Document



Institutional Repository Software RFP Template

This template is provided courtesy of <u>Notch8</u>, a Samvera Partner specializing in Hyku and Hyrax implementations for academic institutions. Since 2011, Notch8 has helped over 30 institutions successfully migrate, modernize, and maintain their digital repositories. We offer expertise in repository migrations, custom development, and long-term support for Samvera-based solutions.

For questions about this template or your repository project, contact us at <u>sales@notch8.com</u>. If you find it valuable, we'd love to hear from you.

If you don't find it valuable, we'd especially love your feedback!

Request for Proposal (RFP)

Institutional Repository Software Implementation and Migration

[YOUR INSTITUTION NAME]

Issue Date: [DATE]

Proposal Due Date: [DATE]

Project Start Date: [TARGET DATE]

Section 1: Institutional Context

1.1 About [Institution Name]

[Brief paragraph about your institution - size, research focus, notable collections]

1.2 Current Repository Environment

Current System(s):

- Platform: [e.g., DSpace 6.3, Hyrax 2.9.6, ContentDM, Digital Commons]
- Number of instances: [e.g., 4 separate instances]
- Architecture: [e.g., shared Fedora 4 backend]
- Hosting: [on-premise/cloud/vendor-hosted]
- Collection Scope:
- Total digital objects: [e.g., 50,000 works]
- Total storage volume: [e.g., 4.5 TB]
- Primary content types:
 - ☐ Images ([quantity])



☐ PDFs/Documents ([quantity])
☐ Audio files ([quantity])
☐ Video files ([quantity])
☐ Datasets ([quantity])
☐ Complex/TEI/Other ([quantity])
 Annual growth rate: [e.g., 5,000 objects/year, rough estimate of increase storage]
1.3 Motivation for Change
Primary Drivers: [Select all that apply]
 □ End-of-life technology (specify:) □ Performance/scalability issues □ Maintenance burden □ Missing functionality □ Cost reduction □ Compliance requirements □ User experience improvements □ Other:
Critical Pain Points:

- 1. [e.g., Four separate systems create maintenance complexity]
- 2. [e.g., Outdated technology stack poses security risks]
- 3. [e.g., Limited search and discovery capabilities]

1.4 Success Metrics

This project will be considered successful if:

- [e.g., Repository consolidation reduces maintenance effort by 50%]
- [e.g., User engagement increases by 30% within first year]
- [e.g., All content migrated with 100% integrity verification]
- [e.g., System achieves 99.9% uptime]

Section 2: Functional Requirements (MoSCoW Framework)

*Please indicate your capability to meet each requirement using:

- Available: Out-of-the-box functionality
- Configuration: Available through configuration
- Custom: Requires custom development (provide estimate)
- Not Available: Cannot be provided*



2.1 MUST HAVE Requirements (Deal-breakers)

ID	Requirement	Description	Vendor Response	Notes/Cost
M1	Digital Preservation	Checksums, versioning, audit trails		
M2	Authentication	[SAML/Shibboleth/CAS] integration		
М3	Accessibility	WCAG 2.2 AA compliance		
M4	OAI-PMH	Harvesting protocol support		
M5	Bulk Import	Import [#] objects via CSV/API		
M6	Performance	Support [#] concurrent users		
M7	Storage	[S3-compatible API, Cloud provider preference] integration		
M8	Metadata Schemas	Support for [DC, MODS, etc.]		
M9	Access Controls	Embargo, campus-only, restricted		
M10	Search	Full-text search of PDFs		

2.2 SHOULD HAVE Requirements (High Priority)

ID	Requirement	Description	Vendor Response	Notes/Cost
S1	IIIF Support	V3 support		
S2	DOI Minting	DataCite / CrossRef integration		
S3	Authority Control	MESH, AAC		
S4	Analytics	Matomo integration		
S5	Flexible Metadata	Admin-configurable schemas		
S6	Batch Operations	Bulk edit/delete capabilities		



2.3 COULD HAVE Requirements (Nice to Have)

ID	Requirement	Description	Vendor Response	Notes/Cost
C1	Data Visualization	Interactive charts/graphs		
C2	Social Media	Sharing and embedding features		
С3	Citation Export	RIS, BibTeX, EndNote formats		
C4	Version Compare	Visual diff between versions		
C5	OCR Integration	Automatic text extraction		
C6	Custom Work Types	UI-based type creation		

2.4 WON'T HAVE Requirements (Out of Scope)

- [e.g., Integrated peer review workflows]
- [e.g., Built-in video editing capabilities]
- [e.g., Payment processing for paid content]

Section 3: Technical Environment

3.1 Authentication & Authorization

Current Infrastructure:

- Authentication system: [e.g., Shibboleth 3.4]
- User directory: [e.g., Active Directory]
- Required integration: [e.g., Single sign-on mandatory]

3.2 Systems Integration

Must integrate with:

Discovery layer: [e.g., Primo, Summon, EDS]
Digital preservation: [e.g., Archivematica, Preservica
Research information: [e.g., Symplectic Elements]
Course reserves: [system name]
Other:



3.3 Storage & Infrastructure

Preferences:

Cloud storage (AWS S3, Azure, Google Cloud)
On-premise storage

Hybrid approachNo preference

Network considerations:

