**Selection and Evaluation of Vendors**

1. We are not calling for tender for the supply of books as the necessity of calling for tenders or quotations in respect of purchase of books and journals was dispensed by the Ministry of Finance, Govt. Of India vide its O.M. No. F.23(7).EII (A)/83 dated 7.02.84.
2. The book vendors are selected based on a three stage evaluation process. In the first stage a tentative list of reputed and eligible vendors are prepared by the library staff by consulting publisher’s representatives and librarians of other government organizations. In the second stage, the listed vendors will be contacted by the Library and Information Officer and those who satisfy the following criteria will be listed in the panel of vendors to supply books.
3. Membership in Federation of Book Sellers and Book Publishers association of India.
4. Yearly business turnout of rupees 1 crore
5. 10 years experience in book supply to the libraries
6. Supplier of books to the central government institution libraries
7. Provision of 20% discount
8. Purchase order will be placed for lists of books approved for purchase for the year by dividing among the paneled vendors.
9. We have a list of eligible vendors prepared by testing over the years their ability to successfully supply the books we have ordered. The following criteria are applied in selecting the vendors. (i) availability of material in the shortest time, (ii) correctness of invoices and material received, (iii), responsiveness to inquiries.
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In the selection of vendors the guiding purpose is to achieve the best possible combination of service and cost.  Availability of material in the shortest time, correctness of invoices and material received, cooperation in accepting returns, responsiveness to inquiries, and prompt and cooperative issuance of credit memos are also factors in the selection of dealers.  Specialization in subject or format which produces excellent service and/or good discounts is a consideration in vendor selection.  Geographic proximity which insures promptness of delivery and the ease with which written and telephone communication can be maintained are also considered.

ids in vendor selection are the department's internal vendor evaluation records and published guides such as the American Library Association's Guidelines for handling library orders for in-print monographic publications (l984) and Ung Chon Kim's Policies of publishers; a handbook for order librarians, 4th ed. (1989).

Regular review of the vendors will have high priority.  Efforts are made not to have large amounts of money obligated for long periods of time to a vendor who is not performing well.  A close check will also be maintained on the discount rate which is promised and delivered on publications purchased.

Prompt, courteous reception of business telephone calls and prompt courteous replies to correspondence are required of Acquisitions Department personnel, and reciprocal courtesy is expected from vendors.  In addition, a spirit of cooperation and amicability is expected in making adjustments such as cancellations, returns, and issuance of credit memos.  Quick response in sending catalogs and brochures outlining services and availability of materials is expected.  Dealers must be willing and able to respond in a cooperative and constructive manner to complaints registered by the Acquisitions Department.

Suggestions from teaching faculty or librarians regarding vendors will be given careful consideration, but the ultimate responsibility for selecting vendors rests with the Acquisitions Department and is based on the above criteria. Verbal offers from vendors to supply expensive sets or large quantities of volumes must be substantiated by written quotations.  All purchasing commitments for non-periodical library materials should be made through the Acquisitions Department.  Teaching faculty or librarians outside the Acquisitions Department are not authorized to make commitments to vendors for library purchases, nor may they claim or cancel Acquisitions Department orders.

**Scores and Criteria**

The standard SAP System offers you a scoring range from 1 to 100 points, which is used to measure the performance of your vendors on the basis of five main criteria.

You can determine and compare the performance of your vendors by reference to their overall scores.

The main criteria available in the standard system are:

* Price
* Quality
* Delivery
* General service/support

These four main criteria serve as a basis for evaluating vendors from whom you procure materials.

* External service provision

This main criterion serves as a basis for evaluating those vendors you employ as external service providers.

You can also define other or further main criteria, as required.
You can assign different weights to the individual criteria. The vendor’s overall score is computed taking into account the weighted scores awarded for each of the main criteria.

The Vendor Evaluation System ensures that evaluation of vendors is objective, since all vendors are assessed according to uniform criteria and the scores are computed automatically.

In this way, subjective impressions and judgments can be largely eliminated.

To create a detailed evaluation, each main criterion can be divided into several subcriteria.

The standard system provides you with certain subcriteria which suffice as a basis for evaluation. You can also define your own additional subcriteria.

The scores for the subcriteria are calculated in different ways.

