

SPRING FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS BUFFALO, NY | APRIL 26 - 28, 2010



FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM
EASY AS FDL | <http://www.fdlp.gov>

2010 FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE AND SPRING
DEPOSITORY COUNCIL MEETING

April 26th, 2010

ADAMS MARK HOTEL
120 Church Street
Buffalo, New York 14202

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. SHULER: Welcome to the spring 2010
3 meeting of the Depository Library Council. I think this
4 is like the three thousandth council meeting we have had
5 since '97 or '75 or so. I want to thank you all for
6 braving the weather, such as it was, and arriving here
7 and agreeing to join us in what I think are going to be
8 a series of very important conversations. As I thought
9 about my short opening sentence or two, I can not think
10 of a more important time than the presence for the
11 Depository Library System. In a few short months we are
12 going to have introduced into our lives a new system to
13 eventually replace the GPO Access, which we have been
14 living with for the last 50 odd years. We are also
15 going to have some changes in our leadership and as
16 always, we always have technology biting at our heels
17 demanding that we change and we change fast. And I
18 think demands, not fear, not running from it, but I hate
19 it say it, more discussion. So what we hope to do with
20 this particular Council meeting is continue and foster
21 and grow that important discussion along these lines.
22 So in terms of the order of work today, I will be
00003

1 introducing Mr. Bob Tapella, the current public printer
2 and he will say a few remarks about our future as well
3 as our present. Bob.

4 MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, John. Good
5 morning.

6 THE AUDIENCE: Good morning.

7 MR. TAPELLA: Oh, come on. Let's try that
8 one again. Good morning.

9 THE AUDIENCE: Good morning.

10 MR. TAPELLA: Thank you. That's much
11 better. Welcome to beautiful Buffalo, New York. Since
12 John didn't do the usual calisthenics or else I missed
13 them. I have one question and I'll tell you later why
14 I'm asking that. Who here is from a university or
15 college library, in any way, shape or form? We are here

16 in beautiful Buffalo at the Adams Mark Hotel. We are
17 here because President Obama said that we can not go to
18 Vegas and the original sight for this meeting was the
19 Flamingo in Vegas. So we came up with a plan B and that
20 B stood for Buffalo. When we booked the hotel, of
21 course, it wasn't going to be at Adam's Mark at this
22 point, it was going to be a Crowne Plaza and completely
00004

1 refurbished, but as we are all feeling the pinch of the
2 economy so is the hotel business. But the reason I
3 asked about the university students is -- I love this
4 meeting room, by the way. Do you like the tables and
5 setup? Is that more helpful? I guess GPO staff doesn't
6 like tables, is that it? I understand some of the guest
7 rooms might not be quite up to the standards of some of
8 our guests and I apologize for that. We got a good
9 laugh over here from Jill. She likes to steal the
10 little shampoos and stuff like that. She was
11 complaining about just having a single bar of soap. Oh
12 wait, no, that was -- well, the reason I asked about the
13 universities is when we found we were coming to Buffalo
14 and you weren't going to be able to gamble, we thought
15 we'd make you feel right at home with the lacrosse team
16 that was here last night to entertain those of you who
17 were out and about the hallways and pools and lounges
18 following the beer cans around, but seriously, I'm
19 actually very pleased to be in Buffalo. For those of us
20 coming out of Washington, it was a quick hour flight and
21 it's working out very well for me because our next order
22 of business for me is actually going up into Canada to
00005

1 meet with some of our Canadian officials that we work
2 with the Trust and Traveler Program with, which is
3 pretty good.

4 Now, I'd like to begin by thanking Council
5 for being here and we have the full Council, right?
6 Except for Dr. Greer. So we are doing very well. Thank
7 you all for coming. I appreciate it. And it's
8 particularly important to see all of you here during
9 such tough economic times because I know for those of
10 you yonder, as well as the Council, everyone is facing a
11 very tough year and it's no different at the Government
12 Printing Office.

13 Now, as many of you know, if not every
14 single one of you may know, President Obama has
15 nominated my successor. His name is Bill Foreman and

16 I'm very pleased by the selection. I have known Bill
17 for many, many years. He is no stranger to the
18 Government Printing Office, although his career took him
19 away from the GPO more than 35 years ago he has remained
20 a strong champion of GPO and I hold him as a friend and
21 I hold him in the highest personal regard. Now, Bill
22 still needs to be confirmed by the Senate and I will
00006

1 remain in place or plan to remain in place, until his
2 appointment. I'm working with him, as are all the
3 senior managers of GPO, to make certain there is as
4 smooth transition as possible.

5 Now, talking about tough budget years, it is
6 appropriations time again and I have testified before
7 both the House and the Senate and so I'd like to begin
8 by sort of sharing what GPO is seeking. Our total
9 appropriations request is \$166,560.00 and with this
10 funding we are going to ask for funding for the
11 Congressional Printing and Binding Fund to make certain
12 that we can meet all of Congress's needs and in addition
13 to meeting all the current and future needs, we also are
14 trying to recover a shortfall in funds from fiscal year
15 2009 and what's projected for fiscal year 2010.

16 Secondly, we are seeking to fund the
17 operation of GPO Statutory Information Dissemination
18 Program and provide investment funds for necessary
19 information dissemination projects, which I will go into
20 a little bit more detail in a few minutes, continue the
21 development of FDsys and implement other improvements to
22 GPO's IT infrastructure, perform essential maintenance
00007

1 and repairs to our aging buildings, undertake
2 necessarily continuity of operations, initiatives and
3 provide funding for employee retraining and work force
4 development.

5 Now, for the SNE Funding. Specifically we
6 are requesting \$44,280,000 for fiscal year of 2011.
7 It's an increase of 3.297 million from the level of
8 fiscal year 10. As part of the appropriations request
9 for the SNE, we are specifically asking for four
10 projects that I want to note.

11 First, a half a million dollars for the
12 modernization of the legacy computer systems, half a
13 million supporting the FDLP and these programs are
14 essential for meeting program needs and must be migrated
15 to current and stable hardware and software solutions.

16 We spent a lot of time talking about FDsys
17 and we've talked about our GBis and our Oracle data
18 bases which is our financial system that we have
19 upgraded, but we still are at that risk for a number of
20 programs. And the systems that we need to modernize are
21 the shipping lister, the item lister, the depository
22 distribution information system, the acquisitions
00008

1 classification and shipment information system and the
2 automated depository distribution's system. Now, if
3 anyone has any questions about those systems, please see
4 Ric Davis because to be honest, I'm not certain what
5 every one of those things do. However, they are all and
6 have been high risk for quite awhile. You're laughing,
7 Justin, do you know what they do? In fact when Ric
8 first gave me the list and we are talking about the
9 appropriations request and we were looking at the IT
10 projects that we need to do, Ric has his whole list and
11 he's going, he wanted to give me about a two day
12 briefing session on how important these systems are and
13 what they do. And I trust Ric and so I said, Ric, I
14 trust you. I'll put in the money. Fortunately Mike
15 Wash, CIO, also concurred and said, yes, those are some
16 of our riskiest systems right now. So hopefully we will
17 get the funding for that.

18 Third, we are asking for \$200,000 for
19 establishing performance measures and survey instruments
20 for evaluating Depository Library access collection
21 service and cooperative efforts, this data which
22 continues to build a foundation for ongoing program
00009

1 assessments.

2 And fourth, we are asking for half a million
3 dollars for special cataloging indexing projects,
4 including completing the creation of the MARC 21 records
5 and for current and historic serials and investigating a
6 long term solution for bibliographic records
7 distribution. As part of this project, bibliographic
8 records will be distributed from GPO's integrated
9 library system to Federal Depository Libraries.

10 Now, while I am pushing for full funding,
11 this is going to be a very tough fiscal year. Both the
12 House and Senate has told us that flat funding is a
13 likely outcome. In fact, Senator Nelson, a couple of
14 weeks ago required that I speak to flat funding for the
15 record. So I want to tell you what I told him. I'm

16 asking for full funding for the Congressional Printing
17 and Binding Fund, which is \$96,652,000 and that covers
18 the short falls and the projected work loads. For the
19 SNE appropriation, I'm not asking for full funding, but
20 we are going to get there anyway if he does what I'm
21 asking. And that is we are asking for \$42,682,000. In
22 essence we have about one and-a-half million dollars in
00010

1 prior year end spent funds. I believe it's from fiscal
2 year end 2005 that the committee could move forward for
3 us and then because of a math difference originally we
4 were anticipating that the President was going to
5 request 1.6 percent increase in salaries. He's only
6 asking for 1.4 percent. So that is roughly \$26,000. So
7 with reducing the SNE by about 1.526 million, we can
8 actually get full funding. And so I have requested
9 that. And when it comes to the revolving fund, that is
10 where we are going to take the hit. Instead of the
11 6,000,000 for the FDsys, we are asking for 5.127
12 million. Instead of 2,000,000 for the advance printing
13 technology assessment, we are asking for 1,000,000.
14 Instead of 4.2 million for COO, continuity of
15 operations, we are asking for 1,000,000. And instead of
16 2,000,000 for continued elevator repairs, we are asking
17 for 1,000,000 and everything else we have asked for, we
18 have decided we are going to postpone probably until the
19 next fiscal year, but if we get what we asked for, there
20 will be full funding for this program and the SNE
21 appropriation.

22 FDsys. John mentioned briefly mentioned about
00011

1 FDsys and some of the challenges and the opportunities
2 that we have. I want to talk about it briefly in a
3 couple of different ways. First, I want to sort of
4 highlight what our Release 1 main goals were and talk
5 about some things that we have done.

6 So first, there were five main goals to the first
7 Release of FDsys and these are sort of the broad goals
8 and as the public printer, I'm concerned about sort of
9 the broader picture and we'll let people get into more
10 specifics.

11 For Release 1, five goals. First, establish
12 the foundational infrastructure. Second, establish a
13 preservation repository. Third, replace the current
14 public access site. Fourth, perform a large scale data
15 migration from GPO Access, FDsys and five, provide

16 operational continuity for the system insuring
17 uninterrupted access to federal publications.

18 I think we have been successful with Release
19 1. We haven't done everything that I had hoped, but I
20 think we have been successful. When it comes to
21 foundational infrastructure, the foundational system is
22 in place. The FDsys search component went live in March
00012

1 of 2009. The FDsys content management system went live
2 in March of 2009. The preservation repository built on
3 the OAIS model went live with the content management
4 system launch in March of 2009. The public interface
5 went live when the search component was launched in
6 January of 2009 for data migration. This has been a
7 challenge for GPO. As I asked all the people involved,
8 both in terms of the folks in Mike Wash's shop, who have
9 done all of the work as well as Ric, who represents the
10 customer and John as the chairman of the board. We have
11 now 29 out of the 40 content collections have been
12 completed. The remaining collections are scheduled to
13 be done, migrated by June 30th, 2010.

14 If we look back on the system and the
15 planning, about the only thing that we may not have
16 anticipated was just going to be how difficult it was
17 going to be in migrating the systems forward. And I
18 think it posed a greater challenge than anyone imaged,
19 but when we look at, even though it's taking longer and
20 costing more than originally anticipated, what is going
21 in there is really good and they've got the proper
22 control.

00013

1 So either I have to shut up or -- so do you
2 want me to continue on? I guess I'm -- maybe I'm
3 talking into the podium. That doesn't sound good. You
4 know they haven't even replaced me yet. Apparently, all
5 I need is new batteries.

6 Getting back on topic. Operational
7 continuity. The continuity of access site should be
8 operational by August 10th, 2010. And the full system
9 fail over should be operational by December of 2010.
10 Right now we are backing up the system, but it will be
11 significantly improved by August and by the end of the
12 fiscal year it will be full fail over.

13 The GPO Access FDsys transition is in full
14 swing and once completed at the end of the fiscal year,
15 FDsys will assume the role as GPO's electronic system of

16 record. That really can't happen until we have that
17 full fail over capability.

18 Additionally, there were two other major
19 FDsys projects that actually came about after we started
20 the planning for FDsys and one of them comes directly
21 from the Office of Federal Register. And I understand
22 Mike White is here. Mike, are you here?

00014

1 MR. WHITE: I'm here.

2 MR. TAPPELLA: Hey, Mike. Thank you for
3 coming. One of our other FDsys customers, the Office of
4 the Federal Register.

5 A new publication, The Daily Compilation of
6 Presidential Documents was released in February of 2009.
7 And that replaces a printed document that we did once a
8 week. I think for the general public it is a much more
9 useful and pertinent document coming out every single
10 day.

11 And secondarily, a pilot project for the
12 digitized statues at large was development demonstrating
13 converted content, preservation and access in FDsys. I
14 think we are going to see a demo later on, aren't we?

15 MR. DAVIS: The FDsys was this morning.

16 MR. TAPPELLA: Oh, was that this morning? I
17 thought it was this afternoon session.

18 On Wednesday, April 7th I convened a public
19 program review on FDsys and I hadn't done a program
20 review really since I became public printer. That was
21 one of the first things I did as public printer and with
22 that we made a decision to change the course with how we

00015

1 were using the master integrator and actually assumed
2 that responsibility which changed the project
3 significantly and I thought it was time, since it
4 basically was a year after the launch that we did
5 another program review. Now, the objective of the
6 meeting was to receive a program status update and to
7 discuss program successes, issues and opportunities with
8 key stakeholders, including library services and content
9 management, Ric Davis and his group, the Office of the
10 Federal Register, which Mike White was there for, and
11 representatives of the Federal Depository Library
12 Council, which included chair John Shuler and incoming
13 chair Suzanne Sears. Thank you both for flying into
14 Washington for that.

15 And in short we discussed the good, the bad

16 and the ugly. And I will let the customers, Suzanne,
17 John, Mike and Ric, at whatever appropriate time,
18 discuss exactly what they found in terms of the good,
19 the bad and the ugly. However, we did publish a
20 document, which is available on the Web site and I think
21 we pushed it out or at least announced it through the
22 LIS serve so that everyone could read it.

00016

1 In addition to these key customers and
2 stakeholders, we also invited observers from everyone of
3 GPO's business units because to date we have spent a
4 considerable amount of sums. To date we are in excess
5 of \$20,000,000 in appropriated dollars directly for
6 FDsys and \$15,000,000 out of our revolving fund which
7 means that we have taken investment capital that would
8 go to other business units within GPO.

9 And I want to make sure that everyone at GPO
10 understood exactly that FDsys is and why it is so
11 critical to our future. We also had -- I also invited
12 our oversight committees as well as our appropriations
13 committees. We had a pretty full house. The items that
14 were discussed were Release 1 goals and status. Release
15 2 goals, cost summary and analysis, program risk lessons
16 learned. It was quite a meeting. And I think
17 representing the library community we did hear some of
18 the concerns. And I think it was really important for
19 the GPO folks to hear it firsthand.

20 Now, some of the key discussions at the
21 review included the impact of the integration library
22 system when GPO Access sunsets, apparently there is

00017

1 none. A continuity plan to recover data and rebuild the
2 system in the event of a disaster. That is currently
3 backed up off site at the alternate computing facility.
4 And the August milestone will provide full continuity of
5 access. And then a list of tasks and scheduled Release
6 1 completion activities. There is a detailed task list
7 and schedule. They have been created. Once completed
8 FDsys will assume the role as GPO's electronic system of
9 record and sunset of GPO Access is planned at the end of
10 this fiscal year. The full report is actually on our
11 Web site and I encourage any of you who haven't read it
12 to read it in its entirety.

13 I also understand that many of you have read
14 the GPO Inspector General's IV&V reports. We did
15 something slightly unusual at GPO, we actually

16 encouraged our inspector general to take on the IV&V
17 responsibility. I wanted to make sure that we had an
18 independent voice that was looking at absolutely
19 everything and IG reports, they tend to be pretty
20 critical and that is exactly what we want. We have
21 taken what the IG has reported and we have turned it
22 into a risk list and we are working right now and
00018

1 setting priorities for what makes sense to do. In
2 fact -- I guess I didn't bring it with me, we compiled
3 it down working with Ric and Mike Wash into some
4 priority sections and I think if anyone has any specific
5 questions later one, I know Mike is doing an open mike
6 later on today and he'd be happy to address all of those
7 risks.

8 Transparency and open government. In the
9 fall I spoke with you about the letter I sent to
10 President Obama laying out the ways that GPO could help
11 support his vision for transparency and open government,
12 as well as digital access so much more information from
13 the government.

14 I posed five goals that GPO is undertaking.
15 I'd like to update you on those today. I'm going to
16 first begin by reiterating what those goals were and
17 tell you how we are doing on them.

18 First, position GPO's federal digital system
19 as the official repository for federal government
20 publications. Second, enable and support Web 2.0
21 functionality through FDsys to support comments on
22 pending legislation. Third, establish a demonstration
00019

1 project to apply Web 2.0 features to rule making
2 documents. Fourth, participate in and lead efforts to
3 standardize electronic publishing formats and fifth,
4 link the White House Web site to FDsys for public
5 searches of government documents.

6 FDsys is based on the concepts of
7 interoperability and reuse and because of that, GPO is
8 now at the forefront of the open government initiative.
9 FDsys is making a difference. FDsys's content is
10 available in all major search engines now. In
11 collaboration with the Office of Law Revision Council,
12 U.S. House of Representatives, the yearly virtual main
13 edition of the U.S. Code Collection was brought into
14 FDsys in XHTML and PDF formats. In support of the
15 Office of the Federal Register XML content was developed

16 and made available through data.gov. The Federal
17 Register in September of 2009 and the Code of Federal
18 Regulation was in December of 2009. Citizens are also
19 finding new ways to interact with key public content
20 through XML data which include sites like fedthread.org
21 and govpulse.

22 Additionally, other government sites are
00020

1 relying on FDsys to enrich their user experience.
2 Regulations.gov uses FDsys Metadata to power their
3 public search, eliminating the need for the Office of
4 the Federal Register to support it. Also, science.gov
5 is now available to integrate GPO collections into the
6 federated search gateway to government science
7 information.

8 Looking ahead to the future, the Office of
9 the Federal Register and GPO are getting together a
10 working group for creating a point in time system for
11 regulatory information.

12 Additionally, early this summer GPO is
13 planning to host a meeting of experts for an
14 authentication workshop. Experts in the field of
15 technology, academics and the federal government will
16 join to discuss the future of authentication and assess
17 future needs.

18 Now, GPO has worked with standard groups to
19 create standard markup schema for government
20 publications starting with agency strategic
21 publications. We are also working closely with the
22 law.gov groups where they are trying to define standard
00021

1 document Metadata for legal materials both legislative
2 and case law. And we continue to work with government
3 groups, the Library of Congress in particular, to
4 develop standards for digitization and authentication.
5 So I'd say four out of the five goals are in full swing
6 and GPO is moving steadily forward.

7 The fifth goal, the White House has decided
8 that it may not be as high a priority as I thought it
9 should be. And as for the White House linked to FDsys,
10 the White House has lowered the priority for this
11 initiative. However, GPO and FDsys are routinely cited
12 by the White House for success in open government
13 initiatives.

14 The federal judiciary's electronic public
15 access initiatives. As you know, I have spent much time

16 as have Ric, lobbying the judicial branch to see if we
17 can get as much information publicly available as
18 possible. I have one fan out there. Thank you. It
19 must be a law librarian, uh? The judicial conference at
20 its March 16, 2010 meeting approved measures that allow
21 the administrative office of the U.S. Courts to explore
22 how they can increase public access to court information
00022

1 and records. Specifically, the conference voted to,
2 one, allow the courts, at the discretion of the
3 presiding judge, to make digital audio recordings of
4 court hearings available online to the public through
5 PACER for \$2.40 per audio file.

6 Second, adjust the electronic public access
7 fee schedule so that users are not billed until they
8 accrue charges of more than \$10 of PACER usage in the
9 quarterly billing cycle, essentially quadrupling the
10 amount of money. Previously it was \$10 any given year.

11 Third, approve a pilot in up to 12 courts to
12 publish federal district and bankruptcy court opinions
13 via FDsys so members of the public can more easily
14 search across opinions and across the courts. Court
15 opinions are available through PACER free of charge and
16 that will not change. The pilot's project to make
17 bankruptcy and district court opinion also available
18 through FDsys will enhance public access through these
19 opinions. More information on the opinion pilot will be
20 forthcoming as we work out the details with the folks in
21 charge.

22 Social networking and GPO. I can't believe
00023

1 I'm saying this. In case you aren't socially connected
2 to GPO, we are actually up on YouTube, which is GPO
3 printer as well as on Twitter and USGPO. We have
4 launched a government book talk blog which is
5 govbooktalk.worldpress.com. Now, this new blog is a mix
6 of informational and first person reviews of federal
7 publications, discussion of past and present federal
8 contents, personal stories about encounters with
9 government information and updates about GPO information
10 dissemination activities. What's absolutely amazing to
11 me is people actually using this book talk blog. I
12 think that is just incredible. And again, Ric working
13 on behalf of the library community with Devita VansCook,
14 who runs the publication information sales unit and it
15 is incredible. Now, this blog has received almost

16 10,000 views so far and is yet another avenue in which
17 we can provide information to our citizens.

18 Well, with that I would like to do a couple
19 of thank yous. First, Lance Cummins and his staff.
20 Lance, are you here? Lance? Apparently he is out
21 working hard. And as you know, putting together this
22 conference takes a lot of work. And Nick and Yvonne
00024

1 Ellis -- I think actually everyone I'm going to thank is
2 out the door because I saw them all at the registration,
3 which is Lance, Nick and Yvonne Ellis, Bridget Govan and
4 Debbie Smith. This is being transcribed for the record
5 and Ric will make sure that they hear it. I also want
6 to take this opportunity, since this may well be my last
7 Depository Council meeting, to thank Ric Davis for
8 serving as the acting superintendent of documents for my
9 entire tenure. My very first meeting of this Council,
10 which was the very first public meeting I held as public
11 printer back, which was the Fall Depository Library
12 Council meeting, back in 2007. I said that I was going
13 to do an open and public search for the next
14 superintendent of documents. And I asked for
15 recommendations and in fact the next month or two months
16 later in December, I brought in all library
17 organizations. We talked about what are the qualities,
18 what I should be looking for in a superintendent of
19 documents. And what was interesting is the person that
20 best fit those qualities was Ric Davis, who was a career
21 employee at GPO and running the business unit of Library
22 Services and Content Management. I said, Ric, I'd
00025

1 really like you to become SuDocs and he said, no, and
2 then I got even because I never filled the position and
3 I purposely didn't. So he actually got to do two jobs
4 for the last three years. And what's interesting is Ric
5 is not a librarian and yet I don't believe there has
6 ever been a SuDocs who has been more passionate about
7 this program, who has been a better representative of
8 this program in the interest of America's libraries than
9 Ric Davis and Ric I really appreciate all that you have
10 done. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Ric.

11 MR. DAVIS: Thank you very much, Bob. I
12 may -- I'm a very emotional person by nature. I'm going
13 to try and hold it together and follow that, so thank
14 you very much. I really appreciate that.

15 I have been giving speeches like this for

16 the last 18 years and I did something this morning that
17 I haven't done before, which is I woke up at four a.m.
18 and decided I really didn't like the speech I put
19 together last week and I just threw it away. So that's
20 about five hours before one of these meetings. The
21 reason I didn't like it was so much has been going on
22 since we have last met, I felt like that it was too
00026

1 service oriented. At lot of times I work on these
2 speeches with my staff and they make fun of me because I
3 come here and I take the speech and I bring it up here
4 and I turn it over and then I just, as they say, say
5 whatever I want to say. I'm going to do it a little bit
6 differently today because there are a lot of things that
7 are in your handout that I'm going to talk about, but
8 there are a lot of things that I'm going to publicly
9 speak to as well. So bear with me as I speak
10 extemporaneously, but also read a little bit.

11 First of all, I want to welcome all of you
12 to Buffalo as well. I want to thank you very much for
13 taking the time to come here. Lance tells me that I
14 can't say this definitively because it's still in the
15 procurement process of GPO, but let us say that we are
16 looking very closely at San Antonio, Texas for the next
17 out of town library conference. I'm happy to say that
18 to at least one person who is a sports fan in the
19 audience who sent me an e-mail last night who said, you
20 know, there is this great NBA playoff game on and if we
21 were in San Antonio right now, we could be at that game.
22 Well, for any baseball fans, there is a Buffalo Bison's
00027

1 game tomorrow night. I guarantee it's not going to be
2 raining and it's going to be at least 55 degrees. So I
3 encourage you tomorrow night to go out to see some good
4 baseball. I want to start as well by thanking the
5 University at Buffalo, State University of New York
6 where we have a partnership to provide the enhanced
7 shipping list service. Is anybody from the University
8 here with us? Thank you anyway. Thanks for that.
9 We have a lot of things to cover over the next several
10 days, but at the same time, weather permitting, I hope
11 you all get a chance to walk around and explore Buffalo
12 a little bit. I felt like -- I went out late Saturday
13 afternoon when I got here and did a little bit of a walk
14 of the city and I felt like it was my first time in
15 Manhattan where the architecture literally took my

16 breath away. And it's not that far so I encourage you
17 to do it. There is also this thing called Niagara up
18 the street that is not too far away either. So please
19 enjoy your time while you're here and as I always like
20 to remind people, take time to network and talk to each
21 other as well as additional GPO staff.

22 I have a lot of things that I'd like to
00028

1 cover today obviously. First I'd like to followup on
2 Bob's comments on GPO's federal digital system. I want
3 to reiterate that in terms of roles and
4 responsibilities, I am a stakeholder. Mike White from
5 the office of the Federal Register is a stakeholder.
6 You are a stakeholder. We are the customer. The FDsys
7 team, many of whom are here today, are responsible for
8 building this system and it's our job to tell them what
9 we want and that's what we need to do. If you guys
10 don't mind, I'd like the FDsys team, that has worked on
11 this system, to stand up for a second and be recognized
12 because the one thing I want to say as well, before we
13 talk about things, is to thank you for a job well done
14 and what you have accomplished thus far.

15 As Bob spoke about, we had an FDsys program
16 review at GPO and I think we almost made our council
17 chair and incoming chair miss their flight. We had
18 promised to a stop point after about three hours and it
19 just kept going because there was a lot of good
20 information and exchange in dialogue.

21 I want to speak to you today from that voice
22 of customer perspective and reiterate some of the
00029

1 comments before I talk about business in my unit that I
2 stated at that meetings from the standpoint of
3 successes, some issues that I see with FDsys and some
4 opportunities that I think we can engage in for the
5 future.

