

**May 18, 2026**  
**Orange County Library District**  
**Orlando, Florida**  
**OCLS RFP ILS 26-002**  
**Questions & Answers**

1. **Q:** Will you accept authorized DocuSign signatures?

**A: Yes**

2. **Q:** In several places the RFP references a "client application." Is a fully web-based staff client acceptable, or is a native desktop client application required?

**A: A fully web-based staff client is acceptable. Listed requirements for desktop clients only apply if all staff client functionality is not included in a web-based client.**

3. *Client application requirement Access Services #2: Bookdrop check-in*

**Q:** The requirement lists "bookdrop" as a distinct check-in mode separate from "backdated." Can the Library clarify what differentiates a bookdrop check-in from a backdated check-in in current workflows?

**A: This overlaps somewhat. A back-dated checkin functionality combined with creating a separate location/user would meet the need of bookdrop by checking in items with the assumption that they were returned one or more days before the due date and attributing the transaction to that location. This is how our current system is configured to check in for remote drop boxes. A drop box checkin mode would record transactions as a drop box checkin separate from the statistics for the branch performing the operation and ideally automatically backdate to a configurable number of days. Back-dating would still be used in the case of closures, etc.**

4. *Client application requirement #34: Relevancy sorting*

**Q:** Is relevancy-based sorting of search results required in the staff client, or only in the patron-facing discovery layer?

**A: Relevancy sorting of keyword search results in the staff client is strongly desired.**

5. *Client application requirement Access Services #45: Non-barcode patron IDs*  
**Q:** What non-barcode patron ID formats must be supported (e.g., student ID numbers, driver's license numbers, username/PIN)

**A: This mostly includes school IDs and some county employee IDs for authenticating electronic resources. A username and password, separate from the barcode and PIN, combination would be highly valued.**

6. *Client application requirement Access Services #122: Truncated*  
**Q:** Requirement #122 ends with an ellipsis ("opt-in for mail..."). Can the Library provide the complete text?

**A: Supports custom patron record elements and use of the information in reporting including fields for language, "opt-in" choice for program/marketing materials, and "opt-in" for mailing lists.**

7. *Client application requirement Technical Services #11: Patron alerts for unfilled holds*  
**Q:** Can the Library clarify what patron notification is expected from the acquisitions module for unfilled holds? Is this about notifying patrons when a new copy of a requested title is ordered?

**A: When the library is unable to fulfil a hold by its expiration date, and the library's collection development department has determined that more copies of the title in question will not be purchased, a notification is sent to the patron that the hold is being cancelled.**

8. *Client application requirement Technical Services #132: Work slip fields*  
**Q:** What fields must be available on customizable work slips?

**A: Basic order information and notes should be available for inclusion. The chief purpose would be for work slip notes.**

9. *Client application requirement Technical Services #193: Truncated*  
**Q:** Requirement #193 (serials enumeration) is cut off mid-sentence ("...the ability for the system to a..."). Can the Library provide the complete text?

**A: Staff can define enumeration levels and labels, including up to five levels of enumeration, a library-defined display label for each enumeration level, the ability for the system to automatically increment both alpha and numeric entries, the**

**ability to specify if each level is continuous or restarts when the parent level increments.**

**10. *Client application requirement System Administration #10: Truncated***

**Q:** Requirement #10 (client application privileges) is cut off mid-sentence ("...full functionality of the system or..."). Can the Library provide the complete text?

**A: Client application does not require end users to have elevated privileges (i.e. administrator access) on the workstation in order to access and utilize full functionality of the system or for client to update.**

**11. *Client application requirement APIs and Integrations #55 — Home delivery label printing***

**Q:** Can the Library describe the current home delivery label workflow — specifically whether labels are carrier-integrated (USPS, FedEx) or ILS-generated address labels, and what label format/hardware is in use?

**A: Currently, the first address from the patron record prints. The shipping labels are just printed on the receipt printer, Star SP742MU and a few older Star SP500. We can adjust to another printer, but it must be non-thermal for Home Delivery.**

**12. Q:** The RFP states the contract length is "TBD-year" with renewal of "TBD years." Can the Library specify the anticipated initial term and renewal period? If left to the vendors, how will pricing comparison be done?

**A: A three-year contract with the possibility of additional one-year renewals at the option of the library is the anticipated initial term and renewal period.**

**13. Q:** Section 8b requires confirmation of Florida Division of Corporations registration. Must this registration be in place at time of proposal submission, or is it sufficient to commit to registration prior to contract execution?

**A: The confirmation would need to be completed and submitted to OCLS prior to contract execution.**

**14. *Aspen Discovery API usage***

**Q:** OCLS implemented Aspen Discovery via the Sierra REST API. Can the Library specify which API operations Aspen uses from the Sierra "Catalog Driver" in Aspen?

