Overview of Scoring for RFI Responses

The LLSAP Working Group consists of 8 members. These members include 1 user representative and 1 LLSAP Manager from each of the 4 automation groups - SILNet, Gatenet, LINC, and eLid. This group met in September to evaluate and determine the top vendor responses to the IHLS Automation Platform RFI (Request For Information).

Seven responses to the RFI were received and determined to be valid and eligible for evaluation. Each proposal was evaluated in terms of functionality, price, scalability, and other areas detailed below. Additional questions were posed to all 7 vendors to help in the evaluation process. Spreadsheets were also developed by the group to compare varying levels of functionality as well as the the vendors proposed costs for the functionality, hardware, and ongoing maintenance requirements as proposed. When the LLSAP Working Group convened to go over all of the responses, each representative filled out their evaluation independently based on information included in the vendor’s RFI response and the answers to the additional questions. These individual evaluations were then tallied to arrive at the committee’s final ranking and evaluation.

The top two vendors - Polaris and SirsiDynix Symphony - scored much higher than the other 5 vendors. Due to the disparity of scores between the 2nd and 3rd place responses, it was determined to only choose the top two respondents to proceed in the selection process.

The overall scores for each vendor were (out of 100):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polaris</td>
<td>85.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SirsiDynix</td>
<td>81.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equinox</td>
<td>60.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Interfaces</td>
<td>54.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC</td>
<td>49.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>44.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondo</td>
<td>43.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scoring Areas with Weight

Weight
25 Price
   4 Purchase
   7 Annual
   4 Adding Libraries
   4 Development
   2 Hardware
   2 Implementation
   2 Migration costs
30 Functionality
   5 Administration (Ease, Security, Flexibility, Access to Data)
   3 Network Requirements
   3 Platform (Web/client)
   4 OPAC (customization, functionality)
   5 Regional holds (handles current environment)
   5 Primary Staff modules (Circ, Cat, Reports, Holds)
   5 Secondary Staff modules (Acq, Ser, Reserves…)
20 Scalability
   8 Can handle size of our DB
   5 Customers live with comparable numbers
   5 Future growth (Additional Locations, VMWare)
   2 Live copies of the DB
10 Reputation
   3 Industry Formal evaluations
   5 Word on the street (our own opinions and user's opinions from list servs)
   2 Size of customer base
10 Consortial Friendly
   2 Number of consortia? Multi-type?
   5 Resource Sharing (holds, ILL, policies, groupings)
   3 Security (Ownership of data, local policies…)
5 Development
   3 Access to Data & table structure
   2 Ability to contribute to development
100 Totals