6 First, in terms of successes, I think the
7 ease of search that has been empowered by FDsys and the
8 search engine is vastly superior to what we have on GPO
9 Access and I think the work of the team should be
10 commended. I think the addition of Metadata, most
11 prominently in MODS, descriptive Metadata and the
12 premise preservation Metadata, accompanying the MARC
13 records, that we make available through our ILS in my
14 unit, are a great complement and I think that is very
15 good additional information.

16 Additionally, the authentication effort that
17 was begun in the library unit years ago with the budget
18 has been greatly expanded by the FDsys team as they
19 continue to authenticate more and more of this content.
20 I think it's equally important that we continue to work
21 towards establishing a full chain of digital custody of
22 this information from the point that is ingested into
00030

1 FDsys to the point that it's disseminated so that we
2 have provenance.

3 Additionally, FDsys is more than a content
4 management system. It's a search system and it's also a
5 preservation repository. FDsys is being built to handle
6 a variety of file formats for ingest for deposited
7 content, converted content, harvested content and
8 particularly in terms of being a flexible platform, I
9 think we have been very lucky over the years of GPO
10 Access in regards to a bit of stability with ASCII PDF,
11 TEXT and HTML files. I don't know that we are going to
12 have that luxury in the future and I think it's
13 important to have a flexible system that can adapt
14 quickly as we need to migrate and refresh this
15 information going forward.

16 Bob spoke about the work that's been going
17 on as part of the Obama administration's open government
18 initiative and I think the work on the Federal Register
19 and CFR in particular in XML format is outstanding.

20 Now, with that, in terms of building any
21 world class system from scratch comes some issues and
22 Bob spoke about some of those that came up in the
00031

1 program review. The two that I'd like to mention, from
2 my voice of customer perspective that we have talked
3 about and we will talk about more this afternoon with
4 all of you is first schedules. I think that when
5 schedules were first put out on FDsys they were stakes
6 in the ground, but I think there is an importance to be
7 able to adhere to deadlines for releases that are
8 promised and communicated to the Community and I think
9 that going forward it is going to be critical to adhere
10 to those dates as they are released.

11 Additionally, there is a cost element. I
12 think it's important to have a detailed cost schedule as
13 part of a larger project plan in terms of what is coming
14 on FDsys and what the cost will be. In terms of my
15 appropriation that I managed in the SNE appropriation,

16 in the last 15 years part of the appropriation I've used
17 to manage the daily operating costs of GPO Access. I
18 expect to manage the daily operating costs of FDsys as
19 it succeeds and replaces GPO Access. That said, with a
20 lot of the new automation technologies put in place,
21 it's also my hope that those daily operating costs over
22 time may actually decrease and more of those limited
00032

1 funds can be devoted to other things we do for the
2 library community as well.

3 With successes and issues also come
4 opportunities and some of the opportunities I see as we
5 go forward with FDsys, is to go back. All this
6 information is out. I know the program management
7 office has it up on the FDsys Web site. I think it's
8 all important for all of us to go back and look at the
9 original requirements, look at the concept of operations
10 documents dating back to 2004, that have been undated
11 over time and continue to validate those requirements,
12 continue to validate that our needs are being met and
13 where they are not, we need to communicate them. I also
14 agree that as Bob mentioned, there may be issues that
15 folks are concerned about in regards to continuity of
16 services. We are going to talk a little bit about the
17 PURLs situation again that we talked about at the last
18 conference, but I think that there is always concern
19 about not having redundancy and continuity of
20 information and it's important to have that with FDsys
21 so that if anything happens, it can be restored and
22 fail-over in a seamless manor. Additionally, there is
00033

1 the integration of legacy applications. FDsys is a
2 major infrastructure component of overall GPO systems,
3 but there are other systems that need to map to it
4 currently and going forward into the future. I often
5 think that wouldn't it be great in the future where you
6 went to a GPO.gov site and there is a single user
7 interface. Wouldn't that be great? I also think last,
8 but most importantly not least, some of you and some of
9 my Council members call is digital deposit. I call it
10 digital dissemination of content packages and enabling
11 that for libraries. I think have a repository of
12 content as we have done since public law 103.40
13 implemented GPO Access back in the early 1990's. Having
14 a repository at GPO is critical, but when I read title
15 44 I also see the word permanent in regards to


16 libraries. I don't want GPO to be the one stop system
17 and I think having a distributed model is most
18 effective. It worked in the tangible world. It will
19 work in the digital world.

20 Next, I'd like to move onto some of things
21 that are going on in my unit, Library Services and
22 Content Management. Some of these are in your handouts,
00034

1 but some of them I want to expand on. First the
2 biennial survey/needs assessment. The biennial survey
3 was combined with the needs assessment as part of the
4 work that we contracted with Outsell to accomplish. The
5 needs assessment was developed to help gauge level of
6 satisfaction with additional services we can provide in
7 the future and I think it's also a good precursor
8 between the Ithaca report that ARL conducted and the
9 FDLP consulting report that I'm going to talk about, a
10 good bridge between those two, to see where things are.

11 We've received a preliminary draft of
12 findings from Outsell. I think some of that summary
13 information may be in your packets and in the next week
14 or so we are going to be releasing a detailed report of
15 that information along with biennial results.

16 Next, I'd like to talk about the PURLs
17 situation. We spoke quite a bit about that at the last
18 conference. Back in 1999, GPO initiated the use of
19 PURLs to provide persistent links to information through
20 our Metadata. I mentioned at the last conference that I
21 consider the PURLs server crash that occurred last year
22 to be unacceptable and I know it was unacceptable to all
00035

1 of you. As a consequence of that, I told you that I was
2 going to fix it and that's what we have done. Going
3 back to the role of my unit, vis--vis Mike's unit as
4 CIO, we defined the requirements and Mike works on the
5 servers and executes the contacts. As a consequence of
6 this, we worked together to award a contrat to Zepheria
7 Corporation who has upgraded the PURLs server
8 architecture and they are going to be on hosting the new
9 solution on behalf of GPO. I think this transition is
10 going to have many benefits. First of all, it's going
11 to be a more robust system, architecture going from a
12 flat data -- a flat text base application to a SQL data
13 base, immediate system backup through synchronization,
14 immediate system fail-over through geographically
15 separated primary and backup servers. The continuation

16 of statistical reporting and improved speed and
17 resolution of redirects. In terms of timing, the
18 migration of this data base has already been done. It's
19 been tested. We are having staff training for my staff,
20 with GPO in early May and we are looking to do the
21 switch over in summer of this year. I called this and I
22 referenced it this way at the last conference; I call
00036

1 this a bridge of stability. We had a situation we
2 needed to fix it. We needed to stabilize it. I
3 recognize there are still requirements associated with
4 persistent name that are part of FDsys architecture and
5 it is something that I encourage you to go back and look
6 at in terms of what is going to be met for you with this
7 upgrade and may not be met as we continued to give
8 feedback as to what we want on persistent name
9 technology.

10 Next, I'd like to speak a little bit about
11 digitization. Could I see a show of hands. How many
12 people had a chance to see the -- to go to the FDsys
13 presentation this morning where you had a chance to see
14 some digitization work? Good support there. Thank you.
15 For those of you who missed it, I think that the program
16 management office is going to have a laptop out on the
17 table. We can certainly arrange some smaller group
18 settings while you're here. I'd like you to get a look
19 at that.

20 GPO, as we've talked about, is embarking on
21 several digitization activities, but they are pending
22 JCP approval. As we've said before, GPO does not have
00037

1 authority to digitize. It's something we need approval
2 from our oversight committee to do. Since we last
3 spoke, we forwarded a letter to our oversight committee
4 asking for approval to do a number of things. I think
5 it's safe to say we have received a favorable initial
6 response, although we still need to do some work to
7 secure final approval. One of these activities is
8 working in collaboration with the Library of Congress on
9 a project to provide permanent public access to the
10 digitized statutes at large going back during the time
11 frame of 1951 to 2002. About 147,000 pages of content
12 have been digitized. The library has performed the
13 conversion to provide the files to GPO to look at doing
14 content processing and making this available through
15 FDsys. As we talked about in the past, the ability of

16 FDsys to do this is critical and I know we have the
17 capability to make this happen. The process content
18 that we make available will also be made available back
19 to the Library of Congress. I think this type of
20 collaboration will really jump start digitization and
21 create a comfort level within government is something we
22 really need to do. I think it takes advantage of the
00038

1 strengths of the Library of Congress in terms of a
2 digitization activity. It takes advantage of the
3 strengths of the Government Printing Office in terms of
4 providing robust content processing and search
5 capability. As I mentioned, a small pilot demo of this
6 was available this morning and I would like for anyone
7 who missed it to have a chance to see it because I think
8 it's really important we get your feedback so we can
9 take that back to our oversight committee and talk more
10 with them when we meet.

11 I spoke about an FDLP consultant. This
12 consultant was hired and in fact was hired to do future
13 modeling for the future of this program and to look at
14 practical and sustainable models for the future. We
15 received funding for that last year. We've written a
16 statement of work and this has been in terms of
17 procurement activity. Before I left we passed this on
18 to our procurement and it's now in a procurement
19 sensitive stage.

20 Bob spoke about system's modernization.
21 I have already talked about PURLs.

22 In the last six months the WEBTech notes
00039

1 migration has also been completed, with recent
2 enhancements to enable more efficient workload
3 processing.

4 In addition, our Lighted Bins system that
5 distributes our tangible publications, we have tested
6 and enhanced our backup server capability for that.

7 We have had cross training throughout our IT
8 organization from the support of our mainframe based
9 systems and we developed a concept of operations
10 document and started the requirements process for the
11 migration off the other remaining legacy systems. The
12 one thing I want to add to that is, we did have funding
13 last year for that, which enables us to start this. As
14 Bob mentioned, we have asked for additional funding next
15 year because I want to make sure it's completed. I

16 don't want to get halfway through and find out we are
17 out of money.

18 Next, I'd like to talk a little bit our
19 catalog and record distribution pilot. I'm not going to
20 go into a lot of detail on this or the pre 76 shelflist
21 because I'll take away Laurie's presentation tomorrow,
22 but a lot of important things are going on with that
00040

1 regard that I do want to mention. We have contracted
2 with MARCIVE for a pilot project for the FDLP. A
3 selection of depository libraries are participating in
4 this pilot program in which GPO bibliographic records
5 are being distributed from our ILS to the libraries.
6 This is something we have never done before, a lot of
7 new process and work flow associated with it, which is
8 why we are doing it as a pilot to start off with steps
9 and then move forward. At the end of the pilot, the
10 libraries participating may keep the records they
11 received. The GPO is going to evaluate the success of
12 the pilot and report back to you, you our community and
13 get feedback on lessons learned and then we are going to
14 go forward. A brown bag lunch is also being held
15 tomorrow for all of those who are interested in learning
16 about the pilot. I encourage you to attend that, if you
17 don't have lunch plans.

18 The pre-76 shelflist conversion project is
19 just as critical, as we all know. We are continuing
20 with the transcription of the historic shelflist. In
21 January of this year, a couple of months ago, we brought
22 on contract staff to begin transcribing the shelflist
00041

1 MARC records. The focus of the transcription effort is
2 currently on the Y4 SuDoc classification numbers, which
3 I believe is congressional, if my memory serves me. At
4 this point over 4,500 to 5,000 shelflist records have
5 been transcribed and are currently available in catalog
6 of government publications and this continues on until
7 it's complete. Additionally, we completed work on the
8 initial start of a project to digitize the shelflist
9 cards. So far 280,000 of the estimated 1,000,000
10 shelflist have been completed in recent months.

11 Linda Rezler, who manages our integrated
12 library system, couldn't be with us today, but I wanted
13 to give a few updates beyond your handout, or
14 complementing your handout on the integrating library
15 system and the great work that she and her team have

16 been doing.

17 New ILS hardware has been received and
18 configured. Part of the reason that is important to me,
19 a few years ago you'll remember we had a 1,000 record
20 limit per session I think through the Z39.50 client when
21 pulling down cataloging records. I told Linda that I
22 wanted to go unlimited and she told me that I was
00042

1 insane. So I said, well, let's take a baby step. We
2 upped it to 10,000 records that we are at right now and
3 we haven't crashed. I think it has been working very
4 well, but she told me to get to unlimited we needed to
5 do some hardware upgrades so we bought it and staff in
6 Mike's IT shop are working to install and I still want
7 to get to the goal. We are also testing the Aleph
8 version 20 on the new hardware, running parallel with
9 existing hardware in Aleph18. The contract is also now
10 in place for the Metalib User Interface. And we have
11 completed authorities update processing of Library of
12 Congress subject to name headings as well.

13 Next, I'd like to talk a little bit about
14 marketing initiatives. A document that I have for ready
15 reference that stays on my desk is a document that I
16 hope a lot of you remember. It was written, I think
17 back in 2006 by another Council class, called Knowledge
18 Will Forever Govern. I consider that a companion
19 document to where we are going strategically. And one
20 of the statements that was made by the Council at that
21 time was, GPO needs to become more active in terms of
22 creating awareness of the FDLP and marketing. We have
00043

1 taken that very seriously. We have launched the easy as
2 FDLP -- or easy as FDL campaign, that I know you're
3 aware of. But we have also been disseminating public
4 service announcements to radio stations around the
5 country. GPO staff have created two separate radio
6 spots. One directed at radio stations on college
7 campuses with a depository and also another for public
8 stations on campuses that don't have a depository
9 library. So far in recent months, over 50 college
10 campuses have been airing these public service
11 announcements. If your depository is on a campus with a
12 radio station and you're interested in participating in
13 this initiative, please write into AskGPO or e-mail me
14 directly rdavis@GPO.gov and I will make it happen.

15 Additionally, we contracted in the last

16 month, with North American Press Syndicate, NAPS. And
17 NAPS staff are working with GPO to disseminate
18 informational articles about the FDLP to over 10,000
19 print and online publications nationwide. And we are
20 also doing radio spots on about 400 FM radio stations.
21 Somebody asked me at the last conference if I was
22 spending a lot of money on this, given all the other
00044

1 things we have. This entire campaign has been several
2 thousand dollars and that's it and I think we are going
3 to have a good return on investment as part of the
4 business plan.

5 Next, I'd like to talk a little bit about
6 additional social networking. I think all of you are
7 familiar with the FDLP Desktop that has become our
8 source to make information available about this program,
9 everything from news feeds to documents that you
10 download. We continue to use, of course, FDLP-L list of
11 announcements as well. The FDLP community site is our
12 portion of the social networking environment for the
13 library program that I think helps collapse the
14 geographic boundaries that we all operate under. At
15 present we have about 450 members and membership to the
16 FDLP Community is exclusive to librarians who are
17 participating in this program.

18 Based on the features and stability of the
19 site, that have been offered, the Depository Library
20 Council, the gov.kidsgroup, godwortohio and others have
21 expressed interest in making this their site and we are
22 continuing to work to make that happen. Our Web teams
00045

1 consisting of Karen Sieger, John Dowgiallo and I think
2 they are going to be our two other representatives, will
3 be here tomorrow and I encourage you to attend a session
4 that they are holding from ten-thirty to noon on
5 Wednesday to hear more about Web activities and social
6 networking.

7 A few more things to go here. Public access
8 assessments. We talked probably two conferences ago
9 about how GPO needed to revitalize public access
10 assessments from the old days when we used to use that
11 nasty word, inspection, which I think is still in the
12 law, but we have made it a bit more friendly. Public
13 access assessments I viewed more as a partnership with
14 all of you, not so much an inspection. The Outreach
15 section of the FDLP Desktop now includes information

16 about our interaction, communication and consultation
17 with all of you on these assessment activities. Since
18 we last spoke, GPO staff have been in states ranging
19 from Arizona, Georgia, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas. I
20 think we surprised Dan in New Mexico. We have been all
21 over. If you are interested in having us come to your
22 area, not just to talk about assessments, but to
00046

1 participate in an anniversary celebration, an event,
2 please visit our fdlp-on-the-go page on the Desktop.
3 Complete the form and send it in.
4 Education and Outreach stuff under Lance
5 Cummins when we last spoke, in terms of folks doing
6 assessments, assessments consisted of Kathy and Ashley.
7 And I mentioned that we were looking to increase staff
8 size. I think when I started at GPO in 1992, I think we
9 might have had six to eight inspectors. I'm very
10 pleased that we have had an additional person join our
11 staff, Kristina Bobe. If you'd like to stand up.
12 Welcome aboard and I want to be able to say that with a
13 staff this small, we tripled the size since before she
14 came on because last week Lance, Robin and myself
15 selected three additional folks to join our staff and
16 turn that into human capital, as part of the
17 certification list so the three people that you see here
18 now will now become six.

19 Next, I'd like to speak a little bit about
20 partnerships. Since last fall's conference, we've had
21 some new developments on this front as well. We
22 developed a new partnership with Cornell University Law
00047

1 Library for a year long pilot to evaluate a conversion
2 process of the Code of Federal Regulations into XML.
3 The Cornell Legal Information Institute is in the
4 process of converting various titles into XML and will
5 make them accessible on the university's Web site for
6 research. As Bob mentioned, we have also done similar
7 type conversion that we make through bulk data download
8 through FDsys and also have made it available on
9 data.gov. Part of this effort is to look at the
10 variation as part of the open government initiative in
11 comparing different types of XML schemas to see what
12 Cornell can learn from us and what we can learn from
13 them. I'd like also to thank you, my colleague Mike
14 White, from the Office of the Federal Register to help
15 facilitate this partnership and I appreciate your

16 efforts on it.

17 We are also, of course, partnering with
18 Southern Methodist University for the Historic
19 Publications from World War II and the Library of
20 Michigan for regional depository library information and
21 that partnership was also renewed. The partnership with
22 the Association of Schools of Public Health to provide
00048

1 electronic access to public health reports was announced
2 and I believe now about 700 libraries have access to
3 those journals.

4 I'm also going to ask for a little bit of
5 aerobics and calisthenics here if folks are in the room.
6 I want to take this time to publicly thank several
7 institutions that recently celebrated anniversaries with
8 GPO as partners. Some of them might even be here on
9 stage. University of Illinois at Chicago and DOSFAN, 13
10 years as a GPO partner. Louisiana State University and
11 the list of Federal Agency Internet Sites - 8 years as a
12 GPO partner. Oklahoma State University and Browse
13 Topics, 7 years as a GPO partner. And last but not
14 least, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and FRASER, 5
15 years as a partner.

16 I want to conclude with three additional
17 things. I think we have had really good success using
18 the OPAL tool online programming for all libraries to do
19 online presentations. That tool was procured at a hefty
20 cost of \$800 and I think it's fantastic. But I wanted
21 to go further. I know how many libraries we have and
22 even with six assessment people and GPO staff, I know we
00049

1 can't always be there, particularly when you need us at
2 a moments notice for training. I think OPAL is good,
3 but we need it to go a step further. We awarded a
4 contract to create online, educational, instructional
5 modules. And you'll see the first one at this
6 conference during Laurie Hall's presentation on WEBTech
7 notes, and I think you will like it.

8 We are looking to do more. We are going to
9 do FPLD Desktop. We are going to do the Community site
10 and beyond that I want to hear from you on what you
11 want. And I think online training is a good complement
12 to in person training and we are going to continue down
13 that path as well.

14 Finally, I'm very pleased to announce for
15 the first time GPO has hired a preservation librarian to

16 join my staff this morning at eight o'clock. His name
17 is David Walls formerly of Yale University and he's not
18 here with us. I thought it might be a little unfair
19 with all that he is going to have to do to bring him up
20 here and I didn't want to scare him off immediately. So
21 he is back at GPO getting acclimated to GPO culture.
22 Robin is there with him and they are getting setup. He
00050

1 is not going to have much time to sit down though
2 because I think it's coming up in June, I'm sending him
3 over to the Netherlands to represent GPO at the
4 Archiving 2010 Conference. Something we haven't
5 participated in, but we need to be at.

6 Finally, travel after this, for all of you
7 who are interested, I encourage you to attend the GPO
8 Interagency Depository Seminary. It will be held back
9 in DC at the Government Printing Office July 26th
10 through the 30th. Advance registration is required, but
11 as always, there is no fee to attend. You can find out
12 more about this under upcoming events on the FDLP
13 Desktop.

14 I'd like to turn the program over to George
15 Barnum. I hope George is here. Is George here?
16 There's George. George is going to talk about our
17 upcoming agency anniversary celebration and George is,
18 of course, our historian at GPO. That's it for me. I
19 want to thank you all of you for attending. I want to
20 thank you for listening during my presentation. As
21 always I encourage you to AskGPO questions during this
22 conference and through our CRM afterwards, but likewise,
00051

1 I'd like to hear from you, rdavis@GPO.gov. I'm pretty
2 much available 24 hours a day. So if you need help,
3 don't hesitate to contact me. Thank you all.

4 MR. BARNUM: Today I want to talk about
5 events that I'm looking forward to with great
6 anticipation and I think we all are around the office.

7 GPO will be a 150 years old next March.
8 GPO opened its doors as GPO on March the 4th, 1861, the
9 same day that the Lincoln administration began. And we
10 are planning a series events and activities to mark that
11 anniversary. Some of which will be visible to you and
12 will include you and others that will be pretty much
13 local in Washington, but I wanted to give you a sort of
14 overview about what we are up to.

15 We are going to start the celebrations

16 this June on the 23rd, when we will observe the 150th
17 anniversary of the day in which -- on which congress
18 passed joint resolution 25 that directed that GPO be
19 established. We have an event planned for that day and
20 we will be launching a lot of our other activities at
21 that point. We are going to republished our long
22 beloved agency history called a 100 GPO Years that was
00052

1 published for the centennial in 1961. We have entirely
2 reset the book and added an index to it, which it never
3 had, and we will be publishing this sesquicentennial
4 edition on the 23rd of June and making that available.
5 And, yes, I expect it will be written for depository
6 distribution because I knew you were going to ask. We
7 have not discussed how we are going to do it
8 electronically, but it is going to be available.

9 At the same time we are going to be
10 launching a new section of the GPO Web site,
11 specifically devoted to GPO history and the -- I think
12 the thing that will interest all of you the most about
13 that, other than announcements of events and that sort
14 of thing, is that one of the things that we really want
15 to do with that Web site is make sections of our
16 photograph archive available. GPO has a wonderful
17 photographic collection going back the better part of a
18 100 years, documenting virtually everything that ever
19 went on in the place and we hope to make a significant
20 swath of that publicly available over the internet so
21 that you too can be fascinated by pictures of presses
22 and the binders.

00053

1 Continuing on from that point, we will be
2 doing various kinds of activities through the
3 intervening months, many of them focus on GPO staff. We
4 have a number of annual observances and events that go
5 on within the office. And we will be tying many of
6 those like the Veteran's Day observance and the
7 observances of black history month and women's history
8 month and that sort of thing, to the anniversary
9 celebration.

10 Then next March we will again throw a big
11 party. The June 23rd event we are going to have a big
12 party for the staff at Harding Hall and invited guests,
13 Library of Congress and various other people. In March
14 we will again throw a party and we hope that at that
15 point we will be opening an exhibit of material from

16 GPO's 150 years that will tell the story of GPO's role
17 and impact in American life. We want to look at the
18 ways large and small that we have been involved with the
19 American experience from the printing of major
20 documents, like the emancipation proclamation and
21 declarations of war to everyday life like your social
22 security card and your census form. We are currently at
00054

1 work on a statement of work for an exhibit design expert
2 and we hope to be able to open that exhibit in March at
3 the time of the anniversary and that will run for
4 several months.

5 Not missing the opportunity to tell our
6 story, we are going to issue another book. A 100 GPO
7 Years, covers a timeline fashion up to 1960. We'd like
8 to bridge the gap between 1960 and now and also again
9 make some of this graphical history as we have it more
10 available. So we will be publishing a new history in
11 March. We have a working title. I won't burden you
12 with it. But it is in process and we are very excited
13 about what that's going to look like because it's going
14 to be very pretty and what it will contain. And we
15 will -- as I say, we will be celebrating in various ways
16 throughout the year of 2011. I want to encourage any of
17 you who are having depository anniversaries in the
18 coming year to be in touch with us. Let either staff in
19 Library Services or me know that you are planning an
20 anniversary celebration. We'd like to be aware of that
21 and tie together some of these celebrations. There is a
22 possibility that we will have some piece or part of this
00055

1 exhibit, some traveling kind of thing going around and
2 so we hope that we could tie that in with depository
3 anniversary if possible. But mostly we want to know if
4 you are celebrating because we never want to miss a
5 party either. So you can be in touch with me at GBarnum
6 @GPO.gov or with Lance and his staff or Kathy and her
7 staff and I thank you very much.

8 MR. SHULER: Over this last year I have
9 thought about of lot of things and I have thought about
10 being chair of Council and I think it comes down to
11 being a personality being made of three parts: One part
12 Martha Stewart, before she went to jail, one part Carrie
13 Nation and one part Saul Alinsky. But I'd like to call
14 on the Martha John to again give a hand to Bob and Ric
15 for the fabulous job that they have done during this

16 year as Council and the gracious and the charity and the
17 resources that they have given us in order to do our job
18 properly. So could I get a big hand for that.

19 The Carrie Nation part of me is not as easy
20 because I like beer. But that Carrie Nation that I
21 remember is basically free public access to government
22 information, that is what this program represents and
00056

1 what fascinated me three weeks ago when we were in
2 Washington, Suzanne and I participated in a PMO.
3 Somebody in the audience suggested that perhaps there
4 was a future for a federal register, for instance, that
5 god forbid, is print neutral. And I got to thinking
6 that maybe you could imagine a depository library system
7 that is -- here wait for it -- print neutral. And I
8 think the series of the conversations that we are going
9 to have this afternoon, as well as tomorrow, are a
10 critical part of that evolution as we move from a paper
11 and print universe to one dominated by Egovernment
12 perspectives.

13 The Saul Alinsky part means we've got to
14 keep coming to the streets and organizing and demanding
15 and insisting and as part of that tradition I'm now
16 going to ask if Council has any questions for our two
17 esteemed guests up here at the table. Come on, after
18 that sendoff. That's it? Anything?

19 MR. JAMES: Actually there are a couple of
20 questions. If you'd like me to propose them? So I'm
21 going through -- there was a question about -- James
22 Jacobs, Stanford University. There was a question about
00057

1 PURLs verses DOI's and whether GPO is going to explore
2 DOI's for that system and maybe that is something that
3 we can talk about later, if readers are interested.

4 MR. DAVIS: I'm looking at our court
5 reporter/transcriptionist. We are going to do the name
6 first as we go forward as well, to make her life easy.