**Scoring Methods**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scoring method** | **Description** |
| Fully automatically | Scores are calculated by the system on the basis of existing data. |
| Semi-automatically | You enter individual scores for important materials, or for the quality and timeliness of a service performed, yourself. The system then calculates the higher-level score from these. |
| Manually | You enter a blanket score for a subcriterion per vendor. |

You can decide yourself which of these methods to use.

**Analyses**

The results of vendor evaluation are displayed in the form of analyses. For example, you can generate ranking lists of the best vendors according to their overall scores or ranking lists for specific materials.

Changes to evaluations are recorded in logs, and you have the option of printing out evaluation sheets

After an approval plan has been operating for one year or more it is time to evaluate its

effectiveness, time to step back and ask: Is the approval plan working? Is it fulfilling the goals for

which it was designed? Has the vendor performed as promised? Is the partnership between the

approval plan vendor and the library working to the library’s advantage?
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How does one conduct an approval plan vendor evaluation? My perspective on this question is

that of a collection development librarian in a large liberal arts college library. The following

observations derive from a literature review and 20 years of experience with collection development

and approval plans in college and university libraries. They are not based on a statistically

oriented vendor performance study. In this paper I will consider essential issues in approval plan

performance evaluation, list criteria for evaluating approval plan vendors, and describe the ongoing

project at Oberlin College Library to evaluate the monograph approval plan with Blackwell’s. This

evaluation is not yet complete, but the process has been productive; we have already made

improvements in the plan. Since disclosure of the results of any vendor evaluation requires caution,

the following disclaimer is offered. Oberlin College Library is not engaged in a comparative vendor

evaluation study; I am simply reporting Oberlin’s experience evaluating one vendor’s approval

plan services.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER

What does an approval plan evaluation consist of? A number of essential issues must be

considered. The plan as a whole and the vendor in particular must be evaluated within the total

context of a library’s collection development program.

Why was the approval plan established? Why is it needed? How does it fit in with the overall

collection development program? Can materials be adequately selected without an approval plan?

Who is doing materials selection and how is it done? Budgetary issues must be considered. Is there

adequate funding for an approval plan? What acquisitions and cataloging workflow and staffing

issues are involved? Are there adequate numbers of staff members in technical services to handle

materials received on an approval plan? Is there a need for the approval plan vendor to provide

outsourcing services?

The answers to these questions establish a context for the evaluation of a particular approval

plan vendor. They help define a library’s needs. Presumably these needs were matched with the

services available from various vendors when the library chose the current vendor. One goal in

evaluating a vendor’s service should be to review these needs and determine if they have changed

from the time the approval plan was established.

What are the essential elements of an approval vendor evaluation and what criteria should be

used in this process? There is a substantial literature on approval plans. Beau David Case’s recent

literature review, “Approval Plan Evaluation Studies: A Selected Annotated Bibliography, 1969–

1996” [1], is valuable. Case summarizes recent evaluation studies, emphasizing their methodologies.

A valuable list of questions for any approval plan vendor was written at the State University

of New York at Stony Brook in April 1996. It is “Vendor Service Expectations and Questions” and

appears in ARL Spec Kit 221, “Evolution and Status of Approval Plans” [2]. ALA also published

a *Guide to Performance Evaluation of Library Materials Vendors* in 1988 [3]. Though intended for

work with firm order rather than approval vendors, this guide emphasizes basic principles that

should be followed in any vendor evaluation. Chief among these is the importance of making

objective judgments about which vendors supply a library’s needs “more accurately, economically,

quickly, and efficiently” [4]. When comparing vendors it is important to establish local standards

of acceptability that apply equally to all vendors. Subjective judgments should be validated,

whenever possible, by objective measurements. Duplication rates and discounts can be measured.

Invoices can be reviewed to verify shipping charges. Perceptions of quality of a vendor’s service

can be compared with quantitative assessments. Logs may be kept of contact with vendor

representatives. Other libraries using the same approval vendor can be contacted to discuss their
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experiences. Approval receipts can be compared with lists of essential new books in various

subjects. Lists of rejected titles can be reviewed to determine rejection rates and reasons why each

title was rejected.

CRITERIA TO USE IN THE EVALUATION

What criteria should be used in evaluating an approval plan vendor? Kay Womack et al. provide

an approval plan vendor review checklist in “An Approval Plan Vendor Review: The Organization

and Process” [5]. SUNY Stony Brook’s List of Vendor Service Expectations and Questions cited

above is also an excellent resource to consult for suggestions.

