

**RFP16-08 Statewide Database Licensing**  
**Office of the Secretary of State, Washington State Library Division**  
**Amendment 2**  
**All Questions and Answers March 1 through 15, 2016 Revised**

Q1: Can you please clarify the motive of this agreement?

A1: This RFP seeks proposals for products in several categories.

- 1) Aggregated periodical databases covering a wide variety of subject areas with content that will be of interest to all types of nonprofit libraries and their patrons;
- 2) Newspapers both national and local, with as many papers as possible from the State of Washington;
- 3) Resources designed for children and students (both K-6 and K-12) that include at least one search interface designed for the younger researcher, and with database content appropriate for elementary reading levels;
- 4) Products in other categories as described in the RFP.

Q2: Is this process being used to establish a list of approved vendors/products at competitive pricing?

A2: Separate contracts covering the areas mentioned above may be awarded to meet the expressed need.

Q3: Or is the intent to select just one worthy respondent?

A3: No.

Q4: Funding clarification. Specifically, Section 1.2.6, can you clarify what is meant by, “no more than 50% of the total cost for any particular contract or for any individual library’s cost?”

A4: For the first three categories LSTA funds will subsidize 50% of the total cost. The remainder of the costs will be paid by the libraries participating in the contract.

Q5: With different online research databases available for a proposal and narrower target audiences will our offer of a limited product range be considered competitive? Or are you looking for as much of an all-inclusive product as possible?

A5: This RFP allows your company to respond only in the category(s) which you deem best matches your product. See 1.2.5 k-12 resources. You may also place a bid for 1.2.7. In this instance the Washington State Library will act as the negotiator for a group of libraries which may wish to take advantage of your product at a group rate. No federal funds will be used to subsidize this category.

Q6: In Section 1.2.3 you write "The combined database package should offer a minimum of 5000 unique titles of which at least 70% should be full text."

Would a highly specialized group of journals (politics, history, culture) still be considered for this RFP as a realistic participant for this RFP?

A6: No it would not.

Q7: Does the State Library offer IP's (some limited number that the thousands of libraries from schools, publics, academics and special libraries would authenticate through? My question is related to the administrative efforts necessary to add nearly 3000 K-12 schools.

A7: Yes. Your company would need to be able to deal with IP authentication through all the various subnets.

Q8: What format should the proposal use?

A8: Please closely follow the structure laid out in section 5 "proposal contents" of the RFP.

Q9: Where can we find the Certificate of Debarment and Suspension that needs to be completed prior to the contract's effective date? Should we obtain it from the state website?

A9: It is in the downloadable material in the announcement. Exhibit C of the sample contract. This is intended to be signed at the time the entire contract is signed. It is also available at the state website.

Q10: Can you clarify the naming convention for attachments/exhibits (e.g., both sample contract and statement of work are called "Exhibit B")?

A10: The sample contract and its 3 exhibits are part of the RFP Exhibit B. The parts of the sample contract are watermarked as "sample."

Q11: May vendors respond with pricing for an item for individual groups as opposed to pricing for all users? For example, in the K-12 category can resources be offered that are available to middle school only, but not high school.

A11: For purposes of evaluation the RFP wishes to have materials marked as either elementary or secondary. Middle School material would fall into the secondary category. If the product has a more narrow scope than the one requested in the K-12 category, the vendor might consider responding to section "other choices" instead competing in the K-12 category.

Q12: What kind of written reports or other written documents are expected in Exhibit B (Statement of Work)? Can vendors provide a list of offerings (along with delivery dates) in lieu of a written report?

A12: The “work” of this contract is making databases available to libraries and their customers. Therefore a vendor stating that his deliverables (databases) would “go live” at the particular date would be acceptable as a statement of work.

Q13: What is the site considering as “Other” in the Full-Text Format Available section of Exhibit E- Periodical Title Count? Can you explain what is meant by “Full text format available: Other.”

A13: It has been the experience of some that formats other than the three common formats listed fit into a miscellaneous category. The “other” category gives vendors to opportunity to tell the evaluation committee what those additional formats might be.

Q14: The cover page states, “EXPECTED TIME PERIOD FOR CONTRACT: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2018 with three (3) optional one-year extensions.” Then in Section 2.2 ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES, the contract start date is given as June 1, 2016. Please clarify the correct start date of the contract resulting from this RFP.

A14: The Effective Date of the contract is intended to be July 1, 2016. On July 1 we want to go active to not have a lapse from our current expiring contract. If work is done on reaching agreement on the contract or contracts we anticipate executing as early as June 1, but the Effective Date remains July 1. The time before July 1 remains uncertain due to negotiation and possible BAFO.

Q15: There is no mention of product trials as a part of the evaluation and decision-making process. May we provide free trials to libraries in the State during the RFP process?

A15: Yes, if your April 1st bid is viable, we would want our evaluation committee to be able to test out the product(s) which you are proposing.

Q16: Are all participating libraries to be set up with everything in the state-provided set of core resources? Or do individual libraries choose access from among the resources provided by the State?

A16: This RFP is distinct from previous RFP as it can have distinct outcomes. Products which are bid under the provisions of 5.2.1, 5.2.2, and 5.2.3 will be subsidized by LSTA funds and will be provided to every eligible library in Washington State. Products which are bid under 5.2.4 and 5.2.5 will not be subsidized by the LSTA funds and can therefore be offered to a select group of libraries. The State Library’s role will be to facilitate that process.

Q17: Can you please provide a range of dates when oral presentations (Section 3.3) might occur?

A17: If Oral presentations are needed, they could occur between May 2nd and May 6th.

Q18: Section 8 (Assurances), subsection B of the sample Contract requires Contractor to comply with "The federal award of OSOS's license in works developed or acquired with federal support (45 CFR section 1183.34)." Please clarify that notwithstanding this provision, Contractor shall retain ownership of all materials to be licensed under this RFP because all licensed materials are pre-existing and no works are being created or developed specifically for OSOS or member libraries.

A18: 45 CFR section 1183.34 directs us to get use rights consistent to what the Contractor has acquired from the provider of said works.

Q19: What is the significance of the description of "K-6 and/or K-12" (section 1.2.5) and "K-6-12" (section 5.2.3)? In particular, are resources that are designed to be "K-12" in scope but which otherwise meet stated criteria considered to be acceptable in meeting expectations of both "K-6" and "K-12" separately?

A19: What the State Library heard from its libraries is that they want to have choices. In other words while LSTA funds will subsidize all the successful bidders, libraries may select some of the subsidized databases but not all. Section 5.2.3. highlights the fact that public libraries, in addition to school libraries, will be considering the proposed databases. If a proposed product is too narrowly focused on a school market, it may be rated lower due to the lack of appeal to public library youth audiences.