7 I mentioned during my talk that I
8 consider the contract award to Zepheria to be a bridge
9 of stability. I want to keep PURLs going. I think that
10 as myself and my colleagues have done quite a bit of
11 research over the years, PURLs are an outdated
12 technology and I found that is not really the case.
13 PURLs are a choice. And I think that handles and use of
14 DLI's and other things are choices. I think what our
15 job to do -- I mentioned that as a bridge of stability

16 it doesn't mean all the requirements were what we
17 consider to be persistent name for the future and the
18 FDsys requirements document. Now I think what we need
19 to do is go back and revalidate what it is we want and
20 tell the program management office and let them select
21 the right technology for us based on those needs.

22 MR. SHULER: Jill?

00058

1 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
2 of Utah. Another for Ric Davis. I'm just so used to
3 everyone hearing me.

4 Ric, could you outline the job description
5 of the preservation librarian, what you see their role
6 as being?

7 MR. DAVIS: I think it's going to be very
8 interesting. You know, Robin is going to be David's
9 manager and I'm trying very hard not to tell her what I
10 think. I sent her an e-mail last week and I said, what
11 are the first five things you want to work on and she
12 said, I want to talk to you about it and that's good
13 because I've got things I want him to work on. I think
14 it's a unique opportunity in that obviously GPO doesn't
15 have a collection in the tangible world, but we do have
16 a collection in the electronic world. I think when GPO
17 talks about a preservation responsibility, I think when
18 GPO talks about the fact it's an affiliate archive with
19 the National Archive Records Administration, I think we
20 need to give some more teeth to what that means. I
21 think that questions have arisen about the preservation
22 role of GPO on electronic data with the preservation

00059

1 repository of FDsys and whether or not it's gone through
2 various types of audit processes itself using CLR and
3 some other means. I think those are some very important
4 things that we need to do. I always encourage regionals
5 and libraries in general to have a state plan and a
6 collection plan. GPO does not have a collection plan.
7 We need a collection plan and when I talked earlier
8 about things like how we've been lucky in regards to
9 data format, I don't think we can bank on that luck. I
10 think we need to be ready to have migration strategies
11 to move our content forward, in addition to management
12 of that preservation repository. I think as, you know,
13 if we look to do things associated with digital deposit
14 and dissemination of files, what that means for access
15 and preservation copy. I think as we look to do

16 digitization, what access and preservation level copy
17 are associated with that, and you combine all of that
18 with the next for technical Metadata, associated with
19 Laurie's cataloging unit, I hope he is with us for a
20 long time.

21 MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you

22 MR. SHULER: Ric, thank you. Anybody else
00060

1 from Council?

2 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski from
3 California State Library. Ric, I have a question about
4 the shelflist conversion. According to the figures that
5 you have given us, there are somewhere in the
6 neighborhood of 280,000 total shelflist cards in the old
7 shelflist and these are being digitized. The first
8 question is, can you describe what you mean by
9 digitizing? Are these being OCR'd so they will be
10 searchable or would there just be images taken of them?
11 How will this digitization be made available? Second
12 question, there are between 4,500 to 5,000 shelflist
13 cards that have been transcribed and what -- assuming
14 that transcription is more robust than just digitizing,
15 what are the plans for doing further transcription past
16 that 5,000 number?

17 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing
18 Office. To clarify a bit on the numbers, we estimate
19 that in total there are approximately 1,000,000
20 shelflist cards. To date 280,000 of the cards have been
21 digitized and about 4500 to 5,000 have been transcribed.
22 Do I have by numbers right, Laurie?

00061

1 MS. HALL: Yes.

2 MR. DAVIS: Laurie is the expert on this, so
3 if I get in trouble come on up to the mike. Funny you
4 say that about availability of the files. They are not
5 being OCR'd they are being created as a TIF image file
6 with the plan to take the paper shelflist and transfer
7 it to the National Archives and Records Administration.
8 I sent Laurie an e-mail just yesterday and I said, how
9 are we using these digitized files and she said, for
10 internal purposes. And I said, do you think the library
11 community might have an interest in getting the TIF
12 images and she said, let's talk when we are back in
13 Washington. So I'm interested in knowing if you are
14 interested in those digitized files, in addition to
15 those transcribed records. I mentioned that for the

16 transcription, on your second part of the question,
17 David, the contractors came on board in January. They
18 have done 4500. When we talk about cataloging money,
19 this is partially how we are spending it. When Bob
20 talks about future money, it's what I'm asking for to
21 continue it, to complete it. All parts need to be
22 transcribed and made available through our Catalogue of
00062

1 Government Publications and the ILS. Does that answer
2 all of it? Laurie, do you want to add anything to that?

3 MS. HALL: A little bit on the numbers.

4 There is actually a million cards, approximately a
5 million cards. Six hundred thousand of them
6 approximately are the ones that are going to be
7 transcribed because the shelflist didn't shut down until
8 1992, so we have a significant proportion that are CLC
9 cards. The reason there is only 4500, all of the
10 transcription is going on by the contractor. Then our
11 staff, our cataloging staff goes in and quality control
12 checks them as one valid Library of Congress subject
13 heading and one valid name authority heading. So it
14 goes through another process. So what comes out is
15 4500, closer to 5,000 that is in the CGP right now have
16 that extra enhancement so that they are little bit more
17 usable to everyone. Does that answer the question?

18 MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes.

19 MR. SHULER: There's only four more minutes
20 left. Any question from the audience? We have one
21 question in the audience? Nobody? Ric?

22 MR. DAVIS: If there are no more questions,
00063

1 as this may be my last conference with Bob Tapella as
2 well, I want to publicly thank him for the work that
3 he's done as public printer. He has made my life at GPO
4 incredibly easy. He has trusted me to run my business
5 unit and when I've needed help, his door has always been
6 open, so thank you very much, Bob.

7 MR. SHULER: Any last opportunities here?
8 Then I'll now close on a Martha moment. We have this
9 lunch choice today of a regional selective. So this is
10 where the regionals find their selectives. And it's
11 going to be an important part of our conversation this
12 upcoming week so meet up with yourselves and start
13 talking with yourselves. Let's celebrate that we have
14 wireless throughout the hotel. And if anyone needs
15 assistance, GPO staff can always be found at the

16 registration kiosk. And finally, certificates of
17 attendance, if requested will be available on Wednesday
18 after ten-thirty break. Finally law librarians dinner
19 tonight. Meet in the hotel lobby at five-twenty p.m.
20 and/or sign up on the message board before two p.m. With
21 that, I declare lunch and we will see everybody in two
22 hours.

00064

1 (Break for lunch)

2 MR. SHULER: I want to call the Council back
3 into session for the first afternoon plenary and I want
4 to give you a sense of what these next three
5 conversations are about. What Council has done since
6 October is identify three basic themes involving the
7 Depository Library, the Community and GPO and we have
8 setup 90 minute sessions of open questions. We are not
9 going to see a presentation about these particular
10 topics per say, in any particular depository fashion.
11 Rather what Council has done is create a series of
12 questions they will be posed first to GPO folk and then
13 to the audience. What we hope to come from this
14 discussion, and this is where I move into my Saul
15 Alinsky mode, is we hope to generate a sense of where we
16 are going with these changes that the -- was touched
17 upon earlier in the morning session. So there is no --
18 I'm going to be sort of the traffic cop and the button
19 pusher for the slides of the plenary session and if
20 everyone goes quiet then I become the provocateur and I
21 will go in the audience and I will drag Dan out of his
22 chair and I'll make him ask a question. So don't make

00065

1 me do that, Dan. I have my dignity to think of.

2 This particular session is on preservation
3 and access. And the first question is up on the screen
4 as you can see. So I turn it over to the Council folk
5 responsible for this conversation. If you want to
6 introduce yourselves.

7 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
8 North Texas.


9 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
10 University.

11 Ms. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
12 Valparaiso University Law Library.

13 MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington
14 University.

15 MS. SEARS: This session was sort of borne

16 out of a comment that was made by Ric in the October
17 meeting for those of you who were not at the October
18 meeting. He specifically directed Council to have a
19 session on preservation and access and to discuss
20 digitization. So that is sort of the introduction to
21 the session and then this is our first question that we
22 have open for discussion and we would really like to
00066

1 hear from the Community what are the appropriate roles
2 of GPO vis--vis FDLP libraries in terms of digital
3 access and preservation.

4 MR. JACOBS: The questions are -- James
5 Jacobs, Stanford University -- the questions, all of the
6 slides are up on -- you can get them from freegov and
7 vote on the live blog. And what we are getting at with
8 these six questions is not yes or no answers or not
9 even, you know, answers necessarily, but just
10 information and from the Community on what you think we
11 should be doing, so we can start to have discussion
12 about this and where to go from there.

13 MR. SHULER: I see one Ric standing up at
14 the microphone. Ric.

15 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis. Is this one on? Ric
16 Davis, GPO. I think this is a very important question
17 as all of them are for many reasons. As I mentioned in
18 my speech this morning, when I look back at title 44, it
19 talks about the permanent role of libraries in terms of
20 providing a collection of content. When I look at the
21 law for GPO Access, it doesn't say anything about
22 permanence, which frightens me a little bit in terms of
00067

1 future generations taking over this program. It says
2 that there shall be a directory of government documents,
3 correctional records of Federal Register as deemed
4 appropriate by the superintendent of documents, has
5 become this other wide range in collection. As we have
6 been doing biennial surveys in the last six times we
7 have done them, we have seen a steady increase in terms
8 of library response rate of libraries that have
9 expressed some degree of interest in having their own
10 access level or preservation level files that some of
11 you would like to hold at your institutions. And I say
12 that from the government documents like (inaudible)
13 perspective, but I also know I don't want to speak for
14 directors that you work with because there is a cost
15 obviously involved in doing this, but one of the things

16 that I would like to see enabled by FDsys, that I have
17 talked to the program management office about as a
18 requirement, is the ability to make these files
19 available beyond what we traditionally did with GPO
20 Access. So that for those interested there could be
21 more than a copy at Washington DC and a remote backup.
22 I think from where I am part of this question gets to
00068

1 that, you know, since 1993 and the digital world GPO has
2 been doing this with this permanent public access, but
3 in a mostly electronic environment, what roles do
4 libraries want to play going forward that is not a
5 requirement, but more on a voluntarily basis. I hope
6 that helps a little bit.

7 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. Anybody else
8 from Council want to pitch in?

9 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
10 North Texas. I just want to say to the audience
11 members, we talk amongst ourselves all the time, so we
12 have heard what we want to say on this issue. We really
13 need to hear what the Community has to say so that we
14 can -- so we can give solid advice to Ric and to the
15 Public Printer.

16 MR. SHULER: So, you all see no possible
17 future role between the depository libraries and GPO for
18 this fashion? Basically by sitting down and not saying
19 anything, you are basically voting with your feet. Is
20 that true? Yes. Very good.

21 MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University of
22 Iowa. My director has been one of those who has said,
00069

1 we will not put documents on a server so -- and there
2 are -- so I would like to see GPO permanently archive
3 all the iterations of those digital documents that --
4 that the PURLs no longer go anywhere because the federal
5 agency that initially posted those has withdrawn that.
6 So I'm speaking from a different angle possibly because
7 our library has no interest in archiving those. So I
8 would like GPO to pick up that mantle. Thank you.

9 MR. HERMAN: My name is Ed Herman. I'm from
10 the University at Buffalo. As being a part of a state
11 university within New York State, our budget situation
12 is almost as bad as the budget situation is in
13 California. If we were to agree to do, you know, to
14 house digital information at UB, University at Buffalo,
15 does the Council have any cost estimates that they can

16 provide to depositories indicating to them approximately
17 at least a ballpark figure indicating how much it would
18 cost to house an X number of terabytes of information?

19 MR. SHULER: You're asking us if we have
20 those figures right now? Or are you asking us to
21 investigate that as part of this line of inquiry?

22 MR. HERMAN: Well, perhaps if you don't have
00070

1 those figures now, perhaps, you know, investigating
2 these figures would be helpful to the libraries who
3 might be considering housing this kind of information.
4 The first thing that my superiors would ask me, if I
5 were to go back to the library this afternoon and give
6 them such a proposal is, how much is this going to cost?

7 MR. SHULER: Okay. Thank you. So noted.

8 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
9 University. It's sort of a question of multicolored
10 answers. I mean the short answer of it is, if you just
11 want -- if you just want to store PDF's on hard drive,
12 that hard drive cost two hundred bucks for a terabyte.
13 If you want to join the LOCS alliance, it depends on how
14 large your university is, you could join the LOCS
15 alliance and then be part of the LOCS -- US.docs.locs
16 network which is currently preserving all of the content
17 that are harvested at the time from GPO Access from 1991
18 to 2007. That doesn't cost anything more than a
19 machine -- four or five hundred dollars for a machine
20 and a couple of hundred dollars for a terabyte hard
21 drive and the cost of being in the LOCS alliance. If
22 you wanted to build an institutional depository with all
00071

1 the bells and whistles, then you are talking thousands
2 of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars, so it
3 really depends on what level you're interested in.

4 MS. MCKNELLY: I have sort of a two prong
5 question now. This question is about appropriate roles
6 and then digital access. We've had institutions for
7 years creating scan digital contact and asking to have
8 that made more broadly accessible through an umbrella
9 organization and if GPO FDsys can take materials from
10 third party LC and digitally assign and make them
11 available, you are going to clearly articulate why you
12 are not going to take that information from other third
13 parties who have created these large sets because that
14 would make it much more broadly available then they
15 currently are because we've got all this stuff stuck in

16 all these different silos. I was very interested in the
17 fact that GPO staff is now digitally assigning this,
18 that it is as it is because I think that they could
19 digitally assign that. There are a lot of institutions
20 out in the Community creating a lot of content and we
21 need broader access to it and we need to clearly state
22 what can go in and what can't and now I see it got much
00072

1 muddier for me this morning when you're taking something
2 from LC at this point.

3 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

4 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I wanted to
5 respond to both questions from the gentleman of Buffalo.
6 I could also get a breakdown from us in terms of storage
7 costs. But in terms of running GPO Access in its
8 totality, it's somewhere between -- it runs between 1.8
9 million and 2.5 million a year, but that encompasses all
10 the processing and everything else as well. So I can
11 get a break down for storage as well.

12 Going back to Michelle's question, one of
13 the things that I mentioned maybe a little too briefly
14 in my speech this morning was I think the LC
15 collaboration is a start. LC certainly has money that
16 they received for digitization as has GPO and I think
17 the White House and others are looking for collaborative
18 activities where tax payer money is not spent in a
19 duplicative fashion. That said, when I talked to Mike
20 in the PMO staff as well, I would like the library
21 Community to approach GPO with partnership opportunities
22 with the goal being that I think we were asked about the
00073

1 role of the preservation person, looking for the
2 government information within scope obviously official,
3 obviously complete, meeting certain standards like that
4 where we sign partnerships as we have always done with
5 libraries to further access by making that content
6 available in FDsys. In terms of recognizing the source,
7 where it's from, what standards it was digitized to, I
8 think we can handle those types of things in technical
9 Metadata. And at a time when we are often talking about
10 the value of the program and the value of partnerships,
11 I think that's a real opportunity that we should
12 continue to work towards. Obviously there are
13 sensitivities with the digitization subject. Given the
14 approval, we got to show something this morning in the
15 continuing approval, but I think having paper in hand,

16 showing that libraries want to partner that they have
17 digitized collections and they are saying in the
18 partnership agreement, I want you to make this available
19 through FDsys, make it happen; that's what I need.

20 MR. SHULER: Thanks, Ric. Yes.

21 MS. LASTER: Sharalyn Laster, University of
22 Akron. I think that two additional roles that GPO can
00074

1 play would be to help facilitate training related to all
2 different levels of digital content maintenance whether
3 it wants to be a library that wants to participate in
4 harvesting, whether it's a library that wants to save
5 things on their hard drive in sort of an appropriate
6 preservation manner or whether it's a library or
7 consortium of libraries that really wants to go out
8 there and create their own digital library then that
9 would act as a preservation mechanism for the content of
10 FDsys.

11 Another role that I think many of us would
12 love to see GOP, possibly in conjunction with IMLS
13 playing, is to somehow secure funding for these
14 projects, both the beginning startup work that it really
15 takes to create a large scale project, and also funding
16 that might encourage libraries to work in consortial or
17 work in sort of ongoing projects to improve these
18 preservation capacities.

19 MR. SHULER: Thanks.

20 MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago Public
21 Library. We are one of the larger paper depositories
22 and we don't see that role going away. But we see the
00075

1 same difficulties as everybody else does in digitizing.
2 Being a digital depository it would require digging
3 money out of something, getting -- working through the
4 local politics getting them to commit to it. But I
5 think for the same reason that we don't really envision
6 getting rid of our paper documents, that definitely the
7 depository libraries do need to somehow digitally
8 preserve these things because GPO is a single point of
9 failure here. They may have redundant servers, but all
10 it takes is an act of Congress to shut them down.
11 Whereas that's never been able to happen with paper
12 documents. Technically, why doesn't GPO explore a
13 distributed model of archiving? One library just
14 archives the department of agriculture, another library
15 archives something else, etc., etc.

16 MR. SHULER: Thank you. I think we have
17 time for one more on this before we move on.

18 MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells,
19 Northwestern University. One part of that question is
20 about digital access and sort of going back to what
21 Michelle mentioned about the silos of already digitized
22 content. Some of those digital files are probably not
00076

1 appropriate to ingest into something like FDsys. They
2 may be too dirty, at too low of a level of resolution or
3 sort of older material that would digitize under
4 standards of an era. But until we have a complete
5 digital collection, what I would especially like is
6 Metadata records for those digital files that exists
7 around the country to be available through GPO because
8 discovery is an incredibly important part of this.
9 There is an awful lot of digital content that we don't
10 know about.

11 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Ric?

12 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One more
13 followup on the previous question. I'm concerned too,
14 what happens if GPO loses funding? That was part of the
15 reason five to seven years ago I guess we signed an
16 agreement with the National Archives to become an
17 archival affiliate. I think at that time we might have
18 been the thirteenth in the country. So there is a
19 backstop there. In terms of digital deposit
20 dissemination, I'm not going to steal the thunder
21 because I think that's on the radar from some additional
22 questions, but we have been working with Mr. Jacobs
00077

1 particularly in the last few weeks to enable some
2 capabilities on FDsys that would enable LOCS
3 functionality and I think that, you know, part of what I
4 spoke about this morning in terms of content packages,
5 is something that we need to enable through FDsys to
6 enable what we are talking about as digital deposit.

7 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. James?

8 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
9 University. There was one comment posted to the live
10 blog which if you don't mind I'll read. It's from Bill
11 Sleeman, University of Maryland Law Library. He says
12 one role that GPO has to maintain is that of a standards
13 setting agency. When you look at the variety of quality
14 in any scanning projects, even and particularly some of
15 the larger scale ones, you discover that it's very

16 mixed. If we are to be in a position where we can
17 insure the long term future of joint projects, they have
18 to be up to a standard level. I know this was asked in
19 an open session in the fall and I made the point at the
20 time as well. If we are to partner with GPO to produce
21 digital products or if a vender is, there needs to be a
22 requirement that the product is up to a viable standard.
00078

1 MR. SHULER: Okay.

2 MR. SCHOENFELD: Roger Schoenfeld with
3 Ithaca SNR. First of all to echo about what some of the
4 others have said about the importance of having multiple
5 sources for digital preservation, I also wanted to just
6 raise a question, maybe for the group, about one of the
7 roles that GPO has traditionally played in the print
8 preservation environment that I don't hear as much
9 discussion about in the digital preservation environment
10 which is the importance that GPO has played in
11 formalizing relationships, partnerships, however you
12 want to call it, with the regional federal depository
13 libraries to insure that there are libraries that are --
14 have a sort of publicly stated responsibility for
15 certain kinds of preservation. And I just wonder if
16 that kind of role of identifying partners, whether they
17 be libraries or groups of libraries, who would be sort
18 of assured or guaranteed preservation partners and not
19 just kind of optional or at will preservation partners,
20 might be an important thing to consider in some future
21 environment for digital preservation?

22 MR. SHULER: Thanks.

00079

1 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I wanted to
2 respond to the question that came up as part of the
3 blog, I guess. James Mauldin can speak to this much
4 more eloquently than I can, but I will try. I think
5 it's important to have access level content. I think
6 it's important to have preservation level content from
7 which you can migrate and refresh in the future. The
8 one concern I have, when we talk about the right
9 standard, and you know we have had meetings of standards
10 experts at GPO, probably 10 to 15 percent of James's job
11 involves meeting with various agencies throughout DC and
12 others to talk about digitization standards and where
13 they are going and where they are evolving to. One
14 thing that I have come to the conclusion on, that there
15 is no agreement. And the one thing that I don't want to

16 do or I hope not to see is that while we aspire to
17 achieve a certain perfect standard, we don't use it as a
18 reason for not progressing in the digitization realm.
19 And I guess my thought process is that as the standards
20 are evolving, we should focus on quality and we can
21 reflect standards in technical Metadata, but I just
22 don't want to use them as a reason to not pursue
00080

1 digitization activities.

2 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Council group, is
3 this enough for this question? Okay. Should we go to
4 the next?

5 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
6 University. The question we have is what are libraries
7 doing to facilitate digital preservation and access?

8 MR. SHULER: So, John Shuler, University of
9 Illinois, Chicago, this is another easy one? We are not
10 doing anything to facilitate digital preservation and
11 access. Maybe somebody, slowly.

12 MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North
13 Carolina, at Chapel Hill. We are doing the same things
14 that we are struggling to ask GPO to do on a state level
15 in that we are crating partnerships. ECU is digitizing
16 maps and North Carolina is hosting them and helping with
17 the Metadata. Also at Carolina we have done
18 digitization of special collections that we have. If
19 anyone has ever looked at documenting the American south
20 slave narratives, that's a UNC homegrown project. And
21 we are sharing that at times with folks like the
22 internet archives and preserving it that way, so having
00081

1 sort of a mirror image of the collections. So I don't
2 think we are doing any trailblazing in North Carolina.
3 I think some states are in fact further along with state
4 digitization of state documents then we are and so they
5 might very well have other things to add. I don't think
6 we are really trailblazing with what we are trying to do
7 with this discussion. I think if it's just going to
8 take somebody to decide, okay, I'm going to lead in this
9 area, but keep everybody informed. One thing that I
10 would have liked to have said on the earlier question
11 today was that the document's community is sometimes too
12 passive in that we are not informing the world about
13 what digital projects we are doing. So when a director
14 asks you what collection would you like to digitize of
15 the federal documents that you have or what piece, it

16 may take you a week or three weeks or a couple of months
17 to determine has anybody indeed digitized this? I'm not
18 taking swipes at the clearinghouse, you know, because I
19 know there are pros and cons about trying to capture in
20 one place all the projects, but I think we need to be
21 blowing our own horns as it were and say what we are
22 doing to every listener we can imagine so that the word
00082

1 gets out there of what we are doing and we figure out
2 who needs a partner to either digitize the material, who
3 needs a partner to provide the materials, who needs a
4 partner to host the material and go from there.

5 MR. SHULER: Thank you. James?

6 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
7 University. You're raising the idea of the internet
8 archive. I wonder if anyone out there is actually
9 cataloging content from the internet archives government
10 document collection? Is anyone? They have a growing
11 collection. They have been digitizing content from
12 University of Illinois, from the Boston Public Library,
13 from other libraries.

14 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
15 Michigan. We are doing it for Michigan documents, but
16 not for Federal.

17 MR. SHULER: Yes.

18 MR. PHILLIPS: This is Mark Phillips of the
19 University of North Texas. One of the things that we
20 have been trying to do over the past several years is
21 really try to lay down a base level infrastructure for
22 all of our digital content coming in. And one of the
00083

1 unique things I think that we have going on is a lot of
2 that digital content that is coming in is government
3 publications. So it's kind of leading our design
4 strategies, access strategies. What we are trying to do
5 is based on the content we get. So I don't fit in the
6 govdocs department. I'm one of the system's people, but
7 it is really based on what we are getting. So if we
8 weren't ever actually bringing in content saying this is
9 a very core piece. We need to be preserving this, we
10 wouldn't plan for it. So one of the things that might
11 be helpful is to actually start saying is we need to
12 bring this in. We are already downloading it. Now we
13 need to deal with it because it is bigger than just the
14 govdocs department within the university. It has to be
15 a system wide or at least a library wide infrastructure

16 to support this and it needs to be planned out over
17 years, otherwise it's just not going to happen. It's
18 not just one thing that gets done here and one thing
19 that gets done here. It's being part of an overall
20 based level set of services you provide for all digital
21 content, otherwise, it's just one scale. I guess we are
22 kind of in a good spot because we have been approaching
00084

1 it in that way and for us it seems to be working really
2 well.

3 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything over here?
4 James.

5 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
6 University. Thanks, Mark, this is great. It's one of
7 the things I've been trying to raise more with the GPO
8 staff and with Council and whoever else reads my blog,
9 is that government documents are a unique collection and
10 because they are largely in the public domain, libraries
11 who are looking to build digital infrastructures, they
12 could easily ramp up those digital infrastructures by
13 using government documents as their test bed, as their
14 original collections. So it's really a great thing that
15 you can talk to with your directors that, hey, here are
16 these collections that can help us help the larger
17 library, the library in general build digital
18 infrastructures, digital collections. I'm glad UNT is
19 doing that in leading the way.

20 MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of
21 Chicago, Illinois. There are two what could be
22 considered gold standard projects of interinstitutional
00085

1 cooperation going on right now. One is from the CIC and
2 the other one I understand is still being aborn in
3 ASERL, the southern states. I was wondering if anybody
4 in the audience would speak to either of those about the
5 experience or -- thank you, Bill.

6 MR. SUDDUTH: To be perfectly honest, I'm
7 sitting back their doing collection -- collection
8 measures that I have to submit to architects for a space
9 study in our library. I'm supposed to be projecting out
10 until 2025. So I'm listening to this and doing this at
11 the same time, but I will talk about ASERL. What we are
12 doing at ASERL, we are doing -- oh, I'm sorry. Bill
13 Sudduth, University of South Carolina. We are doing a
14 -- it's a pilot project. We actually have an IMLS grant
15 and we are working on what's called a collection of

16 excellence. We have three libraries currently involved
17 and the concept is that a library takes on a particular
18 agency or set of materials and makes sure it has a
19 complete collection. It's completely cataloged and if
20 possible a duplicate copy. So that in the future there
21 is always going to be an archival copy and that there
22 will be a lendable copy or a copy somehow that will be
00086

1 digitized. Different libraries -- we are taking
2 different approaches. Florida is going to digitize all
3 of the Panama Canal materials and they have actually
4 gone out and sought other materials. University of
5 Kentucky is doing works progress administration and I'm
6 doing education and only the education department from
7 1979 forward. So in some cases I've actually got three
8 copies at this point, but I don't have a complete
9 collection either. So that's where we are going with
10 that project. It's interesting and lots of detail and
11 we are just in beginning stages of it so. Questions?