It is important to decide which of these criteria are most important to one’s own library. In my

view these are the most significant criteria:

1. *Reputation and financial stability*—What experiences have comparable libraries had with

this vendor’s approval plan? Ask a vendor for names of comparable libraries operating their

approval plans. Contact librarians at these libraries and discuss their experiences with the

vendor.

2. *Publisher coverage*—Does the vendor have a list of publishers included in their plan? Obtain

and review it carefully. Does it include all the essential sci-tech, trade, university, and small

press publishers issuing books essential to your university’s programs? How large is the

vendor’s inventory? Vendors can usually deliver books more quickly if they have them in

stock than if they must be ordered from publishers.

3. *Approval plan management tools*—Is there a detailed subject thesaurus? Obtain and examine

it. How are both subject and non-subject aspects of each book profiled? Is there a list of

non-subject parameters? What other profiling tools are available? Are they accessible on the

Web? Are they detailed enough to develop precise subject profiles capable of identifying

important books in narrowly defined subject areas? Are the subject profiles easy to write then

revise? What management reports are available? Can customized reports be generated on

short notice for specific needs?

4. *Technological Development*—Is the vendor keeping up with advances in information technology,

even contributing to its development? Are the vendor’s approval plan services and

management tools moving to Web-based access? How developed and useful is the vendor’s

Web site? Can the library outsource any acquisitions/cataloging services to this vendor? Does

the vendor offer cataloging records with each title that can be easily downloaded?

5. *Notification Forms*—Can the approval plan profiles be used to generate selection forms for

distribution to selectors? Examine some forms, do they contain adequate and accurate

bibliographic and financial information. Can they be customized with your library’s fund

codes, names of subject profiles, etc.

6. *Duplication Prevention*—How does the vendor prevent duplication between approval plan

titles and firm and/or standing orders?

7. *Discount Structure*—What discounts does the vendor offer for specific levels of dollar

volume? Will the vendor absorb shipping charges?

8. *Vendor Staff Qualifications*—How educated and experienced are the vendor’s approval staff

members? How available are they? Do they respond quickly, accurately and courteously to

customer needs?

9. *Invoicing, Returns, and Claims*—Are the vendor’s invoices accurate? Is the returns policy

liberal and flexible? Are claims handled promptly and accurately?
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APPROVAL PLAN VENDOR EVALUATION AT OBERLIN COLLEGE LIBRARY

Oberlin is the largest college library in OhioLINK with a collection exceeding 1.1 million

volumes. We are adding, 15–20,000 vols./year. The 1997–98 materials budget is $1.5 million for

the Art, Conservatory of Music, Science, and Main Libraries. At Oberlin Library materials

selection involves collaboration between faculty and librarians. A network of liaison librarians

works with faculty in each teaching department. Oberlin’s Art and Music librarians have advanced

subject degrees and function like university bibliographers, selecting a large percentage of titles

added to those branch libraries. The Science Librarian and liaison librarians in the Main Library

work with faculty in teaching departments who select a large percentage of titles added in the

Natural Sciences and most fields of the Humanities and Social Sciences. This faculty-dependent

selection model is evolving toward more librarian selection as older faculty retire, and advances in

technology and heavier workloads make it more difficult to keep both liaison librarians and faculty

continuously involved in selection.

Approval plans have been gradually adopted at Oberlin as one method of insuring the selection

and acquisition of important new books in the most timely and cost effective manner. In the

mid-1980s we wrote broad interdisciplinary Blackwell approval plan profiles to generate selection

forms for new books in several interdisciplinary areas: African-American, Judaic and Near Eastern,

Latin American, and Women’s Studies. Faculty selectors found these forms easy to use.

Music was the first subject area in which Oberlin began to buy books on approval. A Blackwell

music approval plan was established to acquire English language books from the U.S. and U. K.

in the late 1980s. By the mid-1990s it became clear that we needed to extend the approval selection

concept to other departments. Using approval plans for most subject areas was endorsed in

principle by the Faculty Library Committee and detailed profiles were written for 19 additional

departments plus the Main Library Reference collection during 1995–96. These Blackwell profiles

were used to generate selection forms during a six-month trial period to determine if these titles

were worth adding to the collection. The trial period was successfully completed, and in March

1996 a transition was made from a strictly forms-based plan to one combining books and forms.

