

OCA-DGCP-069:

Robotic Book Scanning System, Fourth Appellate Department, Law Library

Request for Proposals

Questions and Responses

The New York State Unified Court System (UCS) thanks the vendors that submitted the questions below concerning OCA-DGCP-069 Robotic Book Scanning System, Fourth Appellate Department, Law Library issued on Tuesday, May 26, 2026.

Question #1:

Have you considered contracting with a company to complete the digitization of your bound appellate court records? We scan books, newspapers, and periodicals with secure handling and temperature-controlled storage to preserve original materials. Clients like Ancestry.com and the Temple University Libraries have trusted us to digitize historically significant publications for long-term access.

UCS Response:

UCS has considered various digitization approaches. However, the volume, variety, rarity, and condition of the materials require in-house digitization capacity to ensure sustained access and preservation. Contracted services may supplement this work in the future but cannot replace the need for an in-house system.

Question #2:

Is the statement in the requirements correct? Is this per hour or per day production?

1. Performance • Capable of scanning up to 2,890 pages per hour under production conditions.

UCS Response:

The statement is correct. The requirement refers to pages per hour.

Question #3:

Must the batch scanning, post processing software and workflow management software be authored and offered by the same company as the manufacturer of the scanner to insure long

term compatibility of future versions of the software with the scanner operability, batch scanning and workflow management features?

UCS Response:

No. The minimum qualifications describe required software capabilities but do not specify software authorship. Bidders may offer any software that meets the stated functional requirements.

Question #4:

What are the sizes and weights of all of the bound materials? What are the maximum and minimum sizes of the bound materials? What is the maximum and minimum thickness of the bound materials?

UCS Response:

The system must safely accommodate bindings (book thickness) up to four inches, page widths up to ten inches and page heights up to 14 inches; minimum page widths of five inches and page heights of seven inches. The system should accommodate books weighing up to 10 pounds and paper weights from 16 lb.-80 lb.

Question #5:

What is the size and condition of your bound material that was used to benchmark the rated speed requirement for the scanner? Rated speed of 2,980 pages per hour is very specific and appears to have been simply copied from a commercial brochure for one specific scanner rather than benchmarked with your materials. It is commonly understood that scanning speeds vary greatly depending on the size and condition of the bound material, i.e. small books can be scanned faster than large books.

UCS Response:

The bound materials' sizes and conditions are extremely varied. The minimum qualifications meet the needs of the organization.

Question #6:

Have you actually seen your bound materials scanned on a robotic scanner and achieved 2,980 pages per hour?

UCS Response:

No robotic scanners have been tested.

Question #7:

What is your reasoning to specify using outdated scanning capture technology like photographic cameras and lenses when state of the art line scanning technology produces higher quality, totally flat images and greater reliability? Was this requirement also copied from a commercial brochure?

UCS Response:

The mandatory requirements define the capabilities needed to meet operational and preservation objectives. They do not restrict vendors from proposing additional or alternative features beyond the minimums.

Question #8:

Requirements to describe “Page Flattening” indicates a preference to use outdated scanning technology. “Page Flattening” should never be a consideration, if the scanner uses state of the art line scanning that never requires curvature removal. Why are you asking for description of flattening technique, when flattening is only necessary when the scanner creates curvature in the image as a by-product? Why are you not prohibiting use of “flattening” software or hardware?

UCS Response:

The RFP requires vendors to describe handling and image-quality measures, including flattening methods where applicable, to ensure preservation-appropriate digitization. The requirement neither favors nor excludes specific technologies.

Question #9:

Page 8 of the solicitation states, “ Experience.... At least (3) installations of comparable high-volume robotic book scanners within the past five (5) years.” What is the meaning of “comparable”? Why does the language not require the bidder to furnish (3) installations of the “**EXACT** same scanner being offered” within the past (5) years”? XXX Vendor requests that the solicitation be amended to reflect this language change. Allowing a bidder to offer experience with a “comparable” scanner is unduly prodigious against those vendors that have proven

expertise and have existing installations of the exact Robotic Scanner that they are bidding, which another vendor may not have.