12 MR. SHULER: Does Council have any questions
13 of Bill, since he's in our virtual world as opposed to
14 his paper one right now?

15 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
16 University. Bill, is that the ASERL draft proposal for
17 managing FDLP collections? Is that part of that?

18 MR. SUDDUTH: That's part of that. That's
19 kind of a draft guideline. Somehow we are going to work
20 within it. I was lucky enough to see it about 10, 15
21 days in advance. But have just come out. I'm
22 interested in people's reactions. We really haven't
00087

1 even talked about within the documents librarians and
2 all that, but bottom line, what I want to say about that
3 is, it's really nice to see that the deans within ASERL
4 are as interested in the future of this program as we
5 seem to be, as interested in the future of this program.
6 What we are getting out of it is -- the biggest thing
7 that we are getting out of it at this point is we are
8 going to be able to go forward cooperatively in this.
9 It is not going to be, we-said-they-said, kind of thing.
10 We are going to be working together and I think that's
11 the first big step that we are taking at this point.

12 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

13 MR. JACOBS: For those that are interested,
14 ASERL, is A-S-E-R-L.org and right at the top there is a
15 link to the draft proposal for managing FPLD

16 collections.

17 MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of
18 Minnesota. I just wanted to talk to John's point on the
19 CIC project. There is a handout in the foyer area.

20 Basically I just wanted to point out what
21 our particular project, what Bill is talking in terms of
22 corporation, and it's very similar within the CIC. Also
00088

1 having the directors behind this project and wanting to
2 go forward on it and moving forward on it and putting
3 money towards it, which I think a lot of people have
4 talked about it as being a big stumbling block. We are
5 really focusing on access copies and with working with
6 Goggle, that has been the point of the project. We are
7 not trying to do the preservation piece, per se, but we
8 want to get this stuff available and I can say the
9 University of Minnesota was the pilot project. Our
10 stuff is showing up on Goggle in HathiTrust and copies
11 are available. I have been answering questions using
12 it. So it has been a very good thing. We were the
13 pilot. Penn State has some stuff. I believe Illinois
14 is getting ready to send, University of Illinois, so we
15 are working together within the CIC to provide these
16 copies, but again for us we are really focusing on the
17 access to them rather than the preservation.

18 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

19 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New
20 Mexico. I'm involved in the Trail. I'm going to be
21 nice for right now because I'm still trying to decide
22 which foot I'm going to vote with on you, John. It will
00089

1 be a frozen boot. We are involved in the Trail Project,
2 which is several different universities in the Greater
3 Western Library Alliance, and we are partnering with the
4 HathiTrust and it looks like we are going to migrate
5 over to CLR here real soon. But we are collecting and
6 digitizing federal government information on the science
7 and technical side of things and we've got most of the
8 -- what else are we working on back there, Esther?
9 We've got Bureau Mindstone and we are looking at the
10 fisheries, Mr. Phillips? Yes, National Bureau of
11 Standards and things like that so, you know, the point
12 being, as we have heard, there are a lot of different
13 groups, lot of different consortia that have directors
14 backing and things like that. I think it ties into real
15 well to what libraries are doing and it's also what

16 other groups are doing with federal preservation or at
17 least trying to facilitate digital preservation and
18 access to information, whether its more digital than
19 paper in trying to digitize it in bringing it out there
20 for the general public's consumption. My thought is
21 that GPO has done a really good job in trying to
22 encourage partnerships and I know they will continue to
00090

1 do so. They have done a good job in trying to collect
2 information, the various digital projects that are going
3 on, whether they are just internally or externally with
4 large groups of consortium numbers. I think that is
5 what our future holds. This ties in somewhat with the
6 last question. You asked what GPO needs to do. GPO was
7 the nation's first aggregator and disseminator with
8 information to the public. We all know that. And the
9 second phase of that was the Depository Library System
10 of which we all -- I assume all of you are participating
11 in, am I right, to some degree? Okay. So it builds on
12 that sort of foundation it's incumbent that we all
13 continue to work together. But more importantly we
14 continue to work with one another and not replicate the
15 efforts of one another, but at the same time making sure
16 that what is going on is still based in this kind of
17 national sharing environment that we have had for over
18 150 years.

19 I hate to be the frog that boosts about its
20 own pond, but I'm involved in a couple of different
21 projects now with some of the national laboratories out
22 in New Mexico, take the unclassified information. We
00091

1 either try to digitize it or -- and take electronic
2 files. And Geoff mentioned something about Metadata. I
3 think that is one of the keys to access right now, being
4 able to have that Metadata available so we can all look
5 at each other's stuff with open windows and not have to
6 worry about trying to figure out what I've got versus
7 what John's got versus what Joe's got, etc., etc.

8 MR. SHULER: Those boots are made for
9 walking, by the way. Gwen.

10 MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of
11 Hawaii at Manoa. Going back to the question, what are
12 libraries doing to facilitate digital preservation and
13 access? I'm one of those libraries that is not doing
14 much. We provide server space for Trail, but we don't
15 actually provide any content. We have made noises about

16 joining LOCS, but have basically concluded that we don't
17 have any personnel resources to devote to that.

18 Going back to what Marianne said about the
19 lack of support from her director for digital
20 depositing, I'm just wondering if ARL can help in this
21 area. A lot of times our directors go to ARL meetings
22 if they are ARL members, or even if they are not ARL
00092

1 members, they are still influenced by what ARL says and
2 does. So I'm wondering if ARL can help to motivate
3 libraries to participate in this activity more and
4 jumping in with what Roger suggested about thinking in
5 terms of digital deposit being analogous to regional
6 depositories. I think if ARL and Ithaca SNR made more
7 statements about what libraries should be doing, there
8 might be more participation.

9 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Laurie?

10 MS. HALL: Laurie Hall from GPO. I wanted
11 to address I guess Dan and Geoff's question. A couple
12 of days ago Suzanne and I put together cooperative
13 cataloging partnership draft arrangements to do just
14 like you asked for, Geoff, to work on partnership
15 cataloging for partnerships. Council has a draft. I
16 have some copies of the draft up in my room, but it just
17 sets some basic guidelines if what if you come in as a
18 partnership what we will do. Say for instance you've
19 got a collection of 200, 300 documents and you don't
20 have cataloging. You come in as a partnership and we
21 will do the cataloging for you and then provide copies
22 of the catalog back to you or, you know, or display it
00093

1 in the GCP. So that document I have copies of. I'll
2 pass it out tomorrow. We are going to post it to the
3 Desktop when we get back and we'll have a comment period
4 until like May 21st. So there is a lot more details
5 about, you know, if you give us a brief Metadata we will
6 upgrade the Metadata and some standard guidelines about
7 exchanging Metadata.

8 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything else on
9 this question? Okay. I do want to make one observation
10 though. I think we crossed Rubicon for Depository
11 Library Council meetings in that I believe those two
12 questions that came from the Web were actually the two
13 first questions ever submitted online during our Council
14 plenary session. So we should probably recognize that.
15 And to give you the alpha and now the omega, forgive the

16 conceit of the stool, it's John's legacy systems that
17 need help. Are we agreeable to the next question since
18 that didn't get much of a response?

19 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
20 Valparaiso University Law Library. The question is what
21 could or should GPO be doing to capture borne digital
22 material such as agency documents for ingestion into
00094

1 FDsys?

2 MR. SHULER: Probably shouldn't do anything
3 more than what they have done, right? Stop it there,
4 you know. James?

5 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
6 University. Oh, go ahead.

7 MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Carmen, Orth-Alfie,
8 University of Kansas. I'm sort of showing my own
9 naiveness here, but this question makes me wonder what
10 the National Archives is doing in this role as well?
11 And what GPO's relationship with the Nation Archives is
12 in dealing with agency publications on the Web?

13 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Does GPO want to
14 respond to that question?

15 MS. HALL: Laurie Hall GPO. We are kind of
16 refiguring the whole fugitive document process and
17 that's in -- on the content acquisitions area of mine,
18 tech services. We have been spending a lot more time
19 with agencies. We are going out to agencies. We are
20 taking a little bit more practical approach, instead of
21 waiting for stuff to come in because only a very small
22 portion comes into GPO anymore. So that's one of the
00095

1 things that we are doing to try to find more things that
2 are in the process of being developed. And of course we
3 go online all the time on agency Web sites looking for
4 new content. But, once again, it's piece by piece by
5 piece. I think we -- also we are working with Robin in
6 her collection development or preservation library to do
7 a collection development policy and practice. We are
8 working on some of those things.

9 MR. SHULER: What specifically is the
10 relationship between GPO and the National Archives in
11 this regards?

12 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The
13 relationship is a close one.

14 MR. SHULER: Well begun.

15 MS. ETKIN: To be more specific, John, and

16 answer your question, NARA deals in records. We deal in
17 publications and there are a lot of publications and in
18 the work of an agency that goes to NARA in their
19 collection, but not always. And there is not always a
20 permanent retention that is attached to those things
21 that are sent to NARA as part of the records retention
22 schedule.

00096

1 MR. SHULER: Does that make it a bit clearer
2 what the relationship is?

3 MS. ORTH-ALFIE: In that there is not enough
4 of a relationship.

5 MR. SHULER: Ah, now, you are talking about
6 quality of relationship.

7 MS. ETKIN: We recognize the relationship,
8 but we also do have, as Ric mentioned earlier, we are a
9 NARA affiliate for the materials that are available
10 through GPO Access.

11 MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago Public
12 Library. I would sort of echo as the people from GPO
13 are doing, because we are kind of grappling with this
14 issue in Chicago documents which is one of the larger
15 publishers of government documents in the US. And we
16 decided that in our role as a public library, and also
17 our continuing roles as a special library, we inherited
18 that role, we grabbed a little bit with what we should
19 be collecting. Our objective was to collect documents
20 and put them in our catalog, electronic documents. And
21 we came up with the publication definition like GPO,
22 it's published. And probably the best definition of

00097

1 published is if it's made available to more than one
2 person. The law libraries here might be familiar with
3 liable and slander and all that and if it's intended to
4 be made available to more than one person outside of the
5 originators, it's a published document and probably
6 belongs in a library. Otherwise, it's an archival
7 material which probably belongs with the archives. Of
8 course, we haven't solved who deals with the archives,
9 that's supposed to be a state responsibility, but as far
10 as we know, they are not doing it, but anyway.

11 MR. HERMAN: Ed Herman, University at
12 Buffalo. I have a question about the FDsys system.
13 Does the FDsys include a robot that goes out and crawls
14 feral Web sites the way search engines would crawl the
15 larger Web?

16 MR. SHULER: Very good question. Are they
17 consulting?

18 MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips, University of
19 North Texas. One of the things that -- maybe not just a
20 stop -- but one of the things that GPO could be involved
21 with, they are -- but they can possibly continue to be
22 more involved with, is the Web archiving community and
00098

1 going through and taking a very proactive -- having a
2 very proactive agenda of active collecting -- just hold
3 until we figure out how to go find the stuff that we
4 piecemeal find right now. Whether it's through the
5 International Preservation Consortium and making sure
6 there is a strong membership there and strong
7 collaboration and with things like we did with the term
8 Web crawl where GPO was a partner in that and try to
9 push forward and to take this real proactive stance in
10 capturing this content and sorting out later.

11 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

12 MR. LANDGRAF: Matt Landgraf with the
13 Government Printing Office. Just from the GPO to the
14 technology perspective, we have done some pilots with
15 harvesting in the past with two different companies to
16 actually, you know, go in and sort of test some of those
17 technologies. But I think sort of speaking back to
18 Lori's point, obviously, yes, we do need to sort of
19 further those technologies and see how well they can
20 identify specific publications or Web sites. More of
21 the point is to actually build those relationships with
22 agencies to make sure that we can proactively get those
00099

1 federal publications from agencies. It's that
2 partnership and it's that collaboration that is sort of
3 what we need right now.

4 MR. SHULER: Thank you. John.

5 MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University
6 of Delaware. I wanted to followup on Lori's explanation
7 about the outreach to agencies. Since the word fugitive
8 has been mentioned and there has been a lost docs
9 program and an effort to apparently get some titles
10 reported by depositories librarians and some other
11 interested parties and I wondered if a clarification
12 could be made as to what is the best method of getting
13 them in since there are at least two channels through
14 the FDLP Desktop and it's not clear as to which one is
15 preferred. The lost docs reporting form allows the

16 people reporting to assign what they think would be the
17 appropriate SuDoc number and item number to report a
18 document which appears within scope of the program like
19 its predecessors, but which is not in CGP and the AskGPO
20 form doesn't ask for any of this, but I guess allows
21 some of the same kinds of things to be reported.

22 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. John, we are
00100

1 embarking on a big project to revamp the lost docs
2 process. We've got some new processes mapped out and
3 they all begin with submissions into AskGPO and we are
4 working to create a more specific form for LosDocs
5 submission so that when you hit the fugitive category a
6 form that has those fields to prompt you to fill out the
7 information that we need to process will be there. And
8 then it will go into the work flow and have various
9 decision boxes about if it's already cataloged then it's
10 going to go here. Those kinds of things that you do
11 when you work out work flows and all of that. So that
12 is going to be happening, but we've got things mapped
13 out. And at certain trigger points there will also be
14 statistical reporting available so that we can also
15 chart the progress and find out where our work flow
16 might be a little off so that we can adjust it, etc.,
17 etc. Does that answer your question?

18 MR. STEVENSON: That's helpful. In the
19 short term is there any recommendation, since people who
20 are interested in doing this are probably using both
21 forms. Is there one good or do you prefer one over the
22 other?

00101

1 MS. ETKIN: We prefer the AskGPO because
2 that gets it into directly the right person as well as
3 creating a record with all the steps that it goes
4 through.

5 MR. STEVENSON: Okay, so we should use
6 AskGPO, although it doesn't populate all the information
7 the way you want it to yet?

8 MS. ETKIN: Yes, but you can make your own
9 template of the layout and paste it. Just a suggestion.

10 MR. SHULER: Michelle.

11 MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University
12 of Wisconsin, River Falls. I think that John Stevenson
13 and I were some of the original that LosDocs
14 collaborators and this has been around for quite a long
15 time. The problem that I have seen with this is it's

16 piecemeal. It's not systematic. It's dependent on the
17 motivation of one person. My concern about this
18 question is two-fold. First of all, I really want to
19 congratulate, Lori, and the acquisitions people for
20 going out and making those connections with the people
21 at the agencies, but what they missed are the people in
22 the regional offices. These regional publications have
00102

1 kind of always historically kind of gotten out of here.
2 My other thing I want to talk about is, when we do
3 LosDocs we they are doing their ingestion, that is going
4 into the catalog of government information and this is
5 talking about going into FDsys and it is my
6 understanding that those two systems do not speak to
7 each other, so I'm very much interested in seeing the
8 concept of the vacuuming, getting all this stuff and
9 deciding how to deal with it later. We can have those
10 two pilot programs and there was much material within
11 those that was considered out of scope, but the
12 materials that were considered in scope, as far as I
13 know, were never added to the government information.

14 MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Going back to
15 the one thing first, Michelle, the first answer to the
16 question about our acquisitions staff going out to the
17 regionals, as a matter of fact, we started about I think
18 this is April, so early last fall we have the head or
19 content acquisitions going out specifically to target
20 working with our GPO regional printing offices to go out
21 all throughout the US, that's Joe McClain. He's on a
22 trip soon to San Francisco, not only talking with the
00103

1 regional printing offices of the GPO, but also getting
2 coordinated with the departmental offices -- federal
3 offices out in those areas. He just came back from
4 Texas and those meetings have been with the depository
5 librarians, you know, the federal printing officers and
6 they have had these really good two or three day work
7 shops on GPO services, what the FDLP is doing. So they
8 are been very, very well received. And he is going out
9 on a few more trips for the rest of the year. So we are
10 trying to get out to those regional offices.

11 What was the other question? Oh, EPA
12 content. Suzanne can tell you a little bit about that.
13 She is shaking her head. She doesn't want to talk about
14 it. You're right, a lot of the stuff was out of scope.
15 A lot of the stuff was pieces of documents and we had

16 some of you all participated in helping us find the
17 missing pieces to parts of documents. That was
18 relatively minimally successful. So the material that
19 could go in, a large portion of it that were true
20 documents, complete documents, were catalogued, but not
21 the entire amount because it was very, very labor
22 intensive. In terms of a lot of the stuff that we did,
00104

1 you know, a good portion of the stuff that we did get
2 through the harvesting was stuff we picked through our
3 regular acquisitions process.

4 MR. LANDGRAF: Matt Landgraf from GPO. One
5 thing to say from the technical prospective, as far as
6 automated scope determination of publications is I think
7 one of the things that we really clearly found out from
8 our pilot is that and rules that you try to write to
9 automate scope determination for publications are not
10 going to be perfect and you are going to harvest lot of
11 stuff that is actually not in scope. I think that
12 actually goes back once again to Laurie's point for the
13 cooperation with the agencies themselves before we
14 actually try and go out and harvest to identify hot
15 spots on their sites or to talk a little bit about where
16 their in scope publications are, so that that
17 determination can be made up front, as opposed to trying
18 to write a comprehensive set of rules that are going to
19 identify in scope publications which we know is going to
20 be a huge challenge.

21 MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. One thing
22 I just wanted to add that even though CGP and FDsys
00105

1 aren't currently talking to each other, we are capturing
2 those documents and archiving them on permanent as part
3 of the cataloging process.

4 MR. SHULER: We have 30 minutes left in the
5 match. Anything else on this question?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm really excited to
7 hear that GPO is going out to agencies, talking to
8 agencies both at the fed level and starting to go out to
9 the regional levels. One of the things that you can
10 talk about, I don't know if you have talked about, but
11 it would be great if you discussed the need to have sort
12 of a publications subdirectory on their Web sites,
13 something that is not job escripte enabled, something
14 that isn't in a data base, but something that crawlers
15 could get to because then a lot of us who are

16 harvesting, whether it's, you know, NARA or GPO or
17 individual libraries, we could get to that stuff a lot
18 easier and feed into the LosDocs process.

19 MR. SHULER: Next question.

20 MR. OTTO: Hi, I'm Justin Otto from Eastern
21 Washington University. The next question is, how might
22 digital deposit with FDLP libraries be part of the
00106

1 effort to save borne digital materials which are at risk
2 of disappearing all together. I realize that with our
3 first question it prompted some discussion of the idea
4 of distributed, you know, deposit with depository
5 libraries, but I guess so maybe the direction we could
6 take this question, please jump in, is just how hard it
7 would be for people to implement something like this, if
8 it was decided to do this, what challenges people see or
9 for people who have more experience with it please share
10 what you found through your institutional repository or
11 something like that.

12 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
13 North Texas. Just to clarify. This would be if GPO
14 were offering us the opportunity to accept borne digital
15 not forcing it upon us. That's not what we are talking
16 about. We are just saying they make it an available and
17 you as a depository choose to go get it and put it on
18 your own server.

19 MR. SHULER: So again we have no interest in
20 becoming volunteers for America in this fashion?
21 Anybody out there in the Community?

22 MS. HORNE-POPP: Lauren Horne-Popp,
00107

1 University of Michigan. When I hear this my first
2 question is, what are the incentives and I think maybe
3 that is the conversation to have. And what I mean is
4 I'm trying to imagine getting my director, and I'm sure
5 many other people are playing this little experiment in
6 their mind too, we need to go out and pull these records
7 that we didn't make ourselves. We don't necessarily
8 think initially that we need to have responsibility for
9 to flip that and say, yes, we want these. We want to
10 hold onto them. So I think here is a good opportunity
11 for us to talk about that. How would you actually want
12 people to say yes I want to voluntarily go out and grab
13 that and maintain it? That's what I'm interested to
14 hear what others have to say.

15 MR. SHULER: Before you sit down, what do

16 you see as the incentives?

17 MS. HORNE-POPP: Well, that's an excellent
18 question. I'm sure we can always say something about
19 the distribution of it, the fact that not everything is
20 on government servers. But once you get past that
21 conversation, I'm not sure. That's why I'm putting the
22 question forward. Other than saying it makes us feel
00108

1 good to do it, I'm not for sure. I don't really know.
2 I don't know when you're talking about money and cost to
3 do these sorts of things, how you argue that to an
4 administrator to really want to participate in something
5 like that.

6 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
7 of Utah. I think she hit it right on the head. I
8 suspect the hesitancy of people to come up and address
9 this question has to do with thinking through not just
10 the advantages but the liabilities of housing this
11 information. You go out and you get it, you collect it,
12 you're storing it and actively trying to retrieve it,
13 but frequently, you have to keep justifying this every
14 budget round and you to also make sure you have enough
15 server space, have to keep the quality up, keep going
16 out and meeting all the demands, increasing technology
17 demands but use demands. So I can see there being a lot
18 of liabilities that might offset your advantages.

19 MR. SHULER: Anybody else from Council?
20 James.

21 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs from Stanford
22 University. It sort of gets back to my comment to Mark
00109

1 Phillips about government documents really being the
2 gateway drug to digital depositories. If you can get
3 your administrators to start thinking wow, if we do this
4 with government documents, where we don't have any sort
5 of licensing or copyright issues which are really the
6 harder issues than the digital issues, you build these
7 infrastructures that can be expanded out beyond
8 documents. So I think that is a real incentive for
9 administrators to -- here is an easy chunk of content
10 that they can use to start doing more than they are
11 already doing and, frankly, I think we will need to do
12 in the future.

13 MS. LASTER: Sharalyn Laster, University of
14 Akron. I think another way to incentivize specific
15 libraries that are considering it is to say things like,

16 look who else is doing it. Look at our peer
17 institutions, that has these projects going on now and
18 this is kind of how we can support this -- this need
19 that is out there by working at the same level as other
20 institutions that we might compare ourselves with. I
21 think another component to consider is that different
22 collections of federal government documents have
00110

1 different areas of interest and relevance to different
2 regions, which makes sense. For example it might be
3 that those of us who are Great Lakes states might have a
4 special interest in the preservation of materials
5 related to that theme or that topic. So that might be
6 another way to slice up the pie.

7 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Oh, my god. Just a
8 choice. Cindy.

9 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin at Government
10 Printing Office. I just want to throw out a couple of
11 figures from the biennial survey. This is from the
12 aggregate report. There were 1120 -- you'd think after
13 all these years I'd know how to speak into a mike. So
14 from the aggregate data from the biennial survey there
15 was one question about whether or not your institution
16 was interested in digital deposit, whether or not it's
17 been discussed with your dean or director and do you
18 feel you have your administrative support for digital
19 deposit? Now, this is aggregate data. I haven't looked
20 at segmentation data yet, but overall more than 60
21 percent of the libraries that responded have discussed
22 this with their director, but less than 30 percent feel
00111

1 they have administrative support and along those lines
2 approaching 30 percent of the respondents are interested
3 in receiving digital files. Again I have to look at the
4 segmentation to see where those 30 percent are.

5 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Steve.

6 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre
7 Dame. Cindy, many people wished I had never learned how
8 to speak into a mike.

9 I'm in the business library at the
10 University of Notre Dame, formerly government documents
11 librarian, perhaps soon to be the government documents
12 librarian again. For me the hook is collection
13 managers. Right now we are still in that period where I
14 really want this stuff, especially if you are going to
15 collect it and I can get at it when I want to get at it,

16 but you collect it and you maintain it and you house it.
17 I think we are beginning to see, at least at my
18 institution, the only safe way I know it is not going to
19 disappear and it's key to the collection that I manage
20 and develop is, we used to put it on the shelf. Now I
21 have to put it on the server and I think that is where
22 the hook is really going to come in, but it's not going
00112

1 to be for the general good of yes I'll collect
2 everything. It's going to be what's in it for me and
3 unfortunately it's going to be piecemeal, but I think
4 that is the hook you are getting into. The other is the
5 analysis is now becoming entirely different. I'm in an
6 environment -- to use the example, in the library world
7 you tell me the needle and I buy the haystack that
8 contains that needle. The academics are saying, buy me
9 the haystack. I will find the needle that will make my
10 academic career. You can do that with this kind of
11 content. You can't do it in the form we are
12 traditionally used to. Not only is it going to be a
13 collection that's going to drive I must have this and I
14 must maintain it locally because it's too important to
15 lose. It's also going to be, I have to have it locally
16 because I'm going to use an analysis tool that it, as of
17 yet, has not quite made its way into my discipline and
18 that is what's going to distinguish me and my career.
19 So, therefore, the director will go, we'll fund it. We
20 want it because then the library is indispensable. See
21 what you have done for me. Notre Dame is on the map for
22 research and not just football.

00113

1 MR. SHULER: David.

2 MR. CISMOWSKI: I'm David Cismowski.
3 California State Library. The money creates
4 possibilities. And to library administrators money or
5 the release of money or the allocation of money I think
6 depends upon administrator's sense of what are we going
7 to do with this stuff? What are we going to do with the
8 product we are buying? And granted it's an over
9 simplification, but I tend to look at digital deposit as
10 having maybe three stages. The first is the ingest, is
11 getting it -- getting it onto your servers. The second
12 is migrating it forward. And the third is actually
13 accessing it and serving it up. I think that I'm --
14 maybe I'm wrong. James is the expert. I think of the
15 real costs involved in digital deposit, in those last

16 two things; forward migration and serving it up. We
17 looked at the cost of FDsys, which attempts to do all of
18 this, but a large part of FDsys is actually enabling
19 searching, refinement of searching and viewing results
20 and then further refining notes. The large part of
21 FDsys is going into that. Now, if individual
22 depositories receive this digital content and store it,
00114

1 I mean, that is important to a certain extent. But an
2 administrator is going to say, well, are we going to
3 continue to store this stuff for 50 years and not really
4 do anything with it? What are we going to do with it?
5 And it's that ability to do things with this digital
6 content that is going to cost them money, so I'm a
7 little -- I know that there is a value in preserving --
8 for preservation there is definitely a value for
9 distributing content, but how long can that go on
10 without a product coming out of it that an administrator
11 can point to and say, yes, it's worth the money because
12 we are able to provide that to our customers?