**A: We would need some time to evaluate every possible http method against every endpoint and parameter. We can provide that if it's necessary, but Aspen is open source with its code published on GitHub. For now, here are the endpoints used in code/web/Drivers/Sierra.php:**

/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/token/  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/checkouts  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/bibs/{id}  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/branches  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/items/checkouts/{barcode}  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/items/{id}  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/checkout  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/checkouts/{id}/renewal  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/find?  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/holds/{id}  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/metadata  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/validate  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/checkouts  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/checkouts/history  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/checkouts/history/activationStatus  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/fines  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/fines/payment  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/holds  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/holds/requests  
/iii/sierra-api/v[version number]/patrons/{id}/holds/requests/form

**For more information, see <https://github.com/Aspen-Discovery/aspen-discovery/blob/26.04.00/code/web/Drivers/Sierra.php>**

**15. Q:** Does TBS support integration via standard REST or SIP2, or does it require the proprietary Sierra Patron API? Is re-integration of TBS in scope for this implementation?

**A: TBS uses SIP on all of their non-Sierra implementations.**

**16. Q:** Can the Library confirm iTiva will be retained and whether SIP2 integration with iTiva is part of acceptance testing?

**A: At this point, the library does not have plans to cancel iTiva,**

**17. Q:** Can the Library share which API operations Communico uses so vendors can evaluate REST API compatibility?

**A: Based on our department's most recent communication with Communico, they use the following API requests:**

- Authorities Read - Read
- Bibliographic Records - Read
- Branches - Read
- Items - Read
- Patrons - Read
- Patrons - Update
- Holds - Create
- Holds - Update
- Holds - Delete
- Checkouts - Create
- Checkouts - Update (renew)

**18. *Bookmobile and book drops***

**Q:** Are offline circulation capabilities for the bookmobile in scope? Are the four standalone book drops staffed or automated (RFID/SIP2)?

**A: Offline circulation would only be a last resort when a reliable network is not available. Our courier collects materials from the standalone book drops, which are otherwise unattended. There is not electronic checkin or any other reading of the item on the book drop.**

**19. Q:** Appendix B (fee proposal) is referenced but not included in the RFP documents. Will it be issued as an addendum, or should vendors create their own cost structure?

**A: Appendix B is listed on the Advertised Solicitation webpage in the listing for OCLS RFP ILS 26-002 under Information <https://ocls.org/board-trustees/advertised-solicitations/>**

**20. Q:** Can the Library define parameters for "peer-sized" (e.g., collection size, service population, annual circulation) so vendors can select appropriate references?

**A: For the purposes of this RFP, a peer-sized public library system serves a minimum population of 500,000, has multiple locations, and a minimum annual circulation of 5 million.**

**21. Q:** Will short-listed vendors receive a demo script or scenario list in advance of demonstrations, and if so, how much lead time?

**A: The library will inform all short-listed vendors about key topics to cover in advance of the demonstrations and presentations. The library will provide this information as soon as possible after the short-listed vendors have been announced.**

**22. Q:** What is the anticipated timeline for the completion of implementation (“go live”)?

**A: The library will work with the selected vendor to determine the project timeline for implementation and the go-live date.**

**23. Q:** How many bibliographic records are in your current database?

**A: There are just over 400,000 unsuppressed records.**

**24. Q:** How many bibliographic records do you add to your collection in a given year?

**A: 53,461 is the mean for the last ten years with as few as 31,409 in 2023 and as many as 129,216 in 2024. This large range can probably be attributed to electronic resource reloads. As we are directly integrating some electronic resource vendor titles into Aspen, this will likely go trend towards our lower numbers.**

**25. Q:** How many authority records are in your current database?

**A: 173,558**

**26. Q:** Do you use a third party provider for authority control services, such as Backstage?

**A: No**

**27. Q:** Do you use SMS notifications for hold notifications, overdue notices, circulation receipts, etc? If so, approximately how many SMS messages are sent per month?

**A:** We continue to use a locally developed system for sending SMS notifications for items coming due. Patrons have a choice between individual messages and a digest. On average, we send 1,800 message per month. Ideally, we would replace this service in the migration.

**28. Q:** Other than Bibliotheca, iTiva, EZproxy, Communico Connect, and Aspen Discovery, are there other third party software solutions or services currently connected to your ILS that should be integrated with the new ILS?

**A:** This information is detailed in the APIs and Integrations tab of Appendix A, which is listed on the Advertised Solicitation webpage in the listing for OCLS RFP ILS 26-002 under Information <https://ocls.org/board-trustees/advertised-solicitations/>