



COQUITLAM PUBLIC LIBRARY

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Multi-Function Devices:
Fleet Replacement & Public Printing System

RFP #2026-02

Issue Date: June 19, 2026

RFP CONTACT

All enquiries must be made in writing and the enquiries regarding the RFP must be addressed to:

Rachel Burke
Manager, eBranch and Collections
Coquitlam Public Library
575 Poirier St., Coquitlam, BC, V3J6A9, Canada
rburke@coqlibrary.ca

www.coqlibrary.ca

Addendum 1: Questions & Answers

This Addendum is comprised of questions submitted by vendors and answers provided by the Library. This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Proposal for Multi-Function Devices: Fleet Replacement & Public Printing System. Respondents should carefully review this Addendum.

QUESTION 1:

The deadline for submitting proposals is July 1, which is Canada Day. Is it possible to change this to July 3 or the following week?

ANSWER 1:

The close date for questions has been revised to Friday, July 3. See Amendment 1.

QUESTION 2:

Is there a maximum size for emails going to your mail server? Can we submit multiple emails if we go over?

ANSWER 2:

The Library's mail server has a maximum receive message size of 36 MB per email, including attachments. If a proposal exceeds this limit, proponents may submit their proposal in multiple emails. Please clearly label each email with the RFP number and indicate the sequence (e.g., "Email 1 of 3", "Email 2 of 3", etc.) to ensure all submission materials are received and assembled correctly.

QUESTION 3:

What is the current condition of the City-owned devices, and can this be confirmed as subject to inspection given that the current dealer might not maintain them going into the RFP?

ANSWER 3:

The Coquitlam Public Library is a separate organization from the City of Coquitlam

The Library owns three (3) Konica Minolta C3300i devices. These units are in good working condition, have had limited use, and are performing as expected. For these Library-owned devices, we are seeking basic continuity of service only. Maintenance would include labour, parts, drums, and standard consumable supplies, excluding staples and paper. Support is intended to keep the devices operational on a run-to-fail basis; if a unit cannot be reasonably repaired, it may be retired at the Library's discretion.

While basic support for the Library-owned devices is requested, the replacement of the Library's leased fleet is the central focus of this RFP.

QUESTION 4:

Can you confirm whether the existing devices can be removed and recycled, given that they may belong to a leasing company?

ANSWER 4:

The Request for Proposal has been revised related to removal and recycling. See Amendment 1.

QUESTION 5:

Does EnvisionWare (LPT:One with Princh Mobile Print Service) operate via standard Windows print drivers, and if not, what is required for integration?

ANSWER 5:

The Library's current public printing environment uses EnvisionWare LPT print management software integrated with Princh Mobile Print Service. While LPT manages the submission, holding, accounting, and release of print jobs, output to the public multifunction devices is typically accomplished through manufacturer-supported print drivers installed on the associated print release workstation.

- EnvisionWare LPT Print Client and Print Release components installed on a Windows workstation
- Manufacturer-supported MFD print drivers installed on the same workstation (e.g., Konica Minolta or equivalent)
- Princh Mobile Print Service integrated with LPT to support mobile, email-to-print, and web-submitted print jobs
- Network connectivity between the release workstation, MFDs, and EnvisionWare server components

In this environment, print jobs submitted from public computers and mobile devices are processed through the LPT print management system and released to the MFD through the configured device driver and print queue.

The Library requires proponents to support integration with EnvisionWare LPT and Princh Mobile Print Service, or an equivalent vendor-supported configuration compatible with the proposed devices.

QUESTION 6:

Can you clarify what specific environmental metrics are expected as part of the quarterly reporting (alongside service history, consumables, uptime, and print volumes)?

ANSWER 6:

The Library is interested in environmental metrics such as device energy consumption, duplex printing rate, colour vs. black-and-white usage, total print volumes, and consumables usage and

recycling activity. The Library may request additional environmental indicators where available from the manufacturer.