13 MR. SHULER: Jill.

14 MS. MORIEARTY: I want to followup the last
15 sentence -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I think
16 that when we collect something digitally it has to
17 fulfill the same collection development, principles,
18 policy guidelines, as anything that we pull up and so I
19 agree with Steve and I'm sorry I see you, Laurie, thank
20 you, when you are building a collection, a unique
21 collection. My hook is always the special collections
22 area. If we have parameters for existing collection
00115

1 development projects, the digital supports, that's your
2 why. Yes, servers are expensive, not as expensive as
3 building yet another vault to house all of the rare
4 papers that go along with the project. In some ways it
5 winds up being cheaper, but it fits in this project. It
6 fits this niche of information that you are building
7 that is truly unique to your area. In our case it's
8 water. We ain't got enough. We used to have some, but
9 it's the history of water, the politics of water, water
10 resources that we used to have, we have now, we are
11 depleting; that's our project. So as long as you setup
12 this parameter, they're guidelines for the project, the
13 digital slides right in and is a way to defend the
14 servers, I have found, because you are not going to get
15 in paper. We need to continue this project. This is

16 our rare and unique either IR or special collections or
17 unique collections information. And so in order to
18 supplement it and keep it current, keep it ongoing, that
19 just defies servers.

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
21 State Library. I agree and we all agree that server
22 space is cheap, but what a server does is just stores
00116

1 stuff. You attach Metadata to the stuff, so that you
2 can find it, so that you can preserve it adequately so
3 that you can migrate it forward.

4 For instance, if you ingest a PDF file that
5 was created with Acrobat Professional version 9, you
6 want to put that into your Metadata so that ten years
7 from now, when nothing can read that or Adobe notifies
8 the world that they are no longer going to support
9 Acrobat version 9 created documents, your Metadata will
10 tell you now is the time to gather together all of the
11 documents that are in the server, created with Adobe
12 Acrobat 9 and migrate them forward. If you don't have
13 that Metadata in there, you might as well not have even
14 collected those documents in the first place because
15 they are not going to be readable. And so the real
16 cost -- not what I was trying to drive at was not the
17 original server space, but the curation of those
18 documents and the access that you provide to those
19 documents now, 50 years from now and a hundred years
20 from now.

21 MR. SHULER: Okay. We have ten minutes left
22 in the match. We have one question left. Are we ready
00117

1 to move on? Last question. Suzanne.

2 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
3 North Texas. How could GPO utilize FDLP Desktop and
4 FDLP Community sites to coordinate communication and
5 digitization efforts of FDLP libraries? What
6 information should be shared there?

7 This goes to the point that was made earlier
8 by Geoff Swindells about discoverability.

9 MR. SHULER: So basically librarians have
10 nothing to say about discoverability. Actually, no
11 relationship to what we do.

12 MS. HORNE-POPP: Laura Horne-Popp,
13 University of Michigan. I brought this up several
14 times, so sorry for being redundant, but one of the
15 things that I would like to see, several years ago when

16 we did the survey, what were one of the first things
17 that we want digitized from the collection to be up
18 there because I think in a lot of libraries, when it's a
19 matter of where to start, we have a list right now of
20 who is doing what, but we don't have a list of what
21 could be done. I think for a lot of libraries that
22 there is a sense of paralysis because they don't know
00118

1 where to start. This is a great opportunity and it also
2 again helps people to divide and conquer. Because there
3 are a lot of smaller institutions that would be happy to
4 do something. We can't digitize all of the serial set,
5 but we can do part of it. So I think anything like that
6 where we hear the things as a community, we agree are
7 the first titles to tackle would be excellent. And have
8 that some way with the directories we have it now
9 because I think it gives a lot of people some ideas for
10 partnership and just again where to start.

11 MR. SHULER: Thank you. I imagine what is
12 being asked in this question is some kind of
13 coordinating role from GPO as was just pointed out. I
14 think depository libraries that are willing to work on
15 this material need to know what and when as much as how.
16 And so the question could be put to GPO directly, is
17 there an imagined role for GPO in this kind of
18 coordination?

19 MR. DAVIS: This is Ric Davis, GPO. I think
20 this is something that GPO shouldn't be shy about asking
21 for Council's help on because I think this question came
22 up at the last conference as well. And channeling
00119

1 Robin, who can't be with us, she told me that she's
2 struggling a bit with it in terms of what that
3 coordinating role is. I think from my perspective one
4 of the things we still need to do is I think the
5 registry of digitization projects is very good, but we
6 get that question still often. What can I go to help
7 and where do I go next? And I still think it goes back
8 to understanding what is in the registry. Do we need
9 that more granular title by title breakdown to say this
10 is what is in here? This has been done. This is what
11 we need to do. Haven't looked at the digitization page
12 in a couple of months, but I think there was a priority
13 listing of titles as well, but what does that mean?
14 Does that mean because it's on the priority list should
15 you start with this and you start with this? I think we

16 need to do a better job with that. Do you have anything
17 to add, James?

18 MR. SHULER: Okay.

19 MS. SARE: Laura Sare, Texas A&M University.
20 One of the things I'd like to see is part of -- I think
21 as most libraries, we are trying to gain space, so we
22 need to know what to weed. I would like to see this
00120

1 list say, you can really trust -- we made a partnership
2 with the department of agriculture or something and you
3 can trust their digitization and they are going to
4 maintain it so that if I pull all my ag stuff, which is
5 not going to happen, we need to know who we can trust
6 and what is going to be there 10, 15 years from now,
7 rather than just having a list of people who have sites,
8 or have information, digitization projects now. But
9 like David was saying earlier, that they are not
10 preserving it for the long term and it goes away and we
11 are lost with, we don't have any electronic and we don't
12 have the print anymore. I think that is what we'd like
13 to see.

14 MR. SHULER: Cindy, bring it home.

15 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I wasn't
16 going to do a followup to that. I was going to do a
17 followup on the previous one, if that's okay.

18 MR. SHULER: Still bring it home.

19 MS. ETKIN: Still talking about what is it
20 that my library can digitize and a list of priorities.
21 As we mentioned, we do have a priority list for
22 digitization that was devised by the Community for GPO's
00121

1 priorities. You in your libraries may have very
2 different priorities, based on the needs of your users
3 and different topics, as was mentioned by Jill with the
4 water topic for Utah. You only have similar kinds of
5 topics that are of interest to you and your users and
6 more beneficial for you to take that route and include
7 your topic in the registry so that people know about it.
8 Just a suggestion.

9 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Susan.

10 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
11 North Texas. I guess I was just thinking of having GPO
12 having some kind of site similar to what many of us are
13 familiar with that live in large metropolitan areas for
14 getting a community partner so that you can share a ride
15 to work. Basically you have somebody who has a project

16 and they would be able to input in there and somebody
17 says, look, I can digitalize this small amount and they
18 can put it in there and GPO somehow matches those people
19 together so that you have this collaboration of working
20 together on a project data. Maybe.

21 MR. SHULER: Sort of like micro lending.
22 Cindy.

00122

1 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin GPO. I'm going to
2 bring it home again. Suzanne, that's what the registry
3 does. There is an option in there if you are looking
4 for collaborative partners for your project, that's an
5 option in there in the registry entry. Unless I'm
6 misunderstanding what you were saying.

7 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
8 University. I'm looking at registry FDLP.gov and I
9 don't see a list of priority titles on there and I don't
10 see what you just mentioned about -- is that part of the
11 apply to contribute or where is that?

12 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The priority
13 title they are on the Desktop.

14 MR. JACOBS: Oh, they are on the Desktop.
15 They are not on the registry site.

16 MS. ETKIN: Right.

17 MR. JACOBS: Wouldn't it be a good idea to
18 put a link to then on the registry site?

19 MS. ETKIN: That's a good suggestion.

20 MR. JACOBS: Thank you.

21 MR. SHULER: With that advancement in
22 knowledge, we will close this particular match. I want

00123

1 to thank everybody for the first drama free plenary
2 session ever. Thank you. We will be take a half hour
3 dessert break. We will open up the second match at what
4 time, four, four o'clock. Thank you everyone.

5 (Break in proceedings.)

6 MS. SEARS: We just want to make a point of
7 clarification that came up in the last session about GPO
8 and getting funding for the digitization project. That
9 was brought up in October and other meetings as well and
10 GPO has investigated that and Ric may want to speak to
11 this more and Ted. Ted was the one that originally gave
12 us the response to that. And GPO does not have the
13 authority to do grants, so they can't do that.

14 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I'm just
15 going to echo what you said there. I was part of the

16 group that did some initial investigation and put
17 together a preliminary list at the time of grant
18 opportunities that was a document that we put forth that
19 could be used and updated as needed by Council. And in
20 terms of the grant authority, it's absolutely the case.
21 We do not have grant authority and based on that, beyond
22 sharing as we are aware as you do in the Community, of
00124

1 opportunities, that really is not a function we can
2 entertain.

3 MR. SHULER: Did that answer the question,
4 Suzanne?

5 MS. SEARS: Yes, John. We just wanted to
6 clarify so that question doesn't keep coming up.

7 MR. SHULER: All right. Now, welcome to the
8 second match of the afternoon, which is about FDsys and
9 what you have here is the first slide of this group and
10 I'm going to turn it over to them to start posing the
11 questions and getting the conversation started.

12 MS. MORIEARTY: Hi, everyone. Jill
13 Moriearty, University of Utah. And these questions are
14 intended to supplement that information that we received
15 this morning and I hope everyone had a chance to attend
16 that excellent presentation of FDsys that was provided
17 to us by GPO. How many people attended? Look around
18 guys, that's a fantastic turnout. Well, we are going to
19 supplement some of this information with our questions
20 and at anytime please feel free to come up to the mike
21 and ask any followup questions you may have. First,
22 FDsys is defined as a content management system with
00125

1 many planned releases. Have GPO goals for FDsys changed
2 since the project was initiated? GPO?

3 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I was wondering
4 if someone else was going to answer that. Speaking for
5 GPO, no, the goals have not changed. The one thing --
6 actually a couple of things I'd like to add to that is,
7 yes, it's a server content management system, but it is
8 also a bit more than that. It's an advanced search
9 system as well and it's also a preservation repository.
10 I think that if you look at your handout there is a
11 system map also showing where FDsys also relates to
12 other systems at the agency. And back in other public
13 documentation that we have off of the FDsys Web site in
14 our ConOps and also in our requirements document, it
15 shows visually and also in narrative format how it's

16 really those three things and more than a content
17 management system.

18 We talked this morning about how my unit
19 defines the requirements, works with you, the Community,
20 to define your requirements and we give them to the
21 management office to build the system. I can tell you
22 my goals have certainly not changed. I think the thing
00126

1 that we have seen expand at GPO, the Public Printer
2 talked about this morning, is that perhaps wasn't
3 anticipated years ago, was the open government
4 initiatives, the work that is being done with the XML as
5 part of the open government initiatives data.gov and
6 things of that nature. So there is an expansion, but
7 not a change of what I view as the goals. I would be
8 interested as well with hearing from the Community about
9 given goals for this system initially whether your goals
10 have changed or whether they are still the same.

11 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. Anybody in
12 Council want to deliver a volley? Seeing none, how
13 about out in the audience? So are you all set in that
14 meeting this morning and you thought it was just the
15 bee's knees, hey? You're ready to rush into the great
16 arms of that digital future with no regrets, with all
17 hope and charity? Going once. You have no goals
18 whatsoever with what you saw this morning? My lord.

19 MS. MORIEARTY: Perhaps I can tempt them
20 with the next question, John.

21 MR. SHULER: Perhaps so, Jill.

22 MS. MORIEARTY: Could GPO give the Community
00127

1 an update on the actual functionality of the program as
2 reflected in the major capabilities of FDsys document,
3 particularly for Release number 1.

4 MR. WASH: I am Mike Wash, the GPO. There
5 is a page in your handouts that has discussion of
6 Release 1 and Release 2 functionality. It's a two
7 pager. Bob Tapella this morning answered I think pretty
8 well, but let me put it in my words. What Release 1 is,
9 it's a lot of work associated with creating what we call
10 the foundation system of FDsys. So it's the core
11 functionality of the content management system and it's
12 also responsible for providing the enhanced access to
13 the data in the content management system. Plus it is
14 the migration of GPO Access content that is currently in
15 the WAY systems into FDsys, add to that the presentation

16 depository and the authentication tools. That is what
17 Release 1 is. Also in this document is a description of
18 what will be included in Release 2 of the system which
19 is really focused on submission. Opening up the system
20 so that it goes beyond the type of submission that is
21 capable of being supported today. Today's submission,
22 within FDsys, because we needed to have some form of
00128

1 submission in the early stage of the system to be able
2 to ingest GPO Access content, but it's a limited level
3 of submission. It's limited to GPO's plan operations to
4 be able to put forward content into FDsys, as well as
5 the submission of actually the team to be able to
6 migrate content in. And the other examples of submission
7 that we support today is the office of the Federal
8 Register. They provide content directly to us and it
9 goes into the system, particularly the daily compilation
10 of presidential documents, but we need to go further
11 than that so the rest of the federal government agencies
12 and Congress can do direct submission into the system.

13 In this document you can see an analysis of
14 what will be left. It's in bold on the simple list on
15 the back. What will be left after we are done with
16 Release 2 that has not yet been completed in some of the
17 original scope. So there is some things you can see
18 that won't be included, but those don't include the core
19 functionality of submission, content management, access,
20 preservation and authentication.

21 MS. MORIEARTY: You might want to stay
22 there.

00129

1 MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Ross-Blakely Law
2 Library, Arizona State University. Thanks for all this,
3 Mike. When you refer to submission, is that the same as
4 the migration or the ingestion of the collections that
5 have been under discussion, I think the 40 collections?
6 Are all those terms interchangeable?

7 MR. WASH: Not really, and we probably use
8 them a little too sloppy. Submission in the content
9 management system is really the activity of moving data
10 into a content management system, so it's submitted.
11 For example, if you saw the presentation this morning,
12 Blank went through a submission activity where it was
13 federal register from Friday -- no, it was the Blake's
14 fake document, I think it was. He actually went through
15 the work flow process of preparing the data and actually

16 pushing the submit button so it goes into the system.
17 Migration is really different because it's an activity
18 of transforming data from one form into something that
19 is compatible with a new system and so that doesn't mean
20 changing it necessarily, but on GPO Access today in many
21 of the files that are included in that system, they are
22 in various formats and some of them aren't even
00130

1 accessible any longer. So migration is actually moving
2 them up to a new form so that they will be accessible.
3 And then particularly for FDsys, it's putting them into
4 a form that we can submit. So migration is the activity
5 to move it from one type of format, if you will, to
6 another. And then the submission is actually moving it
7 into the content management system. When we say we are
8 ingesting content into FDsys, it's a submission
9 activity.

10 MS. TROTTA: Thank you.

11 MR. WASH: There's a document in your
12 packet, entitled "How Does FDsys Improve My Life as a
13 Librarian?" I think if you go through this document you
14 will see some of the things that are different and
15 hopefully enhanced. What has been done, as we have been
16 developing the system, is we have looked in the day of
17 the life today and listened to the feedback from the
18 Community of what needed to be done differently or
19 better or etc. And hopefully what you will see in
20 September, in the scenario that you described, will be
21 the realization of many of the things that you discussed
22 are indeed there, but many of those things are there
00131

1 today in the stages of FDsys. As we have been moving
2 from January of last year through today, there is
3 continual increases in either the content that's in the
4 system or in some cases some functionality as well. So
5 certainly the access elements are enhanced substantially
6 in FDsys and that will be seen in the September time
7 frame.

8 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Something I
9 want to add to that, that I brought up this morning, was
10 more of the, let's tell them what we want. I think
11 particularly while Release 1 is in this beta stage, I
12 know everyone has certainly used FDsys and has used the
13 search capability, but I think it would be interesting
14 to take this document that talks about how life improves
15 or changes on that date that John put out and go back

16 and revalidate that and say, well, this is nice. What
17 is missing? What else do I want in terms of what they
18 are releasing through this first release? What else do
19 I want that I'm not getting?
20 MR. WASH: This is Mike. Maybe one followup
21 to that. When we did what we call voice of customer,
22 it's the market research working very closely with Ric
00132

1 and his team. There are several passes to this. We
2 have done this for the last five years in the prior
3 systems. Basically the first thing you'd like to do is
4 have a conversation and find out what are some of the
5 unmet needs in an information system. So what are the
6 things that you think you would like? You have that
7 conversation and then, you know, a team goes back like
8 the IT team and the PMO, and says, this is what I think
9 we heard. This is how I think we can fix it. A key
10 part of that activity is validation. Go back and have
11 another conversation and say this is what we thought we
12 heard. Did we hear it right? And many times we didn't
13 and we have to correct. So here we are five years,
14 almost six years down the road on this project and we
15 have delivered major functionality within FDsys and this
16 simple page and-a-half document are some of the things
17 that you will see when you go to use the system today.
18 What Ric is really talking about is it's a macro type of
19 validation. So now here we are through a major release
20 of the system, how did we do? And I think that that
21 path of validation say, this is what you said you wanted
22 us to do and is this is what we have done? Have we hit
00133

1 the mark? How far have we missed the mark and those are
2 things that we can do in the future to slowly close
3 those gaps or hopefully there are not that many. But
4 there is that continuous validation. What is it that
5 you want? Help us understand as a project team. We
6 deliver it in different conversations and hope the
7 course is corrected to get to the final conclusion.

8 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Jill.

9 MS. MORIEARTY: Don't move. We have seen
10 this document, something that I had not read before and
11 it's our next question, when will Release 1 be out of
12 beta?

13 MR. WASH: Beta is kind of one of these
14 fuzzy words and let me try to describe that. This is
15 Mike. Beta means it is really still in an evaluation

16 stage and the last thing that any project team wants to
17 do is have a system in beta forever or what feels like
18 forever. But in January of 2009, when we were faced
19 with an opportunity to launch the early stage of FDsys
20 to deliver access to eight collections, we had a lot of
21 serious discussion inside of GPO, whether or not to
22 launch with only eight collections with substantially
00134

1 better functionality than WAYS or wait until we have all
2 of the collections migrated so that we could immediately
3 move to a new system. And the conclusion obviously was
4 that we wanted to launch with the functionality with a
5 limited number of collections. But at that same time we
6 said, let's define what it's going to take to get this
7 system out of beta, so that we would no longer refer to
8 it as something in test or in the evaluation stage.
9 Which is what you naturally think of when you see beta.
10 And we set a couple of criteria that we had to achieve
11 in order to move out of beta. Number one was to get all
12 the content out of GPO Access that is currently in WAYS,
13 so that we could move away from WAYS which was one of
14 the key voice of customers we heard repeatedly, was get
15 us off of WAYS, so that was number one. We had to get
16 all the content out of GPO Access and into a new system.

17 Number two, which is very critical for all
18 of us, hopefully nothing that we never have to
19 experience, but nonetheless. Number two was that we had
20 continuity of access so that if something happened to
21 the main system in GPO headquarters on North Capital
22 Street, whether it's a power failure, which we have
00135

1 experienced, whether it's some sort of problem in DC,
2 there will be no interruptions in access to the
3 information in GPO for the federal publications. So to
4 us that meant, from a government agency perspective,
5 continuity of operations or COOP and for GPO's FDsys,
6 that means continuity of access, so it would mean
7 absolutely no interruption of the ability to access
8 regardless of what happened at 732 North Capital. If
9 the data would be automatically switched over it would
10 be accessible. So those two things were our criteria.
11 So we are now on a path to complete the migration of
12 data off of the WAY servers to be completed in June,
13 June 30th, which is good. We are in group five of all
14 the collections where we just released group four two
15 weeks ago, is that right? So group five is the final

16 documents in a collection to remove the last of the
17 information from WAYS and then by August we will have a
18 fail-over capability of continuity of access and it will
19 be fully tested at the point in time where we will
20 actually break connection to the production capability
21 of FDsys and demonstrate that it works in a fail-over
22 sense for access to our alternate computer facility.

00136

1 And at that point we will be happy to say we remove the
2 beta's.

3 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

4 MS. MORIEARTY: All right. I think we had
5 part of our next question answered and that is when will
6 the sunseting of GPO Access go forward or be
7 rescheduled for some future date? I think you have
8 answered part of that in your last statement.

9 MR. WASH: I'll take part of it and then Ric
10 can take the mike. The sunseting of GPO Access is an
11 activity that will extend beyond August because there is
12 a lot of activities associated with sunseting a system
13 so the two criteria are the things that are going to
14 remove the beta and we have a high confidence that we
15 will be able to get that done by August. The sunseting
16 of the GPO Access in being able to retire the
17 infrastructure that really supports GPO Access includes
18 some other things and probably Ric can better state
19 them.

20 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think that
21 the date that we are sticking to at this point is end of
22 the year, December. I think that also gives us several

00137

1 months to look at this, the COOP capability that Mike
2 described where they -- technically they break the snap
3 with the production environment and insure a fail-over.
4 We've got a system of record that has served us well for
5 15, going on 16 years. So you don't want to jump and do
6 this too quickly, which is part of the reason we have
7 been running in a parallel environment for sometime. At
8 the same time as the program management office has been
9 identifying collections of content, what we commonly
10 refer to as data sets, like the congressional record and
11 reports, etc., I think it's also important that together
12 GPO, Council and the library community go back and make
13 sure that nothing gets left behind because you don't
14 want to find that you're in a situation where you have a
15 big oops situation and there was something on GPO Access

16 that was critical or relevant and it got missed. So I'm
17 conservative in approach about pulling the trigger,
18 turning off the servers and powering down which is why
19 they have been running in this beta position as long as
20 they have. I want to make sure when we do it, we are as
21 certain as we can be.

22 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

00138

1 MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
2 One collection I can tell you for sure that lawyers and
3 law librarians love is the ECFR. So if that could, from
4 GPO Access make it's way to FDsys, it would be great.

5 MR. WASH: I can respond to that briefly and
6 just give you an idea of what is going on there. Bob
7 mentioned that this morning, I think a little bit, as
8 well. The ECFR project is a pretty big project in
9 itself. Mike White is our customer to provide the
10 requirements and it's a topic of your conversations on
11 regular about the ECFR. ECFR today is a fairly simple
12 system, when you boil it down, to provide that snapshot
13 of what the ECFR looks like on a daily basis. What we
14 want to go, and Mike can correct me if I'm wrong here,
15 we want to really create a point in time system. We
16 want to create a point in time system that will really
17 serve as a replacement to the current ECFR and that's
18 going to be a lot of work, but I think it's something
19 that is achievable, particularly with the great work
20 that's been done with creating the content management
21 system of FDsys because each of the elements are
22 structured pieces of the ECFR today or the Federal

00139

1 Register as it's creating the effective sections in the
2 ECFR are unique and identified objects within a content
3 management system. That is a step that we had to go
4 through to really look at creating a point in time
5 system that would work effectively as an ECFR. So I
6 think we are really positioned nicely now. We have a
7 lot of work ahead of us to do that, but we are
8 positioned nicely with the foundational system of FDsys,
9 federal publications and particularly the Federal
10 Register and the code of federal regulations that will
11 allow us to create a good point in time system to meet
12 the needs of the Community, as well as the federal
13 register.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mike has it right
15 about the structure of the ECFR, but I would have an

16 additional question. Is there a remnant of GPO Access
17 that will stand in place for ECFR while we do the
18 development work that is necessary to get it into FDsys?

19 MR. WASH: The answer is yes. Seriously,
20 all of the systems of ECFR is going to stay until we
21 create a replacement for it. So it's not going to go
22 away. It's not going to change. We are going to
00140

1 continue to support it, so we know how critical it is.

2 MR. WHITE: As somebody on the Council said,
3 there are a lot of lawyers that are dependent on it
4 everyday. It is really our only system that was built
5 outside of WAYS per se. So I think the architecture
6 probably, it doesn't have to be extricated as much from
7 WAYS, but it is still a very challenging project. And
8 if I may pitch it a little more, when it was first
9 released in beta about 2001, we were meeting the two day
10 turnaround that will we set for it, so the editors at
11 the FOR are reading the amendments in the FOR today.
12 They are putting them into the ECFR. GPO takes and data
13 processes that material and it's posted. So there is a
14 two day update span. When we started it was beating
15 WesLaw by sometimes a month or more. Even today I can
16 look on WesLaw and not see it updated two weeks. So
17 when we talk about it being a revolutionary system for
18 free and open access to information, that's the heart of
19 it. You know, we are providing a service well beyond
20 what the high cost providers are giving us and that's a
21 big deal to lawyers and other practitioners.

22 MR. SHULER: Do we have an amen from the
00141

1 audience for that?

2 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff from
3 Valparaiso University Law Library. I just have a
4 question about the point in time. So what you are
5 saying that will exist then like every time it's changed
6 there will be a version of it saved because like what
7 access and WesLaw have now, is just as current through
8 this issue of the Federal Register and that's when they
9 change it. They change the date there. I don't know --
10 I'm not sure what the point in time -- what the
11 reason -- reasoning for doing that is. I mean
12 practically why?

13 MR. WASH: I mean -- but you understand what
14 the point in time system means or no?

15 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Well, I think I do. So you

16 can say on a certain date what was there and what wasn't
17 there, but I'm not sure why that -- if that's going to
18 be so much trouble to develop, I'm not sure that is
19 worth holding it up when it's such a good thing to have
20 and it's the best thing you've got, you know, really.

21 MR. WHITE: Well, we are under some
22 restrictions that WesLaw or LEXIS doesn't particularly
00142

1 have to worry about. Everyday at ECFR is a unique data
2 set. People make decisions about their businesses,
3 about their legal liabilities everyday based on that
4 material. So if you have an accident two years ago, it
5 would be useful to look at the ECFR from two years ago
6 and pin down exactly what the laws and regulations
7 related to that were because that is a law that will
8 govern. So, from our prospective we also have to worry
9 about the freedom of information act and the federal
10 records act. Right now the content of the ECFR is not
11 preserved in a manner that you would call truly
12 accessible. We do some data backup, but we lose the
13 illustrations and we have a lot of scrambled text. It's
14 not publicly accessible in a way that up-to-date content
15 management system on top of a sophisticated data base
16 would provide. So that is what we are hoping that FDsys
17 will do for us. So, yes, you're right, it's
18 tremendously useful right now as a point in time system
19 to note what does it say today, but it also is important
20 for access to prior legal information.

21 MR. SHULER: More questions from Council?
22 Okay, next slide.

00143

1 MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
2 Our next question would be, is the full implementation
3 of FDsys relying upon funding and if so does GPO have a
4 plan if further funding is curtailed what functionality
5 would remain?

6 MR. WASH: This is Mike. Yes, it certainly
7 is dependent upon funding. The last part of that
8 question -- it is dependent upon funding. What we have
9 plans for right now in the current appropriated funding
10 is to allow us to complete Release 1, which is that core
11 foundational system, all of GPO Access migrated into
12 FDsys with the access capability preservation, framework
13 and tools for authentication, that is Release 1 and we
14 have the funding to complete that. We also have the
15 funding to get us on our way to the development aspects

16 of Release 2 which is the submission piece. Our
17 estimate is to complete full functionality which is
18 Release 2 from that earlier document that we talked
19 about. It's an additional \$8,000,000. And that
20 \$8,000,000 is the costs for us to do the development,
21 testing and launch of that functionality and have
22 confidence that it is going to work.

