

MTLib2Go Executive Committee meeting

11am

Present: Annie Alger; Stef Johnson; Debbi Kramer; Susie McIntyre; KellyAnne Terry; Cara Orban (ex officio)

FY16 budget numbers:

cost formula revenue (addition of three new libraries since last year, plus some shifting between cost formula tiers for a few libraries)

FY15 cash balance

donations

other (see spreadsheet)

Invoicing: discussion of new content credit purchase process through OverDrive

WMA removal

OverDrive has given us a credit of \$2,489 for circulating WMA titles purchased after January 1, 2011 that were not replaced by an MP3 copy. Altogether, OverDrive removed 1,030 WMA titles, of which about a third had circulated in the past year. This is OverDrive's policy on compensation for these titles:

For every checkout in the last 12 months (May 1, 2014 through April 30, 2015) of a title purchased on or after January 1, 2011 that was only available in WMA or WMV, you will receive \$.50 cents per checkout in the form of OverDrive content credit.

So, we were compensated for 4,978 checkouts between May 2014 and the end of April this year.

Cara shared her concerns with OverDrive and expressed that we didn't think we should be penalized for the longevity of our contract with OverDrive and for having added this portion of our popular audio titles prior to 2011.

OverDrive responded that they considered two criteria in issuing content credit: when the title was purchased (whether it was within the last 4+ years) and how many times it circulated in the last 12 months.

They state that they are continuing to attempt to obtain MP3 versions of *all* WMA titles that were once part of your collection.

Next steps: Would the Executive Committee like to follow up with OverDrive on the WMA issue?

Questions:

What are the parameters on the license agreement?

Ownership of one copy/one user titles going forward

State Procurement RFI:

Cara reviewed the RFI process for the Executive Committee:

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Agencies may occasionally want to consider using a “Request for Information” process to obtain preliminary information about a market or the type of available supply or service when there is not enough information readily available to write an adequate specification or work statement. A Request for Information is simply a document used to informally solicit this type of information. It may not be used as a source selection method to procure a supply or service.

See section 18-4-221, MCA, and ARM 2.5.508.

State project objective; project description; and boilerplate terms and conditions

1.0 Terms and Conditions

- 1.1 The State of Montana will not become obligated as a result of this RFI.
- 1.2 Information submitted in response to this RFI will become the property of the State of Montana.
- 1.3 Information that is confidential or trade secret must be clearly marked and separated from the rest of the response. The response must not contain confidential material in the cost or price section. An affidavit from a vendor’s legal counsel attesting to and explaining the validity of the trade secret claim as set out in Title 30, chapter 14, part 4, MCA, should be attached to each response containing trade secrets. Counsel must use the State of Montana “Affidavit for Trade Secret Confidentiality” form in requesting the trade secret claim. This affidavit form is available on the General Services Division’s website at: <http://www.mt.gov/dao/gsd/procurement/forms.asp> or by calling (406) 444-2575.
Any information separated out under this process will be available for review only by our strategic planning team, and limited other designees. Vendors must be prepared to pay all legal cost and fees associated with defending a claim for confidentiality in the event of a “right to know” (open records) request from another party.

- 1.4 The State of Montana will not pay for any information herein requested nor is it liable for any cost incurred by the vendor.
- 1.5 Economy of presentation: Special binders, colored displays, promotional materials, and the like are not required.
- 1.6 Vendors may be asked to meet for the purpose of explaining and/or demonstrating responses. Any meeting, if necessary, will be held via GoToMeeting Software. List a contact person and phone number the State may contact to schedule a meeting time and place.
- 1.7 This RFI is being submitted strictly for the purpose of gaining knowledge of the products and services available.

2.0 RFI RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS

The State is asking all interested parties to submit a response containing the following information:

- ✓ Your interest in providing the services/supplies.
- ✓ Brief description of past experience providing similar services/supplies.
- ✓ From your past experience, has the State identified all the major components necessary to complete this project? If not, please provide information on other necessary components.
- ✓ Please provide a list of potential problems/risks that the State may encounter during this project. Please provide any ideas or suggestions about how such problems/risks should be addressed in a solicitation.
- ✓ Your best estimated price range to provide the services/supplies as stated herein, lowest estimate to highest estimate.
- ✓ Your best estimated time frame for completing the project.

What we need from this committee:

Questions to ask of other vendors that would allow us to place our current OverDrive service in a context where we can better evaluate the value we are receiving through that contract.

Draft list of questions: Hosting costs, tech assistance costs, licensing

Timeline:

Launch RFI by late August; receive responses by October Exec Committee meeting so that we would have time to take action if desired before the following fiscal year renewal.

Cost formula:

Currently, our cost formula is based only on patron count and this does not lend itself well to planning in advance, anticipating fluctuations in available revenue. Is there interest in reviewing other cost share formulas or revising the structure of our formula to also cover the hosting fee?

Survey – sending statistics on how much they had used

Ask if they know how to get their stats

Susie: we are ok only because of donations

Next steps: bring other cost formula structures to this committee for review, if desired – after RFI, so we would begin this process in November.

Wrap up/follow-up:

Share updated budget info with Selection Committee

WMA follow-up – licensing terms and conditions info to Exec Committee

Cost share formula models – send statistics

Questions for RFI – draft list and send to Exec Committee by July 24th for revisions