During 1996–97 Oberlin received 1,996 books on approval, retaining 1,759 and spending $60,571

on the Blackwell plan. The initial return rate was 11.9%, low for a new plan, reflecting the

painstaking process of writing and revising detailed subject profiles.

After one year’s experience we decided to evaluate our Blackwell approval plan in Spring 1997.

We had three primary goals for this evaluation:

1. To determine if we were receiving the essential books in each subject, books Oberlin must

own locally, rather than rely on other OhioLINK libraries to provide.

2. To obtain feedback from faculty members on the approval plan concept—was it working

from their perspective?

3. To evaluate Blackwell’s service as an approval plan vendor.

Another important goal was to determine if we could broaden the approval plan for particular

subject areas. This was necessary as it is becoming ever more difficult to involve faculty members

in selecting individual titles.

An approval program evaluation plan was drafted and discussed. Key elements involved the

production and distribution of statistical reports and lists of titles accepted and rejected on each

subject profile. Considerable effort was expended working with Blackwell’s to produce reports of

titles accepted and rejected on each subject profile. The results of this effort were disappointing.

Blackwell’s statistical reports covering all subject areas are satisfactory but the format of their title
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lists for each profile made them hard to interpret and distribute easily. Therefore, library staff

generated lists of titles accepted and rejected for each department from Oberlin’s online catalog,

and these lists have been distributed electronically across campus. These reports of numbers, costs,

and individual titles received for each department are being used as a basis for discussions between

liaison librarians and faculty to determine whether subject profiles are capturing important books.

I am meeting with each liaison librarian to interpret the results of these discussions and make

necessary revisions in each subject profile.

Separate meetings will be held with acquisitions/cataloging staff members to discuss Blackwell’s

performance as a vendor. The criteria listed above will be the basis for these discussions and

results will be compiled and presented to the liaison librarians’ group and Blackwell’s for further

action. We will also present a summary report to the Faculty Library Committee.

A key issue in these technical services discussions will be the related issues of duplication and

publisher coverage. Oberlin’s Blackwell approval plan subject profiles include 60 academic

publishers. A major effort was made to identify presses Oberlin selectors consider most important

for each subject area. All firm orders for the 60 publishers included in the Blackwell approval plan

are sent to Blackwell’s to prevent duplication on approval. Firm orders for titles we do not expect

to receive on the Blackwell approval plan are sent to other vendors. This procedure has kept

duplication to a minimum but it is a cause of concern for some of our library staff since it has

reduced the volume of Oberlin’s business directed to other firm order vendors. If Oberlin’s

Blackwell approval plan is to be expanded, additional publishers must be added to the Blackwell

approval list and Blackwell’s share of the total Oberlin monograph business will grow at the

expense of other vendors. This issue will have to examined carefully.

CONCLUSION

Our evaluation is not yet concluded, but the process has already yielded positive results. Fine

tuning of individual profiles has brought in important books we might have missed, and coordination

of profiles has been improved. Discussions with Blackwell’s have been productive. Blackwell’s

Collection Manager Web site was activated this past summer, and we have had the

opportunity to make suggestions about how it can be used to generate management reports for

individual subject profiles. Our evaluation is also timely as it coincides with OhioLINK’s current

interest in the possibility of developing a statewide approval plan, a large-scale, important

undertaking that Oberlin will be better prepared for possible participation in.
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|  |
| --- |
|  **Collection Acquisitions Policy**  |

|  |
| --- |
|  **Collection Acquisitions Policy**  |

 Collection acquisition is a core function of the State Library and an annual endowment for the purchase of collection material is mandated under the *New South Wales Library Act 1939*. The aim of the Collection Acquisition Policy is to ensure the most cost-effective, efficient and timely acquisition of collection material for the Library through a fair, transparent and accountable acquisition process, consistent with the *Public Finance and Audit Act 1983*.

 In a volatile market place that is subject to many outside forces the policy provides a framework to manage acquisitions consistently and systematically across all acquisition categories and formats including published, original, online and born digital categories.

**Context**

The Acquisition Policy for Collection Material was revised in 2004 to reflect the entire range of categories of material acquired. The current version includes updates relevant to the acquisitions process and incorporates procedural changes in the appendix to make use of advances in the electronic acquisition processes.