00144

1 If the funding is curtailed or constrained
2 it's going to affect the schedule. It affects the
3 schedule as well as the total cost, to be real honest.
4 The \$8,000,000 assumes a certain amount of contractor
5 activity that's currently in place. Over the last three
6 years, I think GPO has done a really good job of finding
7 some of the best contractors that are skilled in a
8 system we are building. So we have a core team and we
9 understand it very well. We understand the cost profile
10 and we understand the productivity that we can get out
11 of those contractors. Given that and an understanding
12 of what we need to do to finish Release 2, our estimate
13 is \$8,000,000 and that \$8,000,000 will allow us to
14 complete Release 2 in 2011. If the funding is
15 constrained, therefore, less than \$8,000,000 that's
16 available, we have to lose some of the resources. So
17 that is one of the benefits of working with the
18 contractor community, you can easily ratchet down some
19 of the number resources that you have on the job, that
20 saves you money, but it is also skilled resources that
21 you no longer have available. So that when either more
22 money becomes available or more time becomes available,

00145

1 which would be required, you have to either develop the
2 skill that you reduced or go and find it back and hire
3 it back and restart it. So the net of it is, you can do
4 a simple algebra and say, well, if you only have
5 \$4,000,000 it is going to take two years instead of one
6 years. It's not quite true. If you only have
7 \$4,000,000 per year it will probably take two-and-a-half
8 years just because of the productivity of the resources
9 and the development. So long answer again, but our
10 estimate is \$8,000,000 to complete the core
11 functionality, if we can do it over the course of a year
12 in calendar 2011. If it's curtailed, it delays -- if
13 it's completely eliminated, we stop until we figure out
14 within the agency how to extract money out of our
15 revolving fund to be able to get enough money to

16 continue the development.

17 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
18 California State Library. I think that I heard Mr.
19 Tapella say this morning that the actual request for
20 FDsys has been reduced for the next budget. And I seem
21 to remember a reduction of less than a million dollars.
22 Did I hear that correctly?

00146

1 MR. WASH: Yes. What Bob said this morning
2 was that in a flat funded year-on-year, which was one of
3 the requests that we had in preparation for the
4 appropriation meetings that was really just completed in
5 the last couple of weeks. FDsys or FY 11 was reduced to
6 5.7 million dollars. One million dollars for advance
7 print technology and one million dollars for elevator
8 repair. I probably have those numbers a little bit
9 wrong. But if there was reduction in what we call the
10 revolving fund for appropriations which was the method
11 that was used to do flat funding year-on-year. So 5.7
12 million dollars is not 8 million dollars, but we need to
13 self fund the remaining from our revolving fund and
14 that's internal challenge that we have to find money to
15 do that. Some could come from SNE appropriations or it
16 would come from our revolving fund, so we've got to work
17 to close that account.

18 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think
19 sometimes it's easy for us internally in the building to
20 understand the different types of funds and where they
21 come from, but I want to elaborate that the day-to-day
22 operating costs of running FDsys come from the salaries

00147

1 and expenses of appropriation, just as they have with
2 GPO Access for the last 15 years. For those of you who
3 were around back then, you might remember that the
4 statement was made by congress that there would be no
5 additional funds to run GPO Access because there would
6 be cost savings because of print elimination and I'm
7 here to tell you that didn't happen.

8 MR. SHULER: Any questions from the
9 audience? So we got all that? I'd ask you a question,
10 you'd answer it? Anything from Council? Next question?

11 MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Ross-Blakely Law
12 Library, Arizona State University. How will GPO notify
13 stakeholders when features are deferred from FDsys
14 release? And does GPO have a plan for involving
15 stakeholders in setting FDsys implementation and release

16 priorities?

17 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. In some ways I
18 feel like we have been doing it for years through
19 conferences. I think that as Bob mentioned, the program
20 review where we also had a variety stakeholders together
21 in the room, including Hill staff, my unit, other
22 business units, the Council chair, the incoming chair
00148

1 was critical. I don't know, as none of us know, whether
2 Bob will be around at the time of the next Council
3 meeting, but something that he suggested, that I think
4 is a good idea, is for October we were talking about,
5 you know, taking that program review to a broader scale.
6 We are obviously doing somewhat of a program review
7 right now, but we did a three to four hour one that GPO
8 really drilled down into the details and perhaps having
9 all of Council there, since you'll already be in Crystal
10 City, or Arlington, anyway but having that back at GPO
11 and having everyone there. So I think that those types
12 of things we need to do on a more regular basis. We
13 have the social networking capabilities obviously to
14 communicate outward dissemination on what we are doing,
15 what is being deferred, what is changing, but I also
16 think where we are talking about Council involvement
17 with the FDLP Desktop and the Community site and to
18 social networking, I think we have more collaborative
19 opportunities to engage there on a regular basis with
20 you and with the Community beyond having simple lip
21 serve type technologies where we are pushing messages
22 out.

00149

1 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything from
2 Council? The audience, how are you? I hope you're
3 sitting easily, comfortable in your knowledge. Your
4 boldness of answers. Nothing? It's only going to get
5 sharper as we go along. All right.

6 MS. MORIEARTY: Okay. As we look -- I'm so
7 glad.

8 MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells,
9 Northwestern University. I think it's particularly
10 important that we look at releases and release
11 priorities and we look again because I think that a lot
12 of those priorities were set when we were in a different
13 era. So I was late getting here because I was on the
14 phone in a conference call with our vender and we are
15 looking at new tools to bring in data sources into our

16 primo discovery tool. And one of the resources we would
17 love to bring in is the data and FDsys, Metadata, and
18 that requires OAIPMH. It doesn't necessarily require
19 it, but that's the easiest and best way for us to get a
20 lot of that data and that's how we are defining that
21 data, kind of data we prioritize to get in. So I think
22 that many of us may be in different places and although
00150

1 OAIPMH was certainly around then, a lot of us are
2 looking again at some of those (inaudible) as being more
3 important then we might have thought before.

4 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I know these
5 documents are not like that type of reading, however, I
6 encourage all of you to go to the FDsys Web site and
7 click on the link that says more documentation and if
8 you look there, there are the various versions of the
9 concept of operations document, the requirements
10 document in particular. As we were talking this morning
11 about PURLs, for example, where we talk about it, I call
12 building a bridge of stability to get to an FDsys of the
13 future for persistent name, part of what would help me,
14 and I think help the PMO, is to go back and look at
15 those requirements for persistent name, look at those
16 requirements for ILS integration and answer two
17 questions, are they still valid yes or no and what is
18 missing? Because as Geoff mentioned, there has been a
19 time delay since those requirements were development and
20 is that where their focus should still be.

21 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Name and serial
22 number.

00151

1 MS. DALECKY: I'm sorry. Selene Dalecky,
2 GPO. Just to followup on the requirements, what Geoff
3 presented was an excellent use case and that is just as
4 important for us or more important because knowing what
5 the requirements, what would be good to have is one
6 thing, but knowing how it is going to be used, not only
7 by one person but reused multiple times, that helps set
8 priorities and helps us to find what the actual
9 functionality is going to be. So I think that one thing
10 that we have learned over this whole development process
11 is to be smarter and to understand not only that you
12 need the technology, but how it is going to be used.
13 That was just an excellent example, in really to help us
14 define what comes next.

15 MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

16 Wouldn't it be helpful for the rest of the Community if
17 on the Community Web site we actually had a thread going
18 where people could post what they are using the
19 information for from FDsys and what they would like to
20 see in the future in releases? We could pose what they
21 are using the information from FDsys and what they would
22 like to see in the future.

00152

1 MR. SHULER: I think that's an excellent
2 idea considering our earlier endorsements of using the
3 FDLP community Web site for more further communication
4 and social networking amongst depository librarians.
5 I'm going to ask any pointed question of the Community
6 and this is leading into the next questions and it
7 surprises me -- frankly, it surprises me your
8 complacency about this coming system. I don't think you
9 really understand what a major change it is in terms of
10 the relationship between GPO and the content creators as
11 well as what that relationship would mean for federal
12 depository libraries. I'll use as exhibit 1, the loss
13 of the weekly compilation of presidential documents to a
14 digital counterpart and there was not one disturbance in
15 the force when that happened a year ago. I'm so choked
16 up about it. I would imagine that that is only the
17 first that will be lost, if you will, to the great
18 digital uplift and I put it to you, as the empire in the
19 chair, does that not shake your complacency? Michelle.

20 MS. MCKNELLY: I didn't want to run and
21 interfere with the force. Michelle McKnelly, University
22 of Wisconsin, River Falls, a very small place. I have

00153

1 been listening about FDsys for a number of years, for a
2 really long time and I think that I want to come and
3 talk about this IG report, that came out in March. A
4 lot of the information that's coming out seems to be
5 directly answering some of the criticisms that came out
6 of this report. And in what John has been talking about
7 some of this was, what do we expect and how will we be
8 in Peoria in the future once this system launches? When
9 this concept was introduced, when the library community
10 and other communities got behind it, there was a great
11 expectation it was do all. It was sold to us that way.
12 Everything would be in there. It would ingest all of
13 this material. This report points out to what I think
14 our, you know, problems with that concept and if that
15 concept is no longer valid, then this needs to be

16 rescoped out to the Community. Because I think there
17 are a lot of institutional administrators out in the
18 depository community who are expecting to be able to
19 remove materials from their shelves, based on the idea
20 that these historic documents were going to be ingested
21 and available and authenticated in the system. But at
22 this point when you look at the materials for Release 1,
00154

1 we are not even seeing basic ILS functionality. And I
2 think that this is very concerning to me because I
3 believe that we are going to have trust issues going
4 into the future because we were planning on this
5 functioning in a certain way and we are not seeing that
6 functionality, so if someone wants to address that or
7 you can throw fruit at me later.

8 MR. SHULER: GPO?

9 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. A lot of parts
10 to that that we can delve into. One of the things that
11 I'd like to talk a little bit about because it spun off
12 of what I mentioned early, let's talk about ILS
13 integration. Going back to the requirements and looking
14 at what that entails, what is mentioned there beside
15 crosswalks to the ILS and what are your wants from the
16 system because I believe in the requirements document,
17 and I think it's listed on the What's Coming Release 1
18 and 2, there is discussion about where ILS
19 functionality fits, but when you go back and actually
20 read the requirements, it was a discussion of
21 integration. FDSys currently produces MODS and PREMIS
22 Metadata files. The ILS produces MARC. I know that the
00155

1 PMO staff right now is using some the Metadata fields
2 associated with MARC to help populate those MODS
3 Metadata files. From a voice of customer perspective in
4 the library unit, what I'd like to see is a future in
5 which those automate together and by crosswalk I mean
6 that you are able to get to that information, but there
7 is no loss of functionality. ILS continues as we wait
8 for that enhancement. But that is exactly the kind of
9 point that I think Selene was making about hearing more
10 about what is not happening and what it is you want and
11 part of that is looking back at the requirements to say
12 what is missing? What are we not getting right now that
13 we need?

14 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. So to be
15 absolutely clear, come the magical date in September,

16 ILS will not be part of the FDsys uplift? It will still
17 be two separate systems?

18 MR. WASH: This is Mike. That is correct,
19 but they will be interfaced together. This is Mike from
20 GPO.

21 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
22 of Utah. Could you expand on that just a bit?
00156

1 MR. WASH: Ric called it a crosswalk. You
2 have independent systems. We have a number of systems
3 at GPO and this is an IT technology. If the
4 requirements are for systems to talk to each other, our
5 job is to make sure that they talk to each other. ILS
6 is a completely independent system, but some of the
7 Metadata elements associated with information and ILS
8 are shared with FDsys so we interface them together. On
9 the sheet, this one, Discussion of Release Functionality
10 1 and 2, item number 11, ILS integration. ILS
11 integration doesn't mean that we subsume ILS into FDsys.
12 It means that ILS is there and it's integrating with
13 FDsys. Item 12, Enterprise Service Bus is the tool that
14 we use to do that. It was listed as a requirement.
15 It's not really a requirement. It's not a functional
16 requirement. It's a tool that we use to integrate
17 systems together. We do it all the time at GPO. It's
18 part of creating functionality without creating one mega
19 system. You keep the best of the systems that you have,
20 maintain them and integrate them together.

21 And this one follows to Michelle's comments
22 and questions. I think you know we have talked about
00157

1 it, FDsys, for quite sometime, but we have been focusing
2 on creating the functionality and this core
3 functionality of the capability to ingest or submit
4 content into the system. The capability to be able to
5 use existing data, as well as day forward data. Like
6 our daily feeds of the Federal Register of the
7 Congressional Record. It happens almost automatically
8 everyday. The demo this morning showed that we can
9 except converted content back to 1951 and the statutes
10 at large. We demonstrated that. So our job has been to
11 create a system that has the capability to do certain
12 things. What we do next really is input from you. What
13 is the priority of the data that comes into the system
14 now from the retrospect aspect? Do we go after the
15 harvested? Do we go after the converted? The system is

16 ready.

17 MR. SHULER: Council? We are into the last
18 question. We have about a half hour left of the match.

19 MS. MORIEARTY: But we have one more slide.

20 MR. SHULER: We have one more slide? What?
21 How did that happen?

22 MS. MORIEARTY: We snuck it in. As we look
00158

1 forward to an even more robust FDsys or -- by the way,
2 GPO, we are going to have to have only one name for this
3 thing sooner or later. What are the problems or
4 challenges that GPO faces? Are there ways in which the
5 Community can help address those changes?

6 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I'm going to
7 step out of the policy realm and go over to the
8 technical realm for a second and speak to what I know
9 are some of the challenges thus far. The big one being,
10 of course, the normalization of the data. I think that
11 you guys can tell me technically where I'm going off
12 kilter here. I think there was a hope and an
13 expectation that early on in the data migration process,
14 that data sets would be similar and that parsers created
15 to work with one data set would work with another data
16 set. And I think that in normalizing the data from GPO
17 Access and migrating it over, having the appropriate
18 tagging to offer the advanced search capabilities that
19 you see, filtering, etc., there was a lot of additional
20 work and expense that had to be associated with that. I
21 don't know if there were other issues or challenges you
22 want to address.

00159

1 Speaking to the second issue, I'm sounding a
2 bit like a broken record here, but in terms of how the
3 Community can help address challenges going forward, I
4 can't emphasize enough to go back and reread the ConOps
5 and reread the requirements document and tell us, as
6 these releases go forward, what you're not getting, what
7 unmet needs there are, what else needs to be delivered.
8 Working with Council, what are your priorities so that
9 we make sure that is what GPO is doing.

10 MR. WASH: I'd like to just add onto that a
11 little bit. The requirements document and the concept
12 of operation are living documents to us. The other
13 thing that I think would be really helpful would be to
14 really experience the system, use it and tell us what
15 you'd like to see differently. There are new

16 technologies coming out. We talked about the social
17 media aspect. We've talked about the possibility of RSS
18 feeds for notifications. We've talked about the need
19 for an API, for interface to the system to be able to do
20 other things. We demonstrated both data with the
21 Federal Register, and Code of Federal Regulation with
22 many if not most of the bills. How much of that type of
00160

1 functionality is needed? There is a lot of things that
2 are changing very, very rapidly. So it's experiencing
3 today and also what do you want to see in the future for
4 this type of system to be able to do the things that you
5 need. Help us understand that, prioritize those things,
6 as well as the type of data that you would like to see
7 in the system and that's the type of information,
8 working with Ric and his team, we can then prioritize
9 and figure out how we can slide it for the functionality
10 to be released.

11 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything else from
12 Council? James?

13 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
14 University. There has been some discussion on the live
15 blog about a new name for FDsys and some of the names
16 mentioned were Franklin and Madison and the last one
17 that came up, which I would personally sponsor would be
18 Adelaide.

19 MR. SHULER: Anybody in the audience? Good.

20 MS. MCKNELLY: I would like to compliment
21 Council on these questions in really getting to the
22 heart of many of the issues here and thank you for your
00161

1 hard work.

2 MR. SHULER: Don't go away, but I want to
3 get back to your comment where we are going from here
4 and what we are promised. I'd like to have as chair a
5 singular moment of reconciliation, okay? What you have
6 heard over the last hour or so is a way that we can walk
7 away from what happened before and accept that the
8 Council working with GPO and the Community will provide
9 that document on the releases that would explain to the
10 Community well enough that they know what is going on.
11 With the understanding that the Community will get on
12 the damn Web and use the system and start tearing it
13 apart and sending in the comments.

14 MS. MCKNELLY: You know, John, I have been
15 using the system --

16 MR. SHULER: Agreed.
17 MS. MCKNELLY -- and I have to tell you,
18 there's some problems, like when the system goes down
19 for maintenance at five o'clock eastern time, it is not
20 the time off where many people are. So we have been
21 using the system, but we need to have the realistic
22 expectations of what the system is going to do.

00162

1 MR. SHULER: If we can agree then that this
2 moment starts, we get a do over. Let's give a do over
3 to ourselves.

4 MS. MCKNELLY: I'm not taking a do over.
5 It's GPO that takes the do over.

6 MR. SHULER: Forgive the vernacular. Never
7 mind. If you guys don't want to reconcile and still
8 assign the blame then we will need to keep walking this
9 walk for a little while. What I'm saying is simply, if
10 the mechanisms exists, if GPO can tell us that they hear
11 our observations and criticisms and they assure us they
12 will react to them, will that be a step forward for the
13 Community?

14 MS. MCKNELLY: I don't speak for the
15 Community.

16 MR. SHULER: But you are a member of the
17 Community.

18 MS. MCKNELLY: I think that is a good first
19 step. We need to have realistic expectation and we have
20 to work on the trust issue because if GPO is not a
21 trusted party to fulfill these -- to fulfill what they
22 are promising us, that is probably not the right word,

00163

1 then we are just going to be back at the same point
2 again where we have our expectations built and then
3 people feel disappointed. So we need to have them to
4 become a trusted party. So, yes, we should start over.

5 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre
6 Dame. I was on the group that selected a company called
7 (inaudible) for RILS system. This sounds real familiar.
8 I mean, they promised us it would slice. It would dice.
9 It would control absolutely everything we can in the
10 most seamless way possible. And, yes, we bought it and
11 guess what? When we had it the first week, it was
12 alpha. It wasn't even at beta. I think that we have to
13 cut GPO a little bit of slack here in terms of this is,
14 you know, you wrote the expectations listening to the
15 Community and I think you move forward as best you can.

16 Actually it works just perfect at Notre Dame now. If
17 you believe that, I have property for you. So it's in
18 there. But the one thing I want to highlight it goes to
19 that last question and, Mike -- I don't know if you
20 heard it the way I did, but Mike dropped a very
21 important bomb in there that I'm not sure everyone
22 heard, you know. What do you want to go forward with
00164

1 and we had two buzzes going on in here. My director
2 wants -- you know, it's all digital. Get that old stuff
3 in there because then I can dump it off of my shelf. At
4 the same time I'm hearing it's borne digital and we are
5 going to lose it. If I heard Mike correctly, and I hope
6 I did, Mike, there is some direction. If you are like
7 my library, I want it all and I want it all now, instead
8 of, which is better? Do we make the ERL, my director,
9 happy, old stuff, off the shelf. Do you make me happy
10 going, you know, fugitive has been a problem. It is
11 going to continue to be a problem. Do we have one
12 chance of maybe, maybe taking a little crack at stopping
13 a fugitive and then we will work on the other one. But
14 hopefully GPO is going to have all the answers and we
15 will give GPO their wisdom, based on channeling all of
16 us to give the priorities that are on there.

17 MR. SHULER: Thank you for --

18 MR. HAYES: But look at what you did, are
19 you coming close? What limited knowledge I have, they
20 are coming real close. Is it's perfect? I don't think
21 so. Will it ever be perfect? I don't think so.

22 MR. SHULER: Council?

00165

1 MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
2 I kind of have a question, it's probably a stupid
3 question, about being able to take the content into
4 FDsys. So right now you are almost ready to fully
5 release the statutes at large. You are just awaiting
6 congressional approval on that. Moving forward, are you
7 using the example of the statutes at large as an example
8 that this is easy to do and looking forward it will be
9 easier and easier to be able to upload the content or
10 will things get kind of trapped in that approval process
11 more often and if so what can we do to help push that,
12 whether it be community starts writing their
13 congressmen? What can we do about moving forward?

14 MR. SHULER: Maybe I can pose that as a
15 hypothetical at this stage. If I were, as chair, to

16 pose a question to the Community, that if the JCP
17 allowed for the experiment to take place at our Council
18 meeting this morning, would folks in this, by the voice
19 vote naturally, so the recorder can hear, would the
20 people in this room who are members of the Community, if
21 JCP were in this room say to them give us the rest of
22 it, what would you say? Would it be a yes, a complete
00166

1 yes?

2 THE AUDIENCE: Yes.

3 MR. SHULER: What you saw in that room

4 indicated go for it, would that be a yes?

5 THE AUDIENCE: Yes.

6 MR. SHULER: It's in the official record.

7 Ric.

8 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think they
9 answered the question. I think that's good feedback.

10 As I said in my speech this morning we need approval.

11 There is no approval, as we have been told, no authority

12 for GPO to digitize, but there has been a sentiment of

13 support expressed. So we need that first, something to

14 jump start this to show a couple of things; number one,

15 that GPO can do it, number two, that it's not going to

16 break the bank, and number three, and more importantly

17 is the question of by doing it doesn't delay other

18 things that we want from FDsys. Does it put other

19 things on hold? Where does it fit in the priority

20 chain? I think those are the big questions and answers

21 to take back to the oversight committee and I think the

22 resounding yes shows the support for that. When I look
00167

1 back at the 2004 vision documents created by the PMO,

2 again, I don't see it as taking something away. I see

3 converted content in there as something that was

4 envisioned from the beginning, so I don't view it as a

5 tradeoff.

6 MR. SHULER: Council? All right we are

7 ready for the next slide.

8 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Roger Schoenfield. We're

9 at a point of transition with the GPO, with the Public

10 Printer. I was curious if there was a good way to not

11 just think about this as an advocacy to the JCP, but

12 also to make sure that the new Public Printer sees the

13 importance that the Community seems to see of this issue

14 as well.

15 MR. SHULER: Okay. So noted. We have

16 reached the third slide. Jill.

17 MS. MORIEARTY: I'm sorry guys, but this is
18 where Camilla, Victoria and myself wanted to kind of
19 pull everything together to followup with some
20 discussion as used for Council with the idea that FDsys
21 is something we want. We have been waiting for it. We
22 want it to happen and we want to assist in its
00168

1 development and we want Council to start thinking and
2 discussing some of these issues involving FDsys. Of
3 course the first one, oh, boy, I wish I had my glasses.
4 Again, Council would like -- ageing is so wonderful.
5 Council would like a concise business plan for FDsys
6 moving forward that which will include a discussion of
7 the ingestion of documents into FDsys of both content
8 from government agencies and outside entities through
9 partnerships. We'd like to discuss if the goals and
10 implementations 2 and 3 can not be met, Council would at
11 least like to see the ability to ingest converted
12 digitized content increased and would like to see
13 improved navigation of the relationship between the
14 publication as well as notification to users and
15 delivery by RSS, e-mail and FDP. GPO is also financing
16 requirements for migrating legacy applications like
17 PURLs to FDsys for later system capability releases.
18 Council was told that once FDsys is fully enabled, GPO
19 will have migrated into a more modern and scaleable
20 infrastructure. Moving forward, Council would like a
21 concise plan for stable and redundant systems to access
22 online content. While congressionally appropriated
00169

1 funds have been put towards improving FDsys, we want
2 more assurance GPO is focusing some energy and resources
3 on improving the stability of PURLs and the legacy
4 servers.

5 MR. SHULER: Does Council have anything
6 further, based on those three points, to present? To
7 the Community I think what you have just witnessed
8 Council 2.0. We are the recommendations through our
9 discussion and what we give to you in GPO at the same
10 time. So does the Community have any response to the
11 three points?

12 MS. MORIEARTY: Come on, guys.

13 MR. SHULER: You are totally coprostatic
14 with this approach? It's good to be chair.

15 MS. MORIEARTY: It's okay.

16 MR. SHULER: It's okay. The people are
17 happy. This will guide Council's hand into October.

18 MS. MORIEARTY: And you know how I can get.

19 MR. SHULER: Any further discussion? I do
20 believe then, based on my considerable experience, that
21 we are done talking about this, in this fashion and
22 except from now on it will be a notion of going forward
00170

1 in collaboration and deliberation with our GPO partners
2 through the well established means of communication,
3 which we all take advantage of, of course, and through
4 the good work of Council. Yes, somebody, yes.

5 MS JIALAL: Kamanie Jialal, St. John's Law
6 School. I can understand you wanting our answers to the
7 what you have written there. Can we have a little more
8 time? I don't know if anybody feels the same way, but I
9 couldn't answer you right now when the meeting is over
10 in ten minutes. Can we maybe discuss it tomorrow, maybe
11 Wednesday?

12 MR. SHULER: By all means.

13 MS JIALAL: So we can have just a little bit
14 more time.

15 MR. SHULER: Point taken. Just because we
16 don't have the answers at this moment, doesn't mean that
17 we can't use the advantage of those wonderful social
18 networking tools that we have available through the
19 Community Desktop of which you are all going to sign up
20 and be part of, no doubt. We can continue this
21 conversation online in that fashion because that is the
22 Council meeting between the times we meet physically.
00171

1 We've got the Web people, as annoying as they are.
2 Okay, what have they got?

3 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, University of
4 Stanford. The Web people are about to speak. I have a
5 comment on a live blog. Could someone clarify the
6 purpose of FDsys? Is it primary, and this is regarding
7 earlier questions about change in focus of FDsys. Is it
8 primary easy way to use public gateway of information or
9 more of an official publishing arm repository? Why I
10 ask, FDsys program review differentiates FDsys from
11 USA.gov saying that USA.gov a "a Web portal that makes
12 it easy for the public to get US Government information
13 and services on the Web. But the purpose of FDsys is
14 not to serve as a portal, but instead to provide access
15 to official and authentic content." A little bit more.

16 It says the main functions of FDsys are publishing
17 information, enabling, searching for information,
18 preserving the information and providing version
19 control. The knowledgeable forever government document
20 says that one criterion for the digital FDLP is to have
21 "a common easy to use technology for the public to
22 access the information." So I will just circle around
00172

1 again and say this question one more time. Could
2 someone clarify the purpose of FDsys as the primary easy
3 to use public gateway to information or more of an
4 official publishing arm repository?