• Bandwidth: [e.g., 10 Gbps connection]

• Geographic restrictions: [if any]

3.4 Migration Requirements

Source System Details:

- Export capabilities: [e.g., OAI-PMH, API, database access]
- Metadata format: [e.g., Dublin Core, MODS, custom schema]
- File organization: [e.g., Fedora object model, filesystem]

Migration Expectations:

- Maximum acceptable downtime: [e.g., 48 hours]
- Phased migration possible: [Yes/No]
- Content freeze period acceptable: [Yes/No, duration]

Section 4: Project Approach

4.1 Timeline

Key Milestones:

• Contract execution: [DATE]

Project kickoff: [DATE]

• Data migration complete: [DATE]

• User acceptance testing: [DATE]

• Production launch: [DATE]

• Project close: [DATE]

Critical Deadlines:

- [e.g., Grant deadline: DATE]
- [e.g., Academic year consideration: Fall semester launch required]
- [e.g., Contract renewal: Current system contract ends DATE]



4.2 Implementation Approach

Preferred methodology: ■ Waterfall (sequential phases) ☐ Agile (iterative sprints) ☐ Hybrid approach ■ No preference Desired phases: ☐ Discovery/requirements gathering ☐ Pilot/proof of concept ☐ Phased migration by collection ☐ Big-bang migration ☐ Parallel run period 4.3 Project Resources Institution will provide: • Project manager: [Hours/week available] • Technical lead: [Hours/week available] • Subject matter experts: [Number and availability] • Test users: [Number available] Vendor should provide: ☐ Dedicated project manager ☐ Technical architect ☐ Migration specialist ☐ Training resources

Section 5: Vendor Qualifications

5.1 Please provide:

☐ Documentation

- Company overview (1 page maximum)
- Relevant experience with similar migrations (include 3 references)
- **Team composition** for this project
- Sample project timeline based on our requirements
- Risk mitigation strategies for common repository migration challenges



5.2 Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated on:

Criterion	Weight
Functional fit (MoSCoW requirements)	30%
Total cost of ownership (5 years)	25%
Implementation approach & timeline	20%
Vendor experience & references	15%
Long-term support & sustainability	10%

5.3 Proof of Concept

Top 2-3 vendors may be asked to participate in a proof of concept demonstrating:

- Migration of sample dataset (1,000 objects)
- Key workflow demonstration
- Performance benchmarks
- Integration capabilities

Section 6: Budget & Pricing

6.1 Budget Guidance

Available budget ranges:

- One-time implementation: \$[X] \$[Y]
- Annual operating: \$[X] \$[Y]
- Optional enhancements: up to \$[Z]

6.2 Pricing Structure Required

Please provide detailed pricing for:

Base platform setup
Data migration ([#] objects)



	Customization/development Training Other:
Recuri	ing Costs:
	Annual hosting/SaaS fee Support & maintenance Storage (per TB) Transaction fees (if applicable) Upgrade costs
Option	nal Services:
	Extended support hours Additional training Custom development (hourly rate) Consulting services
6.3 T	otal Cost of Ownership

Provide 5-year TCO including all costs, assuming:

- [X]% annual growth in content
- [Y] hours of annual customization
- Standard support package

Section 7: Proposal Submission

7.1 Questions & Clarifications

- Questions due: [DATE and TIME]
- Submit questions to: [EMAIL]
- Responses will be shared with all vendors by: [DATE]
- Optional bidders conference: [DATE, TIME, LOCATION/VIRTUAL LINK]

7.2 Submission Requirements

Proposal must include:

- 1. Executive summary (2 pages maximum)
- 2. Detailed response to requirements (Section 2)
- 3. Technical approach
- 4. Project plan and timeline
- 5. Pricing worksheet



- 6. References (minimum 3)
- 7. Sample contract/terms

Format:

- Electronic submission only
- PDF format preferred
- Maximum 50 pages (excluding appendices)

Submit to: [EMAIL/PORTAL]

Due: [DATE] at [TIME] [TIMEZONE]

7.3 Evaluation Process

Phase	Timeline
Initial review	[DATES]
Vendor presentations	[DATES]
Reference checks	[DATES]
Proof of concept	[DATES]
Selection notification	[DATE]
Contract negotiation	[DATES]

Appendices

Appendix A: Current System Statistics

[Attach detailed statistics, reports, sample metadata]

Appendix B: Sample Data

[Provide access to representative sample of content types]

Appendix C: Technical Architecture Diagrams

[Include current system architecture, integration points]

Appendix D: Terms and Conditions

[Include standard institutional terms, insurance requirements, etc.]



Contact Information:

Primary Contact:

[Name]

[Title]

[Email]

[Phone]

Technical Contact:

[Name]

[Title]

[Email]

[Phone]

End of RFP Template

Template Usage Notes

- 1. **Customize all bracketed placeholders** [like this] with your institution's information
- 2. **Remove any sections** that don't apply to your situation
- 3. Add institution-specific requirements as needed
- 4. Consider adding a glossary if using specialized terminology
- 5. Have legal review Appendix D before issuing
- 6. **Test all links and contact information** before distribution

For assistance with your repository RFP or to discuss your project needs, contact Notch8 at hello@notch8.com or visit www.notch8.com