 **Policy statement**

**Funding and Audit**

The State Government annually provides capital funding to the State Library of NSW to be used for additions to the collection and a recurrent allocation for online resources.

• All published items where it is envisaged the cost will be over $1,000 and all original materials must be individually recommended for purchase

• All recommendations for purchase, license or subscriptions must be approved by a staff member with the appropriate delegation, ensuring that funds are available

• Weekly audit lists of published material are approved by an officer with the appropriate delegation and filed in the Library’s records management system

• The link between the Library's integrated library management system and the Library's financial management system must be maintained

• The Finance branch undertakes audit and payment functions in line with internal payments procedures

**Suppliers**

A range of suppliers is selected, where possible, to ensure cost-effective fulfilment of orders.

• The Library will give preference to consolidating purchases through library suppliers, subscription agents and specialist suppliers

• When appropriate the Library will use auction houses, second-hand and antiquarian suppliers to supply unique or rare heritage materials

• Suppliers must provide an appropriate range of value-added services based on current standards

• Suppliers are reviewed annually and evaluated against criteria appropriate to the type of supplier and material supplied

*Exceptions*

• Legal Deposit and government deposit suppliers who must be used for statutory reasons

• Donors, individuals who self-publish or offer single items of their own collections

Details of guidelines relating to supplier requirements, documentation and evaluation criteria are provided in Appendix 1.

**Sources**

Material is acquired through:

• Direct offers to the Library by commercial or private vendors; sale catalogues (bookseller or antiquarian dealer); auction catalogues (with subsequent bidding at public auctions); private individuals; Cultural Gifts and Cultural Bequests Programs; collecting projects or individual approach by the Library to a potential donor or vendor

• Country of origin supply is preferred for material published overseas

• Country of origin material is priced based on the overseas retail price

• New material published overseas required urgently may be obtained through a local retailer

• Local supply is preferred for online resources where standards and licenses are consistent with the local environment

• Heritage and original material must be purchased where and when it is identified

**Selection Criteria**

The following criteria are used in the assessment process for potential acquisitions:

• Relationship to the parameters of the Library’s *Collection Development Policy*

• Significance of individual items to the Library’s existing holdings and particularly the New South Wales and Australian historical record

• Pricing is based on the market value

• Physical condition of the material

• Resource implications such as staffing, storage or IT infrastructure required to make the contents accessible to clients

Details of guidelines relating to specific category requirements are provided in Appendix 2.

**Legislative and Policy Framework**

Most relevant legislation

• *NSW Copyright Act 1879 (Legal Deposit Provision, ss5-7)*

• *NSW Library Act 1939*

• *Public Finance and Audit Act 1983*

• *State Records Act 1998*

Related and/or most relevant State Library and government policies

• Premier’s Memorandum 2000-15 Access to published information – Laws, Policy and Guidelines (library deposit)

• State Library Code of Conduct

• State Library Financial Delegations Policy

• State Library Collection Development Policy

• State Library Retention and Disposal Policy for Collection Material and Donations

**4. Responsibilities**

Executive Committee members are responsible for leading the implementation of this policy including its conformity to legislative and other compliance requirements, communicating this policy to managers and supervisors and other relevant activities regarding specific policy implementation.

Managers and supervisors are responsible for managing processes relevant to this policy and communicating this policy to staff.

Staff are responsible for understanding and complying with this policy.

**5. Approval**

This policy was approved by NSW State Librarian & CE on 13 July 2012.

**6. Implementation**

This policy is implemented on 18 July 2012.

**7. History**

This policy replaces the Collection Acquisition Policy, 2004.

**8. Related Policy**

This policy is related to:

State Library Collection Donations Policy

State Library Collection Development Policy

State Library Retention and Disposal Policy for Collection Material and Donations

State Library Metadata Framework Policy

State Library Depreciation Policy

State Library Storage and Service Delivery Policy

State Library Preservation Policy

**9. Prepared by:**

Coordinator, Collection Development & Acquisitions

February 2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10. Document History and Version Control Version**  | **Date approved**  | **Approved by**  | **Brief description**  |
| 1.0  | 13/07/2012  | NSW State Librarian & CE  | First release |

**Appendix 1**

**1.1 Guidelines relating to supplier requirements**

**Selection criteria for suppliers**

Suppliers must provide a range of flexible and efficient services to support cost-effective use by Library staff. The following selection criteria are arranged in the order of importance.