5 MR. SHULER: We have seven minutes on the
6 game clock. Ric.

7 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I'll be very
8 quick in the answer. A repeat of what I said earlier.
9 It's an advanced search system. It's a content
10 management system. It's a digital repository. I wrote
11 that answer to the FAQ in the program report about
12 USA.gov. There has often been some question about
13 whether or not in the past GPO Access was a portal.
14 Whether or not FDsys going forward is a portal, no. We
15 are not in the portal business. We are not in the
16 gateway business for that purpose. We are a content
17 repository of official and authentic content. Period.

18 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. I'm looking at
19 you guys. Anything else from our esteemed Council?
20 Members of the Community one more time come up to bat?
21 By the way it's going to be regionals night at the
22 baseball game tomorrow night. I just want to let you
00173

1 know that. Tough crowd. Tough crowd. I declare this
2 plenary done.

3

4 * * * * *

2010 FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE AND SPRING
DEPOSITORY COUNCIL MEETING

April 27th, 2010
ADAMS MARK HOTEL
120 Church Street
Buffalo, New York 14202

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. SHULER: Before you come to the mike
3 please say your name and your institution.

4 MR. DAVIS: A couple of additional things,
5 handouts, speeches, other materials from this
6 conference, have ask Ted to work with the Web team to
7 have those posted on the FDLP Desktop not later than
8 Friday. As is often the case the transcripts coming
9 back will take a little bit longer. As soon as Lance
10 gets those, he'll post those to the Desktop as well. I
11 also want to remind everyone that Matt Landgraf and the
12 PMO team will be outside on one of the tables during
13 breaks and at lunch. If anyone missed the statutes at
14 large, digitized demo yesterday morning during the early
15 session, I encourage you to go out and take a look at
16 that. We are really looking for comments on that.
17 And one piece of sad news to pass along. I
18 know many of you knew Willie Thompson who used to work
19 at GPO. Will retired in 2004. Formerly in a position
20 similar to Lance in terms of making these conferences
21 happen, and Willie passed away last month. Willie
22 worked at GPO for over 40 years and I believe all of
00003

1 those were spent in the library unit. So a huge loss to
2 all of our family here but I wanted to make you aware of
3 that because I heard that some people didn't know about
4 that. Thanks.

5 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. Okay. One
6 last bit of housekeeping before we get to the main match
7 of the morning. The third in a set. I'd like to
8 publically recognize in the extension of my remarks
9 yesterday of how we are slowly inching into the Web
10 through these meetings. Sherry Laster from the
11 University of Akron is referred to as the resident live
12 blogger. So she is streaming our remarks out to the
13 greater world; I think another indication of how much
14 our lives are changing.

15 So without further adeu, I'd like to

16 introduce the next set of players, which would be what I
17 would call the regionals and these good folks are going
18 to guide us through a discussion with the question is
19 education properly projected, and the match begins.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, the
21 University of Hawaii at Manoa. I'd like to start with
22 the first bullet point on this slide which is -- the
00004

1 question is, sufficient progress is being made on the
2 shelflist conversion and development of a goal for
3 creation of disposal lists to reassure depositories.
4 The basic question is, are you reassured by what is
5 taking place at GPO in terms of dealing with the
6 pre-1976 shelflist conversion and development of a tool?
7 We had a session about this at the fall conference where
8 Cindy Etkin talked about the disposal process and then
9 Lisa Russell solicited ideas for what would be needed
10 for a tool to create disposal lists. We heard yesterday
11 from Laurie Hall about the progress of the shelflist
12 conversion. I believe she said, and she can jump up and
13 correct me if I misheard, that there were 600,000
14 shelflist cards that had been scanned or are being
15 scanned and out of those -- you are already wobbling
16 your head. Do you want to jump up and say something?

17 MS. HALL: It's Laurie Hall, GPO. We have
18 estimated there is a million cards in the shelflist. Of
19 that million there is about 600,000 that are not OCLC
20 cards that will need transcription. So we digitized or
21 scanned 285,000 of the cards for our own purposes or for
22 if anybody is interested in them. To date we have about
00005

1 5,000 transcriptions that have been completed and are
2 displaying in the CGP. We just started the project in
3 January. January it was contracted.

4 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One thing I'd
5 like to add to that as well is in addition to getting
6 ready for the conference last week, we are working away
7 on this project. There is a list serve announcement
8 that will be going out today that we have a concept of
9 operations document which then leads to the requirements
10 document and then the procurement used for expenditure
11 of the funds we have approved for the automated
12 disposition tool. A link will be made available today
13 to that concept of operations document and we have a
14 comment form up where we are soliciting feedback from
15 the library community on that ConOps to help develop the

16 requirements document.

17 The other thing I want to mention is I
18 believe Cindy and Lisa did an OPAL presentation that is
19 archived related to this and we also tried to generate
20 some discussion on the FDLP Community site. I think we
21 only had five or six comments, so we are hoping for more
22 comments on the concept of operations document because
00006

1 that leads down the procurement path.

2 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
3 Michigan. Laurie, could you clarify for us the content
4 of that one meeting card shelflist? How complete is
5 that? What's the time frame that covers?

6 MS. ETKIN: It's about 1880 and we shut the
7 shelflist data in 1992. It is a real mixed bag of
8 things. We know it's not complete. We don't know what
9 we are not missing. George and I have been dealing with
10 you to try and figure out ways to identify the stuff
11 that is missing. It's a combination of some of our
12 dictionary catalog that we used to have in the library
13 division and actually some shelflist things. So it's a
14 real combination. There is temporary cards. There are
15 cards that were things that were identified from
16 libraries throughout the country, but we never had a
17 copy. Most of the stuff has gotten into the paper
18 monthly catalog. We are not sure that everything has.
19 So it's the beginning start of trying to figure out, you
20 know, what's the entire collection. I know people have
21 said something about making a list of everything that
22 was distributed to depositories. I think this is one of
00007

1 the beginning pieces of making that, finding out what
2 that list is. The project is we are estimating about a
3 two year project. We have about 20 staff and the
4 contract will be up and fully running. It's about 20
5 staff people.

6 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
7 California State Library: Laurie, you sat down too
8 soon. When corrections were made to SuDoc members, were
9 those reflected in the shelflist?

10 MS. HALL: Yes. He is asking if there are
11 corrections to the SuDocs numbers, yes, there is lots of
12 corrections and there are lots of discrepancies and
13 there are lots of questions. A lot of work to be done
14 after the transcription.

15 MR. SHULER: Anybody else on Council?

16 Anybody from the audience?

17 MS. SELBY: Barb Selby, University of
18 Virginia. Under disposal tool I guess -- I mean I would
19 look forward to whichever document comes out first about
20 the requirements. Many of us are working towards a less
21 formal more collaborative or cooperative way of disposal
22 and I would hate to see any tool that would put more
00008

1 burden on either the selectives or the regionals while
2 at the same time making sure that we do get the things
3 that are needed for our collection. So I personally
4 don't want everyone to put everything into a form, each
5 individual book into a form, if people can do it from
6 their online catalogs and reports, that might be drawn
7 from those. I'd like to see flexibility in the way that
8 we are allowed to input disposals to our regionals and
9 also examine them.

10 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

11 MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. We had
12 envisioned something that would use the MARC records and
13 then would pull in from the MARC records from ILS and
14 use that so that people wouldn't have to enter at all
15 themselves.

16 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New
17 Mexico. It's more a question there was a product out --
18 I'm not as old as I look or feel today. There was
19 product put out, but at the same time that accumulative
20 subject and accumulative title indexes were put out by
21 the same husband and wife team and they used to sell it
22 out of their garage along with popsicles to the
00009

1 neighborhood kids. It was 98 rolls of film. I don't
2 have it. Barbie, do you? Does anybody have it? Do you
3 have it? Do you know what I'm talking about?

4 MS. HALL: That is what George and I have
5 been working on with Ann Sanders. Here comes George.

6 MR. BARNUM: George Barnum, GPO. We tracked
7 down this thing that was published in the '70's. A
8 couple of librarians came to GPO with a microfilm camera
9 and filmed the entire thing. It's important to remember
10 what this shelflist was. It was not exactly what we in
11 libraries all think of as a shelflist. It was the
12 authority file for the classification system and, oh, by
13 the way, because everything we classified went onto the
14 shelves in the old public documents library, it sort of
15 acted like a shelflist. So at the time that the public

16 documents library, the old public documents library was
17 sent off to the national archives, this thing got
18 divided up and what remained at GPO, what Laurie's folks
19 have been working on for all these many days now, is we
20 think is what class stems were still active at that
21 time. And what went away, and we don't know exactly
22 what away constitutes was the rest of it. That
00010

1 microfilm, which I don't remember the title of it
2 either, Dan, but I've actually got copies of the --
3 finding a title page and stuff in my bag, was the whole
4 thing. That was below that split was made and before
5 the public documents library went off never to be seen
6 again at the national archives. So we've got that and
7 Laurie and I are going to work on seeing how we can make
8 the two things mesh because there is even more --
9 apparently there is even more than those hundred and
10 some rolls of microfilm that is handwritten cards and
11 guide cards to get the librarians in public documents
12 library back and forth then there is in what was left
13 behind.

14 MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of
15 Minnesota. It's really great that you want to use ILS
16 records that has to be cataloged before that will work.
17 I'm still getting a lot of stuff on disposal lists that
18 is not cataloged. I'm just wondering if maybe you can
19 talk to that, but the other point I want to bring up, I
20 don't know if it's sufficient progress. I'm kind of
21 feeling like that I can't really answer this question
22 because there is still so much uncertainty, having not
00011

1 seen the tool or really see how the shelflist is going
2 to affect disposal lists. I'm just not quite sure how
3 to answer this question.

4 MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. We have
5 talked about a number of ways of allowing libraries to
6 input things that are not cataloged. There may be a
7 free form and there is something that is not already
8 cataloged. One of the problems I think someone raised
9 in the past, is that you get something -- if somebody is
10 free forming it, you get something because it looks like
11 something that doesn't match anything that you've got
12 and low and behold, you've got six copies of it. So we
13 want to try and avoid that by using the ILS records as
14 much as possible.

15 One thing we are talking about is having a

16 matching between needs and offers and that might
17 encourage people to use the category records if they are
18 there, so that people aren't free forming things that
19 they could find on the add list.

20 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the
21 other things that we are hoping will be a benefit of
22 doing it this way and while we understand that there
00012

1 will be a few titles that you might have to put into
2 this tool by free form, it also is a notification to us
3 that is a fugitive so we can add it then to the CGP and
4 include that in the inventory.

5 MR. SHULER: Any other questions from the
6 audience?

7 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
8 University. Will those records, once they get into the
9 CGP, will they be tagged in somehow the libraries will
10 be able to tell where they are coming from or pull out
11 just those records?

12 MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. There is
13 actually off the Desktop a project page that has some
14 information about that and has the exact search strategy
15 in the 955 field; it says the historic shelflist and you
16 can actually tell the drawer number of the shelflist so
17 you can retrieve them by simple advance search from the
18 ILS -- expert search, sorry. So the instructions for
19 the search on the Desktop.

20 MS. BURROUGHS: Jennie Burroughs, University
21 of Montana. These are questions for Laurie, actually.
22 You mentioned the conclusion of the project is a two
00013

1 year project. It that two years to finish up quality
2 control or two years until the digitized records are
3 transcribed?

4 MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. We are
5 expecting two years for the transcription of the records
6 to be completed. The digitization of the cards is
7 totally different, but one thing to make clear is the
8 contractor is describing, doing quality control. It
9 comes up to cataloging and then those records go through
10 an additional level of quality control adding a subject
11 heading, an LCSH subject heading and an authority
12 heading, authorized heading. So there is a little bit
13 of additional work that is going on, through my stream
14 of catalogers, so it adds a little bit more to the
15 record. Just to remind people too, that includes

16 serials, so there will be holdings checked in, that's
17 part of the project as well. We should start our
18 serials check in for some of the stuff in the shelflist
19 July of this year.

20 MS. ETKIN: I have an addition -- I wonder
21 if there is a way for libraries to help out GPO with
22 some of these because what we are finding is a lot of
00014

1 these items already have existing cataloging in OCLC.
2 So we are going to talk about maybe a project later
3 today about --

4 MS. HALL: Right. We just finished up a
5 draft of cooperative cataloging partnerships with GPO,
6 more specific on how to not content partnerships, but
7 actually cataloging exchange where, if you come in to be
8 a partner we will potentially catalog this stuff for
9 you; that's one of the projects. Also we will do some
10 classification for you, so there is more details on
11 this. This will be posted. I've got copies for it for
12 the two-thirty meeting, two o'clock meeting. If people
13 want it we are going to post it for comment when we get
14 back. What was the OCLC part?

15 MS. ETKIN: There are an existing record for
16 a lot of these materials already. So it's not so much
17 wanting GPO to catalog this stuff in my library as much
18 as we are already doing a lot of this work. Can we help
19 you out by providing records?

20 MS. HALL: Right. There is some stuff in
21 that already is talking about doing that. Also just to
22 note that, yes, you can get the records through the
00015

1 catalog from Z39.50. Part of the pilot participants
2 with the cataloging record distribution also have the
3 opportunity to get those records as well through that
4 venue.

5 MR. SHULER: Any other questions from the
6 audience? David?

7 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski from
8 California State Library. You're getting your exercise
9 today, Laurie. Laurie?

10 MS. HALL: I'm sorry, David.

11 MR. CISMOWSKI: At a previous session
12 somebody, maybe you, spoke to the detail of analysis of
13 numbered series that is present in the shelflist. For
14 instance, are the titles of individual monographs, that
15 were issued in a numbered series, are they consistently

16 present in the shelflist?

17 MS. HALL: Yes, in those cases they are. We
18 treated -- as far as I know. I don't know how far back,
19 but we have always treated series analytically. There
20 may be some other ones that we haven't come across.
21 It's interesting what we have come across so far. But
22 open file report, they are all treated analytically.

00016

1 Very little was checked in as a series and simply by the
2 series number with no analytic. So just say for that
3 one or some of those labor bureau series they are all
4 analytically treated. So there will be individual
5 representations.

6 MR. SHULER: Anymore takers? All right.
7 Serve up the next bullet item.

8 MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders, Library
9 of Michigan. The next bullet point we want to discuss.
10 How can we help educate regionals and selectives about
11 alternative approaches to disposal and collecting?

12 MR. SHULER: Any additional thoughts from
13 Council? Turn it over to the audience.

14 MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth, University of
15 South Carolina. Define for me alternative approaches?

16 MR. SHULER: Council?

17 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
18 State Library. I think that most regionals who have
19 coordinators who have been around for awhile are
20 familiar with the so called traditional way of
21 processing disposal lists, which was a very time
22 consuming iterative listing of every single item that

00017

1 you wanted to withdrawal from your collection, with the
2 possible exception of serial issues which I think most
3 of us have been allowed to be collapsed into consecutive
4 holding ranges.

5 I don't know if this is the right time to
6 bring it up, but just a few days ago ASERL released a
7 discussion draft of streamlining not only the disposal
8 process, but also collection maintenance and within -- I
9 only looked at that yesterday and just skimmed the part
10 about disposals, but it seems to me that the thrust of
11 that discussion draft is to -- is to generate lists that
12 are more general; that is, you would give a general idea
13 of what a library in that particular area of the country
14 was deciding to withdraw, but you wouldn't -- going back
15 to the numbered or the individual monographs in a

16 numbered series, you wouldn't necessarily analyze them
17 title by title in your list.

18 For instance, if you were withdrawing your
19 entire collection of geological survey bulletins, you
20 might have one listing saying number 1 through 2,500
21 with gaps and that would be your list. So I think what
22 the traditional way would be would be that you would
00018

1 have to individually list all those 2,500 titles, but
2 can we do it in a more streamline way and still
3 communicate to both regionals and the selectives in that
4 region what it is that libraries are withdrawing? I
5 think that is the issue.

6 MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of
7 Virginia Library. I mean I think we are already doing
8 this by in large. I think regional has a lot of
9 conversation about disposal lists, the way that people
10 are approaching that. I do sort of see this one and the
11 first one possibly being in conflict because if -- what
12 I was trying to say before is I don't want GPO to come
13 with the be all, end all of the individual listing title
14 way of doing disposal lists while we are all moving
15 towards potentially a less individual listing of these
16 things, while still making sure that -- you know, I mean
17 I talked to the people. If somebody is disposing
18 something in Virginia, a lot of times if it's a large
19 thing, we'll have a conversation on the telephone and
20 I'll find out what it is and get them to give me an
21 overview of it and then I'll say we will do it this way
22 for that particular group of things. If it's something
00019

1 different then I'll say, no, I think you should do those
2 individually. So I think it needs to be a conversation
3 and I would hate to see some conflicts and somebody is
4 going to address that.

5 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks,
6 Barbie for bringing that up. I just want to reassure
7 you all that the disposal tool that we ultimately come
8 up with is going to be voluntary for libraries to use.
9 It won't be mandatory just as the national needs and
10 offers is not mandatory. There is certainly advantages
11 for using it for lots of other reasons, but for those of
12 you who want to do as Barbie is doing, that will still
13 remain an option.

14 While I'm up here, I want to point out a
15 couple of other things. In your packet is a handout

16 Streamlining the Process, Disposition of Depository
17 Materials. When we went away from the fall conference
18 there was some confusion. So this summarizes what we
19 had presented back in the fall about the disposal
20 process indicates our actions taken and then on the
21 backside of this practice is an education and the
22 recommended best practices. Since that time, we have
00020

1 had discussions with our general Council and the bottom
2 of the front side you will see a little paragraph that
3 is labeled Revised Procedures. And I want to point this
4 out to you all because this will make a difference in
5 the end of the process. Once libraries have fulfilled
6 their legal obligation of offering unwanted depository
7 materials to other libraries, followed the procedures
8 established by their regional and they have received
9 permission from their regional to discard publications
10 and still failing to find a taker after reasonable
11 effort, the depository publications are then to be
12 considered abandon by the government, no longer
13 considered government property. The library may dispose
14 of the publications in any manner appropriate. I want
15 you to know too that the handbook is in the process of
16 being revised to reflect that change. I think that
17 directly affects a third bullet which we haven't gotten
18 to yet.

19 But getting back to education, I want to let
20 you all know there is a disposition of materials project
21 page on the FDLP Desktop. It has information about the
22 ConOps links to the presentation that was done in the
00021

1 fall, as well as the open presentation that was done in
2 December. Links to the pages that Ann has put together
3 on the Community site for the discard procedures of the
4 regionals. So it's sort of a gathering point for all of
5 this information. If you go under about the FDLP there
6 is a link to projects and you'll find it there.

7 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders. We spent a lot
8 of time last fall gathering all the disposal procedures
9 for the 50 states and there is a tremendous variance
10 there and I don't think that anybody here is advocating
11 that there should be one method of disposal and that one
12 state's policy isn't somehow the best. But at the same
13 time there is just a huge range of different approaches
14 and there is a huge range of effort required on the part
15 of both the regionals and the selectives.

16 It comes back to I still get questions
17 regularly, I get lists, that conform to about three
18 disposal procedures to those standards. It's still an
19 education problem more than anything else and that's
20 what we are looking for is suggestions. How can we
21 spread this around in more useful ways before someone
22 goes to the effort of compiling a 249 page list which
00022

1 wasn't necessary, which happened to me about three weeks
2 ago.

3 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One quick add
4 to Cindy's comment as well. As a result of a meeting
5 that we had with legal staff last week that also
6 eliminates the need to send proceeds to the
7 superintendent of documents for the sale of property.

8 MR. SHULER: Well, I think that excited some
9 interest.

10 MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago Public
11 Library. I would say that one of the biggest issues
12 that I have run into with us is we never discard
13 anything so when we do need to discard something
14 everybody is paging through old notebooks trying to
15 figure out what to do and where to send it to and where
16 to do it. And we only run into -- from the small public
17 libraries we run into somebody after three years and
18 they've suddenly realized they are getting documents.
19 And now they need to get rid of them. And so now they
20 need to appoint a depository librarian and their first
21 job is to discard things. It almost always seems like
22 there is somebody new in the process. The people here
00023

1 are all fairly sophisticated and discard things
2 regularly, but I would suspect the majority of the
3 depositories don't. They do it by fits and spurts.

4 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

5 MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn State. I'm
6 sitting here thinking about all the innovation that's
7 happened over the years in terms of depository needs and
8 offers lists and the different ways that people have
9 done it. And recently my regional decided to use
10 Facebook to do their lists. And, you know, to me part
11 of the genius of allowing regionals and selectives that
12 sense of autonomy in doing these lists is it encourages
13 innovation.

14 I'm concerned that you're going to come up
15 with a tool that is going to become obsolete in about

16 five years and we are going to have spent time in trying
17 to create a tool that will become obsolete and there are
18 going to be new and innovative ways to do these lists.

19 And the reality is that these needs and
20 offers lists, I understand that there was sort of a
21 hint, and I would like to hear GPO talk about this more
22 in terms of how you guys use these needs and offers
00024

1 lists. The reality is is how we communicate with one
2 another, how the selective and regional communicate to
3 one another. And that by definition we have so many
4 different personalities it is going to be difficult.
5 It's just -- and to me part of that is a communication
6 between a regional and selective in terms of what that
7 should look like.

8 I guess the main point that I want to make
9 is I'm kind of concerned that we are making something
10 more important. I would much rather you folks finish
11 that shelflist, get cataloging records for that
12 shelflist then spend time working on a product that in
13 about five years is going to be obsolete because there
14 is new technology that will make our -- it's always
15 going to be involving how we are doing these needs and
16 offers lists. There are innovative ways that we can use
17 data minor to create these lists. There are innovative
18 ways that we can use our cataloging systems. In terms
19 of education, as documents librarians, isn't that our
20 job in part? Just a thought.

21 MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of
22 Minnesota. I'd like to add onto what Steven said. I'm
00025

1 just wondering if maybe I missed this, but when you guys
2 were looking at all the different lists, is there a
3 report that is put out what everybody is doing? Because
4 I feel as a regional I can go look at 50 different
5 regional pages to see what everybody is doing. That
6 innovation piece, I think that talks exactly into that.
7 Where do you put the ownership of somebody having to go
8 out and figure out what is happening with all the
9 different regionals and what people are doing? We talk
10 about it. I hear about it in conversations in the
11 hallway at meetings, but there is really no -- what's
12 the word I want? Site. You know, maybe that's what you
13 guys are trying to do to have here.

14 The other thing I want to mention was with
15 the selectives. I can communicate all I want, just as

16 Ann talked about. I'm to the point, you know, what? I
17 have sent this out five times. You are still sending me
18 a list handwritten. I'm not going to accept it anymore.
19 I think there is a point where the ownership has to be
20 on everybody within the program, not just the regional,
21 to have to deal with things where we are trying to make
22 changes, we are trying to move forward, and people just
00026

1 aren't listening.

2 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
3 Michigan. Two points I want to make. One is that we
4 did compile all of these disposal procedures in one
5 place. It's on the Community site. I wrote a summary
6 which I don't think I put there, as I think about it,
7 and I certainly can. But I wrote a summary that went
8 out to regional (inaudible) and the rest of you wouldn't
9 have seen it. So I can fix that, but they are in the
10 Community site under the Web links.

11 The other thing is, I want to kind of flip
12 this around a little bit. Because we have a lot of,
13 wherever two or more are gathered you will discuss
14 disposal. But it's not only about the disposal because
15 there are libraries out there, gulf coast libraries, for
16 example, who really do need this needs and offers tool.
17 There are libraries out there that are actively looking
18 to gather rare and valuable government documents about
19 their region. And that is not going to happen if we
20 completely walkaway from the notion that we need to know
21 what each other is doing.

22 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Ann, your
00027

1 summary is in the slide deck from the fall presentation.
2 I borrowed heavily from it. The other thing I want to
3 reiterate that this is not going to be a mandatory tool
4 for you all to use. So if you want to use Facebook or
5 whatever to do your disposition of materials processes,
6 that is perfectly fine, but we were asked by Council to
7 streamline and come up with a tool. We got
8 appropriations for it, it's not coming out of the same
9 pot that is paying for the shelflist conversion, just so
10 that you understand that. We are not robbing one to pay
11 for the other.

12 MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of
13 Virginia. One of the things David mentioned the ASERL
14 report and one of the things that is in there, sort of
15 speaks to Ann's comments, a needs list as well as an

16 offers list.

17 My library has a needs list up. It's very
18 incomplete. It's what -- it's very incomplete, but I
19 got something from someone who was just trolling around
20 on the Web and had something in his personal collection
21 and he mailed it to me and it was great. And I, of
22 course, realize that any libraries that have undergone
00028

1 strategies and have lost tons of stuff, couldn't put up
2 any real kind of a real -- a needs list would be
3 impossible at that point, but there might be general
4 things. I know I've looked for one 42 volume on Indian
5 affairs thing between the wars. There might be some
6 more general things that librarians could put up. So I
7 think there is that side of it as well, that for my
8 library has been very helpful to have that up.

9 MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. We do have
10 plans in the ConOps to have both needs and offers in the
11 same tool and then match them and then also to be able
12 to mark if you need something because it's a replacement
13 for something that was damaged in a natural disaster or
14 if you need something for digitization project.

15 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley University of New
16 Mexico. I think we are all getting an education here
17 because we all do things a little bit different. Like
18 Barbie, I have a needs list and I have an offers list
19 because I'm still one of those old time regional
20 librarians that really believes that we should build our
21 historic collections and I don't want to open that can
22 or worms right now. That's just the way I operate.
00029

1 The other thing is I have scared my
2 selectives into not discarding. So I deal with those
3 lists and so if you kind of take that approach it kind
4 of solves the problem. But in a more serious vein, one
5 of the problems that Ann just mentioned, that kind of
6 turned my light bulb on, is the fact that we have all
7 bits and pieces of all these different things going on
8 in different parts. Some of it's on the Community and
9 some of it's on the FDLP. I think centralizing this
10 information would be a big help for everyone because
11 then there is just a one stop place where everybody can
12 go and take a look at, do I need this? Is there an
13 offer? There is a couple of other suggestions that may
14 come forward as well. So it is hit and miss right now.
15 I don't have a lot of time to spend trying to figure out

16 where the hell things are. I need to know where they
17 are so I can take a look at them and move along with my
18 life and get things done in a more expeditious manner.
19 So I would hope that at some point we can take some of
20 these things and kind of centralize that.