UCS Response:

“Comparable” refers to systems with similar functionality, scale, and intended use. The requirement ensures vendors have relevant institutional experience without limiting competition to a single model.

Question #10:

Page 8 of the solicitation states, “Experience....At least (3) installations in courts, law libraries, academic libraries, archives, or government institutions.” What is meant by “installations”? The requirement doesn’t state that those installations must be for high-volume robotic book scanners. A bidder could have experience in installation of some other product not being offered by them in response to this solicitation; perhaps totally unrelated to high-volume robotic book scanners. XXX Vendor requests that the solicitation be amended to change this language to require experience in installations of the exact product that the bidder is offering in response to this solicitation.

UCS Response:

Installations refer to completed deployments of scanning systems within relevant institutions. The requirement ensures bidders have operational experience in environments similar to the Law Library’s.

Question #11:

Is there an approved budget for this project? If so, what is the amount of the budget?

UCS Response:

No budget amount is being provided.

Question #12:

Page 8, B. Mandatory Requirements, 1. Performance

- Capable of scanning up to 2,890 pages per hour under production conditions.

Scanner manufacturers typically rate their scanners based on 200 dpi. However, your requirements are for “True optical resolution of at least 300 ppi”. Is your requirement for 2,890 pages per hour under production conditions based on 200dpi or 300ppi? For a scanner to meet this requirement, the time to scan both the left and right pages at 300 ppi, turn the pages to the next set of pages and initiate the capture of the next images would require that all of these steps be accomplished in one and a quarter seconds. This is not an achievable benchmark for any robotic scanner and is even less achievable if the scanner uses a glass platen to flatten the pages prior to the capture process and then raise the platen to allow for page turning. Is this requirement an error, or has it simply been copied from the brochure for the Kirtas Kabis III W, that states “Automatic and Semi-Automatic speeds from 400- 2,890 pages per hour” with no facts to support the claim?

UCS Response:

The mandatory performance requirement reflects the operational needs of the organization. Vendors must propose systems that meet all minimum requirements as stated.

Question #13:

Page 8, B. Mandatory Requirements, 3. Imaging System

- Dual high-resolution digital cameras
- Optical-grade lenses designed for archival reproduction

Why do you have a requirement for the use of archaic “digital cameras” and obsolete “optical-grade lenses” when both of these components have been replaced by many manufacturers of modern robotic scanners with the use of super high resolution CCD Arrays that have no moving parts, faster capture and processing time, produce higher quality images, require no maintenance and rarely, if ever, fail? We request that this requirement be replaced with the requirement to use CCD Arrays in lieu of digital cameras.

UCS Response:

The imaging specifications identify required performance and image-quality characteristics. They do not preclude vendors from offering additional or alternative technical features beyond the minimum requirements.

Question #14:

How many scanner models are to be purchased by the institution?

(This directly influences our quote due to bulk discounts)

UCS Response:

One unit.

Question #15:

Are we allowed to submit multiple proposals with different model options?

UCS Response:

Vendors may submit multiple proposals provided each submission is complete, independent, and fully responsive to the requirements of the RFP.

Question #16:

A scanning speed of 2890 pages/hour with a single machine is most likely not possible with current technology. This would likely damage the materials.

The attached document explicitly requests for "Measures to prevent tearing, double-feeds, or edge damage". This brings up the following question:

Are we allowed to submit for example two-unit packages to cover/exceed this scanning speed requirement?

UCS Response:

No. The RFP seeks one high-speed, robotic, non-destructive book scanning system. Proposals must meet the stated minimum requirements with a single unit.

Question #17:

Are there any limitations related to the company's country of origin?

UCS Response:

The RFP does not restrict vendors based on country of origin. However, all requirements of the RFP must be met, including those related to service responsiveness, data security, and compliance with applicable laws.

Question #18:

Do we need to have a U.S. presence either directly or through a partner company?

UCS Response:

Vendors must be able to meet all requirements, including on-site service support for Rochester, New York, and all contractual and legal compliance obligations. A U.S. presence is not explicitly required, but all obligations must be fully satisfied.