**Capacity to meet the Library’s basic requirements**

• Reliability, integrity and business record are critical

• Provide current information about services and policies

• Process orders using a range of suitable technologies

• Communicate effectively with Library staff

• Invoice correctly and as specified by the Library

• Report correctly on overdue orders at negotiated intervals

• Use a range of appropriate bibliographic and research sources

• Provide accurate supply: high fulfilment rate with low error rate

• Material received in excellent condition

• If supplying original material, can effectively describe the material on offer

**Effective customer service**

• Individual point of contact for most inquiries

• Process requests and claims efficiently and reports results

• Communicate effectively to resolve supply issues and problems

• Provide responsive and ongoing customer support, particularly critical in the case of electronic resources

**Cost**

• Make current pricing policy available

• Pricing policy clearly outlines freight and handling charges, special charges or surcharges for specific services and any other factors affecting the cost of material such as policy on exchange rate

• Pricing policy is understandable in application

• Pricing is competitive

**Timeliness**

• Speed of supply appropriate to category of material and competitive in the Australian environment

• Supplier must be able to meet agreed deadlines for special purchases, renewal invoices or renewal lists

**Range of services complementary to the Library’s requirements -** Specific services may include

• Urgent order service

• Selection support, blanket, approval and standing order services

• Capacity to obtain special formats or types of resources

• Inspection, valuation and reporting on heritage material

• Bidding at auction on heritage material

• Consolidation services for books and serials

• Electronic invoicing

• Cataloguing and processing services as specified

• Local staffing, representation or visits

• Identifying and locating out of print material

**Allocation of orders to suppliers**

Allocating orders to individual suppliers is managed to achieve

• Correct suppliers for particular formats and categories of material

• Appropriate channels with regard to country of origin

• Minimum staff time spent following up orders

• Basis for comparison between suppliers where realistic

• Regular processing ensuring continuous throughput and meeting commitment goals

• Sufficient orders to individual suppliers to ensure custom is valued and appropriate service level will be provided

**1.2 Procedures relating to supplier documentation**

**Communication with suppliers**

Communication with suppliers is ideally managed on a number of levels including formal written documentation about services and pricing and less formal telephone or e-mail discussions about individual items, claims, and deliveries. It is the role of any staff member dealing directly with a supplier to maintain a professional manner and to ensure that communication is open, clear, does not waste the time of either party and achieves the desired cost-effective service for the Library.

**Recordkeeping**

Files will be created in the General Office files in the Library’s records management system for individual major suppliers of books and serials, audiovisual, microform and electronic publications, a single file for miscellaneous suppliers in these categories and a single file for prospective suppliers in these categories.

Current information about suppliers’ terms and conditions and copies of all agreements with suppliers will be maintained in these files. Correspondence with suppliers relating to services, performance and general matters should also be placed on these files. These may be used as a basis for discussing performance with suppliers.

Prospective suppliers may be asked to send information about their terms and conditions to be placed on the prospective suppliers file to be submitted for annual review by the Coordinator, Collection Development & Acquisitions. General Office files relating to current major suppliers, miscellaneous suppliers and prospective suppliers should be kept in number order in the filing system in the Collection Services Branch.

Current information about suppliers of heritage materials and their offerings will be maintained in the Mitchell Library files.

**1.3 Procedures relating to supplier evaluation**

**Monitoring and evaluating supplier performance**

Supplier performance is monitored through formal supplier evaluation and through continuous informal assessment during daily processing. Individual members of staff are required to report their observations to supervisors, particularly in the case of poor supplier performance or a change in supplier performance.

In the integrated library management system environment, substantial information about supplier performance may be accessed as required. From time to time it is gathered, interpreted and placed on file to support discussions with suppliers about their performance.

**Appendix 2**

**Guidelines relating to specific category requirements**

**Significant high value material**

Significant high value material is acquired through direct offers to the Library by commercial or private vendors; sale catalogues (bookseller or antiquarian dealer); auction catalogues (with subsequent bidding at public auctions); private individuals; Cultural Gifts Program; collecting projects or individual approach by the Library to a potential donor or vendor.

