10B10. Patron request ordering: System is able to differentiate between lending and non-lending item locations to determine availability	32	2%		32	3%
10B8. Patron request ordering: System can process incoming OpenURL (version 0.1 and 1.0) from multiple systems (Worldcat Local, PubMed, UC-eLinks)	31	2%		31	3%
10A4. General: Patron can login to request interface using their home campus ILS credentials	30	2%		30	3%
10B12. Patron request ordering: System verifies incoming citation completeness and enables the patron to provide additional information on incomplete citations before processing request	29	2%		29	2%
10B18. Patron request ordering: System enables override of DDS restrictions by patrons without DDS, if they claim item is not held; these go to review	29	2%		29	2%
10B19. Patron request ordering: System can route requests to manual review (Idle queue) based on defined criteria (e.g. Z39.50 timeouts)	28	2%		28	2%
10C2. Patron request management: Patron can opt to see a history of their requests	28	2%		23	2%
10B3. Patron request ordering: System supports authorization with and without PIN/password based on campus configuration	25	2%		25	2%
10B4. Patron request ordering: System enhances ILS authorization through additional configurable rules (e.g. max fines owed)	25	2%		25	2%
10B22. Patron request ordering: Patron request interface enables patrons to specify particular volumes, microfilm reels, date range, or chapter on the request form	24	2%		24	2%
10C6. Patron request management: Patron can download digital copies	24	2%		24	2%
10C7. Patron request management: Patron can contact the ILL office (make an inquiry)	23	2%		18	2%

10C10. Patron request management: Staff can configure / customize the display of request statuses for clarity (e.g. wording, font, color)	23	2%		23	2%
10B7. Patron request ordering: System provides an interface for user login with configurable patron profile	22	2%		22	2%
10B1. Patron request ordering: System can automatically detect home campus of patron (e.g. based on IP address)	21	2%		21	2%
10B14. Patron request ordering: System warns patrons when they are off-network and linking to a licensed resource	20	2%		20	2%
10C14. Patron request management: System can display requests placed outside of the system (ALA form, Docline)	19	1%		14	1%
10B15. Patron request ordering: Patron request interface includes the contact info of the pickup location	17	1%		17	1%
10B2. Patron request ordering: System can allow patrons to manually select home campus	16	1%		16	1%
10C11. Patron request management: Patron ILL requests can be displayed in the same interface as home campus circulation checkouts	15	1%		15	1%
10B20. Patron request ordering: Patron request system can route request to arbitrary back-end system (e.g. ILS system or email to DDS)	13	1%		13	1%
10C12. Patron request management: Patron can see which institution the requested materials are coming from	13	1%		13	1%
10C9. Patron request management: System provides an ETA for incoming ILL books	8	1%		8	1%
10B16. Patron request ordering: Patron request interface provides map and directions to pickup location	7	1%		7	1%

Reporting Requirements					
Question	TOTAL	% Rating		No RLF	% Rating
11A1. Reports/Stats: The system includes a dynamic, intelligent and flexible statistical package (e.g. advanced dynamic filtering options of request and bibliographic data fields, not limited to Request Date, Date Part, Year, Copyright compliance (i.e. CCG, CCL), Title, page numbers, library location etc., and ability to customize date ranges with date operators such as earlier than, later than, equal to, between inclusive)	94	29%		72	27%
11A6. Reports/Stats: The system allows saving and editing of user-created report filters for future use	36	11%		36	13%

11A7. Reports/Stats: A staff user can custom format and print reports	36	11%		32	12%
11A2. Reports/Stats: A staff user can generate user-created customized Copyright Compliance reports	34	10%		34	13%
11A3. Reports/Stats: A staff user can generate user-created customized Collection Development reports	34	10%		30	11%
11A4. Reports/Stats: A staff user can generate user-created customized reports for special initiatives (e.g. WEST)	31	10%		16	6%
11A8. Reports/Stats: The system has the ability to read diacritics and symbols and convert them to base letters	23	7%		18	7%
11A9. Reports/Stats: The system allows access to structured data through download or other automated process (as opposed to manual downloading of data, or web-only presentation of data, or screen-scraping, etc.) (e.g. interface with statistical application such as jReports)	21	6%		17	6%
11A5. Reports/Stats: The system includes a built-in acquisitions function for reporting	15	5%		15	6%
Leftover points	0	0%		0	0%