QUESTION 7:

Should proponents include leasing of coin-operated devices, or are these devices currently owned by the City?

ANSWER 7:

The Library is purchasing coin-operated devices through a separate process that is not part of this procurement opportunity. The Library is currently reviewing options; however, no final decision has been made at this time.

QUESTION 8:

Is PaperCut required as part of the solution, or is standard out-of-the-box authentication sufficient?

ANSWER 8:

The Library requires authentication through EnvisionWare LPT:One for all public-facing MFDs. Standard device authentication is sufficient for staff-only devices.

EnvisionWare LPT:One is a public-printing management system designed for libraries and similar public-access environments. It handles print job capture, queuing, payment, and release, and is built to work reliably at scale. Print jobs from Public PCs and mobile devices are routed through an LPT:One release-station workstation, which holds the job until the user authenticates and releases it. LPT:One integrates with Princh MobilePrint and supports cost-recovery, free printing, and staff-assisted release workflows. This system is used for all public-facing MFDs.

QUESTION 9:

Are card readers required for authentication, and if so, what type of proximity cards or fobs are currently in use?

ANSWER 9:

Card readers are not required for authentication.

QUESTION 10:

Is a dedicated scanning station required, or will the scanning functionality on the MFPs be sufficient?

ANSWER 10:

The scanning functionality on the MFPs is sufficient.

QUESTION 11:

Do you prefer standalone/desktop scanners, or should scanning be handled through the copier devices?

ANSWER 11:

The Library prefers that scanning is handled through the copier devices.

QUESTION 12:

Is it the Library's preference for vendors to provide one model series across all locations that share the same toner/supplies?

ANSWER 12:

The Library is open to vendor recommendations based on anticipated device usage and required functionality (e.g., a model for Public printers, a model for most Staff devices, and a model for Marketing). Wherever possible, the Library prefers devices that use the same toner and supplies.

QUESTION 13:

Is it the Library's expectation that the proposed units match the current device configurations on a unit by unit basis, or would the Library prefer to see a standardized configuration that meets the requirements of Appendix G with any additional functionality such as staple or hole punch as optional? For example, 2 of the 3 current Public devices do not offer stapling or hole punching.

ANSWER 13:

The Library does not require proposed units to match current device configurations on a unit-by-unit basis. As long as the proposed devices meet the minimum requirements outlined in Appendix G, the Library is open to vendor recommendations, including standardized configurations with optional features such as stapling or hole punching.

QUESTION 14:

Two optional Public units: please confirm if the specifications for these units should align with the same models/configurations as the other Public printers (full-size A3 MFPs) or if any alternative units (ex. desktop A4 MFP) are preferred.

ANSWER 14:

The Library is interested in pricing on two optional MFDs for public printing services. The proposed devices should align with the models and configurations for other Public printers.

QUESTION 15:

Appendix B: If multiple models are offered, is it the Library's expectation that vendors provide the same B&W and Colour CPC across all models/speeds?

ANSWER 15:

The Library does not require the same B&W or colour CPC across all models or speeds. Vendors may propose different CPC rates where appropriate, and the Library will consider these as part of the overall evaluation.

QUESTION 16:

Appendix B: In the "Cost-per-copy (CPC)" table, please confirm if this is for the purpose of detailing contracts where a minimum volume commitment is required.

ANSWER 16:

The CPC table is not intended to establish a minimum volume commitment. The Library is requesting cost-per-copy rates so we can understand our expected ongoing costs based on historical usage. Vendors may provide CPC rates according to their standard contract structure.

QUESTION 17:

Appendix G: Please confirm if the Library wishes to see pricing for a dedicated scanning station as an optional line item in Appendix B. Please provide any minimum specifications for said scanning station.

ANSWER 17:

The Library is open to receiving pricing for a dedicated scanning station as an optional line item in Appendix B. Minimum specifications are not required; the Library will consider vendor-proposed options.