**Selection criteria**

Material is often of high value and either original and unpublished; existing as unique items and not replicated in multiple forms; or rare editions of retrospective publications. No matter what the source of the material, the following criteria are used in the rigorous assessment process for potential acquisitions.

• Relationship to the parameters of the Library’s *Collection Development Policy* and other relevant specific subject or format policies

• Significance of individual items to the Library’s existing holdings and particularly the New South Wales and Australian historical record

• Validity of the price at which the material is offered or bids are set and how this compares with valuations by accredited valuers, prices for equivalent material purchased recently, or listings in published records

• Physical condition of the material

Resource implications such as staffing or storage, for example, in the case of the Library acquiring large, unsorted collections.

**Process for evaluating material to be acquired**

Material on offer should normally be sighted by the Library officer recommending purchase in order to assess its status and condition. When this is not possible an agent may be commissioned to view the material on behalf of the Library and report on its condition.

**Determining the appropriateness of the price**

When material is offered for sale, the appropriateness of the price has to be determined. Curators or senior librarians are usually responsible for ensuring the validity of the price. Aspects to be considered in determining a price or price range include:

• Published prices in sale catalogues are usually not negotiable

• Published estimates in pre-sale auction catalogues are indicative only of the low range in which the material is expected to sell

• Private vendors nominate prices which are often negotiable or request that an offer be made

• Prices of equivalent material purchased recently supported by registers of previous sales maintained by the Library are indicative

• Published price listings and compilations of prices realised at art and book auctions are indicative and subject to the condition of the material

Assessment by skilled staff or valuation by accredited valuers acknowledges the complex range of criteria used to identify a price or price range.

**Preparing submissions and recommendations**

The Library staff member responsible for negotiating and recommending the purchase of an item prepares a written recommendation and attaches this to a Mitchell Library file named preferably to include the title of the item and/or the vendor’s name. The file number is recorded on internal or external transactions relating to the item, the sale, the catalogue or the vendor.

The recommendation is prepared and finalised at the conclusion of discussions and negotiations between staff, vendor and valuers. The recommendation must include:

• A statement of the material’s significance in its own right

• A statement about the relationship between the material and the Library’s existing collection, *Collection Development Policy* and holdings

• Reasons the material is required as an addition to the Library’s collections

• Comparative prices of similar material and/or supporting documentation justifying the price

• The recommendation to purchase at a specific price or price range

The dated signature of the Library staff member responsible for the negotiation and compiling the recommendation

**Acquiring material using Library Foundation Funds**

The Library Foundation administers funds that can be accessed for acquiring Library material. The funds may contain specific conditions attached to their use. Details of the conditions associated with a specific Library Foundation endowment or bequest can be obtained from the Executive Director, Foundation.

At the time a recommendation to purchase is submitted the Manager, Collection Services; the Manager, Original Materials; the Director, Library Services or the Mitchell Librarian may consider the use of Foundation Funds. This can only occur where the conditions of the use of the fund is in accord with the material being recommended for purchase.

In these cases a memo requesting use of the appropriate Foundation Funds, signed by the Director, Library Services, will be sent to the Executive Director, Foundation. The Executive Director, Foundation will then prepare a formal submission to the Board of the Foundation for the release of the funds. Once the Board of the Foundation have agreed to release the funds for the acquisition the Executive Director, Foundation will request the transfer of funds through Finance.

**Approval process for high value material**

The recommendation is then submitted with all supporting evidence on file to the Manager, Collection Services, or the Manager, Original Materials for consideration and approval or endorsement at delegated level. Further Library signatories may be required with delegations specified in the Instrument of Financial Delegation Schedule.

When approval for purchase has been granted and the transaction completed with required signatures, the vendor’s invoice is noted on the Library’s integrated library management system and a copy completes the General Office file or Mitchell Library file created for the purchase or the category of purchases. The acquisition must be clearly documented and all records placed on file.

**Material received on approval**

Original material, rare books and retrospective material for the heritage collections will normally be requested on approval for evaluation and comparison prior to acquisition. Material received on approval must be registered or documented on file by a curator, team leader or staff member and a receipt provided. Material on which a decision to purchase is being awaited must be stored securely. When a decision has been made to acquire or not, the supplier must be informed and the material must be paid and accessioned or returned undamaged to the supplier with despatch. The acquisition must be clearly documented and all records placed on file.

Similarly new printed material on blanket orders or approval plans is received subject to selection decisions. This material must be processed as a matter of priority to provide the best possible service to clients, and the decisions reported to suppliers with despatch. Lists of this material are printed, approved and retained on file for audit purposes.

**Material offered at auction**

Recommendations for material to be purchased at auction must be prepared, approved and price ranges for bids confirmed before auction. Approval should be arranged to the amount of the final bid for the lot including any associated premiums and fees. It is normal practice to decide whether a discretionary bid should be authorised to go one bid over the envisaged range, if this can be justified based on the situation on the floor of the auction. However, this must also be approved prior to the auction.

If it is possible that the material will be purchased at an amount (comprising the final bid and the premiums) which will result in an expenditure over the delegation of the approving officer, it must be approved by an officer with a higher delegation prior to the auction.

Staff from the Library or a bidding agent may represent the Library at auction. Use of an agent ensures confidentiality. The basis for the agent’s commission must be on file prior to the auction. Material should be inspected prior to auction by a member of staff or an agent and a written report obtained. Instructions for bidding agents (or in the case of the submission of a prior bid directly to the auctioneers) must be provided in writing by letter, fax or e-mail and receipt confirmed prior to the auction. The acquisition must be clearly documented and all records placed on file.

**Material for which the Library unsuccessfully bid and is offered subsequently**

If a recommended item on which the Library has unsuccessfully bid is passed in at auction or sold to a dealer or individual who subsequently approaches the Library with a view to selling, the Library may review the original recommendation. The value of the item must be reconsidered based on recent comparative price data, the uniqueness or rarity of the item and critically, the relationship to the existing collection. An addendum to the initial recommendation or a new recommendation must be prepared by an individual other than the person who made the original recommendation. This must be endorsed and approved at the appropriate delegation levels. The acquisition must be clearly documented and all records placed on file.

**Material offered for purchase by individuals**

• There is no obligation for the Library to purchase collection material offered by individuals. The same selection criteria should apply as would to any other item under the Library’s *Collection Development Policy*

• Physical condition of the material is critical

• Long term or permanent loans will not usually be arranged

• The individual must own the item offered, and an acquisition form must be completed to this effect and to indicate where copyright rests

The staff member should seek approval in principle for the purchase from the Manager, Collection Services; the Manager, Original Materials or the Director, Library Services or the Mitchell Librarian before taking the time to prepare a submission and recommendation. Material must be valued by experienced curators, archivists or an independent valuer. The submission for the acquisition must be recommended and approved by Library staff with the appropriate delegations as must payments for valuations from independent valuers. The acquisition must be clearly documented and all records placed on file.

**Material offered as a donation**

• There is no obligation for the Library to acquire collection material offered by donation

• Selection criteria for donations is detailed in the Library’s *Collection Donation Policy*

• Physical condition of the material is critical

• Resource implications such as staffing or storage, for example, in the case of the Library accepting large, unsorted collections must be considered

• The individual must own the item offered, and a donation form must be completed to this effect and to indicate where copyright rests

Individual donations are approved in line with the Collection Donations Policy.

**Material offered on Cultural Gifts Program**

The Cultural Gifts Program (CGP) seeks to give the donor a tax concession over up to five years in return for donating material of cultural significance to a listed cultural institution.

• There is no obligation for the Library to acquire collection material offered through the Cultural Gifts Program. The same selection criteria should apply as would to any other item under the Library’s *Collection Development Policy*

• Physical condition of the material is critical

• Resource implications such as staffing or storage, for example, in the case of the Library considering large, unsorted collections must be considered

• The individual must own the item offered, and appropriate forms and valuations must be completed

The team leader or senior staff member must seek approval in principle from the Manager, Collection Services or the Manager, Original Materials for the acquisition before proceeding to arrange valuations. All material offered through the CGP must be treated in accordance with conditions and processes detailed on the *Office for the Arts* website.

Notification of material accepted and processed successfully through the Cultural Gifts Program will be communicated to the Executive Director, Foundation who will ensure that appropriate acknowledgement is given to the donor.

**E-Resource products; license agreements**

Electronic material are identified and selected by working groups with the aim of recommending for purchase those resources that meet the criteria determined by the Library. Any material purchased subject to a license agreement will not be paid or a credit will be sought if the Library's criteria cannot be met by the supplier or another satisfactory agreement cannot be negotiated