21 MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University
22 of Wisconsin, River Falls. I'm a selective. We have
00030

1 never had much problem doing discard lists because it's
2 part of our working routine. And I think the group here
3 that needs to be educated perhaps are the library
4 directors who have this idea that a discard list is the
5 most suppressive thing to create in the world and it's
6 not. We give a card to a student at a cert desk and say
7 type. And then someone checks to make sure they have
8 created something reasonably close to what is there. I
9 don't think that regionals are demanding, you know,
10 coming in a white glove and checking to make sure
11 everything is perfect. They want to kind of have an
12 idea of what is there. There has been a campaign that
13 this is awful, awful, horrible, hideous thing. All that
14 this is, is something that is not in our normal
15 processing for weeding our materials that we acquire and
16 purchase. I think it's important that this update on
17 the sheet go out and that the information about being
18 able to sell materials at book sales goes with that
19 because that has been the one thing I have never been
20 able to explain is that. Okay, we have some things that
21 are really nice here and nobody wants them and we have
22 to absolutely throw this away because the idea of
00031

1 sending a \$2 check to the government costs us way more.
2 So I think that would be a very good thing, to get this
3 information out to directors that it really isn't the
4 worse thing. I don't know that regionals are in a
5 position to communicate with library directors around
6 the country. They communicate with the librarians, with
7 the coordinators, but I'm not sure they are at that
8 level and I'm not sure that's appropriate. I think
9 maybe that should come from SuDoc.

10 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks,
11 Michelle, for that. We'll get out and post it to FDLP-L
12 as well as the director's list. That's a good idea.
13 Thank you.

14 I also wanted to followup on the sale thing
15 so that question is resolved now. And the reasoning is

16 that once the government has abandoned the property and
17 the libraries can do with what they want, putting it in
18 a book sale and sending the proceeds to the government
19 makes no sense since we have abandoned all interest.
20 You're not selling our property anymore, so that's the
21 question that was finally resolved.

22 And a followup to Dan. The project page is
00032

1 that one place where all of this stuff will be gathered
2 or linked to from.

3 MR. MARTIN: Heath Martin, University of
4 Kentucky. I just wanted to return a minute to the
5 alternative approaches aspect of this question. It's
6 specifically to the eight year old draft proposal that
7 was mentioned earlier. Again, just to use as an
8 example, it's a draft proposal. But, again, for
9 example, if one of the things being proposed is
10 something of a parodyne shift in that historically
11 regionals have been responsible for knowing what
12 regionals need. And those proposals there is discussion
13 of the idea of selectives needing to know what regionals
14 need. The burden is on the selectives to understand
15 what the regionals need to publicizing regional
16 priorities. In that case the Center of Excellence and
17 what they are planning and that sort of thing. As these
18 models emerge, if they do in fact emerge, it's going to
19 be important to obviously make sure that for example
20 selectives understand that in theory at least that
21 responsibility has shifted and what regionals'
22 responsibilities are under these, you could argue,
00033

1 parodynes. Part of that would be ASERL, in this case,
2 since it's a regional with a smaller agreement, but in I
3 think also nationally other areas, other libraries maybe
4 not involved in that agreement, are going to need to
5 understand how that particular group, regional group of
6 libraries is dealing with their disposal and their
7 collecting because it's going to affect how that group
8 of libraries is interacting with the other group. So I
9 just think in terms educating an alternative approaches
10 on those parodyne shifts are going to need to be
11 publicized both regionally and nationally.

12 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
13 State Library. I have a comment and a question for GPO.
14 The comment is relating to what Michelle said about
15 regular consistent, methodical creation of disposal

16 lists and that obviously is the way to go about
17 maintaining your collection. The problem with directors
18 comes when all of a sudden something happens in that
19 library to cause a desire to drastically reduce the size
20 of a depository collection that has not been weeded
21 judiciously over time. I think that is happening more
22 and more in the last few years, putting a burden on
00034

1 regionals as well as the poor selective depository
2 coordinator who is told by the director, you have to get
3 rid of all of this stuff and I want it gone in a month.
4 And my question for GPO is at the end of the first page
5 of Streamline this Process, this handout, the sentence
6 reads, "the library may dispose of the publications in
7 any appropriate manner." Could you give us an example
8 or two of what would be an appropriate manner?

9 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. My colleagues
10 say littering on the highway. That language, I can't
11 think of an inappropriate way right offhand. I took
12 that language from a 1962 instructions.

13 MR. SHULER: Body art.

14 MS. CONCANNON: Marie Concannon, University
15 of Missouri Columbia. One thing that might come into
16 play here is the fact that my university is a public
17 university and we have rules about disposition of
18 university property. For example, Fraser 1 and 2 have a
19 book. They are digitizing a serial. They were missing
20 one issue from 1889 or something and we had a copy and
21 they asked if we might have it for digitization. I
22 looked at it and we had a gift plate in it. It didn't
00035

1 come through the depository program so I could give it
2 to them, but then my boss said, oh, wait a second. We
3 have rules about disposition of university property. We
4 can't just take a book out of a collection and just give
5 it to anybody. You have to be very careful about what
6 you do there. So the question about disposing in an
7 appropriate manner, probably the institution has to
8 check its own internal rules about this.

9 And I think another question that this
10 brings up is after it ceases being government property,
11 if it's cataloged, does it become the property of the
12 library or does it simply become no man's land, nobody's
13 property?

14 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's a good
15 question. If you accessioned it and added it to your

16 collection, and then we have abandoned it, it would seem
17 to me that it would be your property, but I'm not a
18 lawyer. So is that something that we should check with
19 general counsel? We'll take that as an action item with
20 our general counsel and get an affirmative answer for
21 you.

22 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
00036

1 Michigan. I'd kind of appreciate it if this whole
2 handout was updated to include that bit about, I don't
3 know, not having to send proceeds to the superintendent
4 of documents because that seems like a glaring omission
5 here and if you could at that same time clarify that
6 point. I think that makes a huge difference.

7 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'll be glad
8 to do that, Ann, and then we will post this on the
9 project page.

10 MR. SHULER: We've got 30 minutes left in
11 the match.

12 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
13 University. The third question and all of these are
14 very much interrelated, but just to toss it out there.
15 The third question, do you have ideas for how discards
16 could be redistributed to other states or digitization
17 projects? And we have touched on a little bit of this
18 already. Other ideas?

19 MR. SHULER: Council, any further thoughts?
20 Audience?

21 MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North
22 Carolina at Chapel Hill. It used to be that selectives
00037

1 in North Carolina, after I got through with the list, if
2 I didn't take too long, had to post it on our local
3 lister, but as I started making visits, when I became
4 regional to the selectives in the state, I found out
5 nobody was taking the materials off of these lists. So
6 it was a waste of time. So I changed it to suggesting
7 that they could post it on gov.sell or doctogo where
8 people said they had much more luck. I would love to be
9 able to tell them to post it to the national needs and
10 offers list at GPO, but GPO has an onerous 90 day
11 posting requirement and that is way too much for my
12 folks. So I'm curious as to how that 90 day requirement
13 came about and whether or not there is any flexibility
14 in changing that because I have a lot more selectives
15 who would love to post to that list and perhaps give

16 materials to people who need it, rather than recycling
17 it as many are doing at this time.

18 MR. SHULER: GPO?

19 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I don't know,
20 but yes we can be flexible. Would you suggest what, 60
21 days, 30 day, 45?

22 MS. ROWE: Forty-five.

00038

1 MS. ETKIN: Or options. Yes, okay.

2 Consider it done.

3 MR. SHULER: Jill.

4 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
5 at Utah. I can remember 20 or 30 different sessions of
6 the last decades where we asked the same question and I
7 was going to say what I always remember is that we were
8 dealing with snail mail then and 90 days almost was not
9 enough time to send it in and have it processed, bring
10 it back then perhaps decisions had -- you know, reasons
11 for decisions had changed. Some you kept. Some as you
12 remembered discarded. You never -- very rarely did you
13 get permission to discard an entire list at one time.
14 So, yes, so pleased to hear that it was just decided
15 unanimously by GPO that we are going to reduce that time
16 because we live in a much faster communication age now.

17 MR. SHULER: Suzanne.

18 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
19 North Texas. I just want to speak to the part about
20 being redistributed to other states for digitization
21 projects. A lot of why items are not claimed could be
22 the cost of shipping to get those items to your

00039

1 collection. UT is doing a massive digitization and we
2 are taking duplicates from needs and offers lists, but
3 we do have a limit to our budget as to what we can
4 afford to ship. I'm personally driving a truck to Fort
5 Worth to pick up some items, so that it will cost our
6 library less and we can get more items. I know we have
7 people going to the University of Missouri to pick up
8 items this summer in the same way where we basically
9 have staff driving trucks to go and get these so that we
10 can save money. I just think that can be a main reason.
11 I don't know that there is a solution, but we do try to
12 heavily pick up the Texas list because we are using
13 interlibrary owned courier and it saves us money that
14 way. I know there were some items that were available
15 last year that I could not claim because the expense to

16 ship them to my library was going to be way too much.

17 MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago public
18 library. I wanted to briefly address the ownership
19 issue again. Number one, I'll say that it's often hard
20 for our administration to be able to claim that -- we
21 have a large government documents department. And we
22 are able to claim we don't own these things. The
00040

1 federal government does, therefore, you have to treat
2 them kindly, but it seems the logical end to what your
3 legal counsel said is that we could put up an offering
4 list saying large depository library wishes to get rid
5 of everything older than five years old. And then if
6 anybody wants it, they could just -- we could just say,
7 no. We decide to keep it then it's still the federal
8 government property and then everything else turns into
9 our property and that seems like not quite right.

10 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Yes, that is
11 not quite right because there were all these other
12 conditions in here about following the regional's
13 procedures and getting the regional's permission. If
14 Chicago Public were to put their entire collection, that
15 is more than five years old, I think that would be
16 suspect.

17 MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict again. I agree
18 with you, it would be way beyond suspect, but would it
19 be wrong would be the question; you know, if we either
20 gave them away or didn't give them away, you know?

21 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. As Cindy
22 mentioned this is the end part of the process. So you
00041

1 would need to go through your regional and I think it
2 would also need to be considered as part of an overall
3 state plan.

4 MR. WOOD: Steve Woods, Penn State. One of
5 the things that comes to my mind, in terms of this
6 question, in many ways it sort of relates to some of the
7 discussions that the CIC has been having about
8 digitizing -- digitizing a federal collection. And
9 is -- the question that comes to my mind is, is there
10 some sort of special dispensation that a library could
11 have in terms of disposing a collection that ultimately
12 would be made accessible to the public as a digitized
13 item, instead of having to go through this process of
14 needs and offers? And I could see something like this
15 happening in the future where, you know, specific

16 sections, you know, some initiatives by cooperative
17 libraries where they are trying to digitize the whole
18 department of agricultural and they want to do it with
19 destructive scanning, would there be any kind of
20 dispensation to this if the collection was made
21 available to the public?

22 MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders, Library
00042

1 of Michigan. Having already been in that position, I'll
2 take a stab at that and then Cindy can correct me, but
3 generally it's within the law, it's up to the regional.
4 That's a regional decision. I can tell you that I have
5 answered that question in specific cases, both yes or
6 no, depending on what they were asking for, whether or
7 not we owned it and whether or not I felt like it was
8 vital for there to be a copy in the state of Michigan.
9 Regional always has that authority under law. It's just
10 whether or not they can feel like they can make that
11 call in the best interest of having a tangible
12 collection in their area served.

13 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I am not
14 going to correct you, Ann, but I'm going to add to that
15 because the law also says that you have to share your
16 offers with other libraries.

17 MR. SHULER: I would make the observation
18 that this binary relationship between selectives and
19 regionals, most of this conversation has been talking
20 about physical stuff, but we do have a binding
21 relationship with the geography represented by the
22 selectives in particular congressional districts and
00043

1 other designations. So I would suggest it's more than
2 just unburdening a particular library, but it's also a
3 deliberative disengagement of a civic value to a
4 community that needs to be carefully considered in any
5 of this. So it's not just about collections. It's also
6 about service.

7 MR. SHULER: Next slide? Next slide.

8 MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco
9 Public. Staying in the program. What are the exclusive
10 benefits of being a regional depository and what types
11 of incentives are most meaningful to librarians besides
12 chocolate?

13 MR. SHULER: Council? Doughnuts maybe?
14 Audience?

15 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New

16 Mexico. This is one of the \$10 questions that keeps me
17 up at night. When I talk to my director, she asked me
18 this very question, what is the benefit of being a
19 regional anymore? And you know back in the day, Carmen,
20 back in the day. I hired Carman, that's why I can say
21 that. There used to be a lot of incentive to stay in
22 the program. We used to say these collections are
00044

1 valuable. They provide all this great information to a
2 lot of different clients and what not. But we have a
3 new breed of directors that are coming in and they think
4 everything is electronic and that's great. Why do we
5 have these paper intangible collections when I can use
6 that space for special collections, for posters and
7 things like that. And that's the dilemma I face to U of
8 M right now.

9 My director goes, when is GPO going to give
10 me money to keep these things here? And I'm sure there
11 is probably one or two other people in the audience
12 whose directors go, where is the money that I can pay
13 your salary or pay staffers to maintain this stuff and
14 we all know realistically that is probably not ever
15 going to happen, at least in my lifetime. So I don't
16 know what you're looking at for incentives. But I think
17 it's again going back -- like somebody else mentioned
18 earlier, it's a matter of going back and talking to the
19 directors again convincing them that these tangible
20 collections are worth while. That they do continue to
21 compliment electronic collections. That we continue to
22 gather and take a look at and try to figure out how to
00045

1 capture the digital stuff while we preserve and maintain
2 the tangible stuff.

3 I don't know what to say about this anymore.
4 My director is ready for me to kind of go away. I think
5 if I retired tomorrow GPO would get a call the next day
6 to bring the moving vans down and get rid of everything.
7 That's the only reason I stay there. I'm really at a
8 loss. This thing has caused me male pattern baldness
9 long before my time.

10 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
11 California State Library. Thank you for that, Dan.
12 You're not alone. What Dan said is a really eloquent
13 truth among regionals. I think I was the one who wanted
14 that question phrased this way about exclusive benefits
15 because this is a question I think that concerns not

16 just regionals, but also selectives who want regionals
17 to stick around. I think that selectives need to be
18 thinking about this too. And put yourself in the
19 position of both regional coordinators and directors of
20 regional libraries. What exclusive benefit do I get for
21 being a regional? And is it just the feel good stuff
22 about doing my civic duty as an academic library or the
00046

1 flag ship library of my state or a state library or is
2 there something I can point to that has a monetary value
3 that says, yes, I'm getting -- I'm getting that because
4 I'm a regional?

5 MS. NICHOLS: Hi, my name is Celina Nichols.
6 I'm at the library, R.M. Cooper Library at Clemson
7 University. I was really hesitant to stand up. So
8 forgive me. It's really early in the morning and I
9 haven't had enough coffee.

10 I'm actually in a very, very, very unique
11 position of having just recently relinquished regional
12 status. April 15th was our last day. I'm no longer the
13 regional librarian. I'm now the selective librarian. I
14 actually was just kind of dropped into this position and
15 told, hey, you get to stop being a regional. You pissed
16 off a lot of people and, hey, I want you to get rid of a
17 lot of stuff. And oh, by the way, completely wants to
18 move into this area, so you need to get rid of about a
19 quarter of your collection. So I'm actually really glad
20 you guys all brought this up. One of the first things I
21 asked myself is what are the benefits of being a
22 regional? What are the benefits of being a selective?
00047

1 And everybody is talking digital. Digital this and
2 digital that. And in one way it was actually easier for
3 me to be a regional because I was able to say, hey, I
4 can't get rid of anything. Sorry. Go away. And now my
5 problem is, I can't say that anymore. Five years and
6 people want me to get rid of stuff. And I don't trust
7 everything that is digital. Why would I? Things are
8 appearing. Things are going. I come to a meeting and,
9 hey, all the PURLs went down. I've got a lot of mean
10 professors that are going to come after me if I get rid
11 of the wrong thing. So I guess what I'm trying to say,
12 there are benefits of being a regional but at the same
13 time I did go along with not being a regional anymore
14 because I started to thinking about all the
15 possibilities. When you are a selective you have the

16 flexibility to collect like a regional and get rid of
17 things when they are not necessary anymore. And so I
18 almost wish this question had been posted long before
19 when I first started this job because maybe it would
20 have helped me navigate these waters and now I'm up to
21 my eyeballs in trying to figure out how to justify
22 getting rid of this or keep that. I hope somebody can
00048

1 answer this question. What am I suppose to keep and
2 what am I supposed to get rid of?
3 I have been working with my new regional,
4 but it's kind of a big question for me. I know it's a
5 big question for everybody else and it doesn't go away.
6 It's a problem as a regional and it's a problem as a
7 selective. I think what a lot of people are asking is,
8 what is the benefit of staying a depository library? I
9 want to stay in one, but that's one of those questions
10 that keeps me up. And it's one of the things that I
11 have been using trying to work with to explain to people
12 why these documents are important not only to
13 governments, but to different liaison areas because
14 other librarians don't understand. Everybody looks at
15 me because I'm a goof. What's a library? What is a
16 depository library? What are all these government
17 documents? And I guess that's why I keep coming to
18 these meetings. I keep hoping that somebody will
19 explain to me how I can tell all these things to all
20 these people. But thank you.

21 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre
22 Dame. I have been coming to these meetings almost 30
00049

1 years and I always enjoy the needs and offers
2 discussion. It arrives at such concrete solutions of
3 how things are going. And it does fill up lonely hours
4 here at these meetings. I'm glad you moved onto this
5 particular one because sitting in the back of the room
6 it gets a little frustrating.

7 Right now we are trying to figure the
8 benefits to remain whatever, selective, regional. If I
9 understand, I was talking with a colleague in the back,
10 there's a clause in there that says if you want to give
11 up your status, you're supposed to ship this back to
12 GPO, correct? Is that still in there? At the library's
13 expense you have to return this government property to
14 someone representing the right one. I think some of the
15 our directors would rethink the cost benefit of a

16 business library if suddenly the price tag was there
17 that says, yes, we are more than willing to allow you to
18 give up your status and whatever, but, you know. And
19 the young lady who was just here, you have some regional
20 only content that in my opinion if the director decided
21 to give it, up needs to find it, pack it up and ship it
22 back to GPO at the director's cost. I think you would
00050

1 suddenly find the directors going, it's probably in our
2 best interest to retain the status. It is cheaper than
3 to find, box up and send back to someone else what they
4 own. And this is based on a shrinking engineering
5 library when the dean of engineer says, I need half of
6 your space and we presented him with the bill that says,
7 here is how much it is going to cost us to reduce the
8 space by half in the time frame that you have dictated
9 to us. And the dean changed their mind. So much as I
10 like the carrot approach, what is in this for us? We
11 are here to do due diligence and to serve, you know, the
12 citizens of the United States. There is that flip side
13 that says, okay, people have been giving this up at
14 absolutely no cost to them, you know. Is there someone
15 from Detroit Public here before I pick on Detroit
16 Public?

17 MS. SANDERS: No.

18 MR. HAYES: They cherry picked, if I
19 understood and selected what they wanted and did not
20 want. I'm sorry. What was the upside for us to let
21 them give up their regional status? They want -- you
22 know, it was nothing but a benefit to them instead of
00051

1 there has to be some cost. Yes, it's costing you too
2 much, but guess what, you need to get rid of that
3 regional only material that is now a benefit for a
4 selective who used to be a regional instead of, you
5 know, you need to behave like a selective like the rest
6 of us. We have to go to a regional to get that because
7 if it was a regional only maybe there would be a little
8 bit more. I'm sorry. It's a little irritating this
9 only carrot, only carrot. There has to be a stick in
10 there too that says give it up, ship it back. The first
11 time GPO presented the bill that says, here is your
12 shipping bill. We are loaning it out to the directors
13 as to, maybe this is not the best way to garner space.

14 MR. SHULER: There are 10 minutes left in
15 the match. May I suggest that we introduce the last

16 question?

17 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
18 Valparaiso University Law Library. Steve would like us
19 to change that question to what are the exclusive
20 penalties of dropping regional depository status? It
21 could be a valid point.

22 MR. SHULER: I will make the observation
00052

1 that docs for dollars I think is going to change the
2 equation. So we've only got 10 minutes left so let's
3 introduce the last question.

4 MR. CISMOWSKI: The last one and I was
5 trying to crane my neck because the angle here means I
6 can't read the monitor. What practical steps can GPO
7 regionals and selectives take to ease the administrative
8 burden on libraries and ensure their continued
9 participation?

10 MR. SHULER: Okay, Barb.

11 MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby University of
12 Virginia. And sorry, but I'm going to get back to the
13 exclusive benefits. And one thing that GPO did offer
14 regionals about, three or four years ago, were the OCLC
15 records which are a benefit and a problem because then
16 if you supercede things you have all these map records,
17 but that was an exclusive benefit and I'm glad that it
18 is no longer going to be exclusive because I think it's
19 a great thing to offer libraries is that cataloging for
20 our government documents.

21 Incentives meaningful maybe this would even
22 apply to this last question as well about easing
00053

1 administrative burdens. But for instance with Steve, if
2 Detroit Public had offered to digitize those materials
3 that they were getting rid of or they wanted to get rid
4 of, for me if there were a way for large selectives or
5 even regionals, if I were to say, I could digitize to
6 GPO standards this part of my collection and it's owned
7 by six other regionals in the southeast, can I digitize
8 it, get it into FDsys because it's all to standard and
9 they are starting to take nonGPO originated materials
10 then would I be able to discard it? That would be an
11 incentive.

12 And as with Dan, five years ago I said there
13 was no pressure on me not to be a regional and there
14 certainly is now. I mean it's space, space, space. So
15 if there were some way, either within current title 44

16 or with something beyond title 44, to let regionals or
17 large selectives digitize and then offer, that would be
18 an incentive.

19 MS. BAYER: Hi, Kathy Bayer, GPO. Sorry to
20 put you on the spot, David or Council, but I was
21 wondering if you can apply some explanation to
22 administrative burden. We hear this all the time. Some
00054

1 of it is accurate and some is not and I feel sometimes
2 that I act as a myth buster. So I was just wondering if
3 you could explain that. Thanks.

4 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
5 State Library. I'll give it a shot because I don't know
6 what was in the collective mind of the rest of the
7 people. But when I look at that, I think about the
8 things that both directors and coordinators of
9 depositories have to do in order to stay in good graces.
10 And I think you are right, Kathy, that a lot of what
11 people think they have to do, they no longer really,
12 truly have to do, but there are some things -- I mean,
13 even the biennial survey is a burden for somebody even
14 though it's required by law. But are there some other
15 things that even in the new era are required of
16 depositories that are not really all that central and
17 could be dispensed with?

18 MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO. I know the
19 Outreach librarians work very proactively trying to
20 dispel those myths and what we are always saying is that
21 there is -- continues to be flexibility in the program
22 and libraries do have that. There are some processes
00055

1 like the discard lists that obviously are a burden. I'm
2 not sure how the biennial survey, short survey every two
3 years would be a burden, other than we still have a
4 hundred libraries that haven't submitted the survey, but
5 it is something we come across all the time and I just
6 wanted to for context sake bring this up. Thanks.

7 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
8 State Library. I think that because these were designed
9 to be discussion generating questions that that is
10 primarily something to be thrown out for your response.
11 Are there administrative burdens that I have as a
12 depository that you see as inconsequential? Why do I
13 have to do this? What benefit does this have to my
14 abilities to run the depository for the national good?

15 MS. CLARK: Mary Clark, University of

16 Virginia, Richmond. This isn't what I would consider
17 practical so I guess this series of questions are to GPO
18 and Council. Several years ago we were having
19 conversations about our dark archives and that kind of
20 dropped away. I think the reason I bring it up is I
21 think a lot of people were rather intrigued by it just
22 as Jay's stories come by with their dark archive concept
00056

1 where people feel, okay, now that we know that there is
2 dedicated collections we can withdraw things in a more
3 timely manner. We don't have to worry about we are
4 getting rid of something that no one else has. So I'm
5 just curious is that gone?

6 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The dark
7 archive concept in terms of having one collection in the
8 east and one in the west put forward by the former
9 superintendent of documents, was not approved by senior
10 management at GPO in terms of an authority action or by
11 our legal counsel. That said, you know, I continue to
12 look at our archival affiliate agreement with NARA as an
13 opportunity for what I call that east collection at
14 least.

15 MS. CLARK: Thank you and then a comment in
16 terms of practical steps. At this juncture I just think
17 we need to make a concerted effort to modify title 44.
18 There is too much specificity there and it's to the
19 point now where people are like, it's too rigid. It
20 can't change and we are just going to get out because
21 GPO is not going to show up with the truck. They are
22 just not. So we can keep the material we want to keep.
00057

1 So I understand what I'm trying could be controversial
2 to some, but I think this rigidity or the lack of
3 wanting to do something because we can't control that
4 entire process, is making the system almost obsolete.
5 So that was just a comment.

6 MR. SHULER: We've still got two minutes on
7 the clock.

8 MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, I'm still
9 advocating chocolate as an incentive to stay in the
10 program. I think it's the only thing that will work.

11 I think this last question is an excellent
12 question, but you may be addressing it to the wrong
13 group. This would be something very good to have the
14 regional librarians to take out to their selective
15 depositories and talk to them about because I don't know

16 that this group sees particular administrative burdens.
17 But the people who don't get to come to national
18 meetings, that come once a year to a meeting within
19 their state if they are lucky, are the ones who maybe
20 able to answer this question, much more to the level
21 that you are looking at because I don't feel that there
22 is a burden. But I also think that I'm well educated
00058

1 and work with this quite a bit. I also think when you
2 talk about incentives, you have to be very careful
3 because there are many things that the GPO can't do.
4 They can't give us equipment. They can't pay for staff
5 and that it brings up in a director's mind, like Dan was
6 saying, that is something that is possible and they
7 don't have statutory authority to do that. So I think
8 we need to be very careful about what the GPO can't do
9 when having that discussion about incentives.

10 MS. JOBE: Hi, Peggy Jobe, University of
11 Colorado at Boulder. I'm not feeling any pressure to
12 drop our regional status, but what I am feeling pressure
13 to do is to downsize our onsite collection and ascend a
14 lot of it to storage. My problem with anything in
15 storage, because we have to do it fairly rapidly, is I
16 have to look for big swaths of material that I can send
17 on one or two bib records because that's the only way
18 that we can clear out large amounts of shelf space. So
19 what we are not moving out are little, tiny things that
20 we could do a hundred of them and we get six inches. So
21 what that does for us is that we are keeping outdated
22 health information in the HE's which really is
00059

1 problematic so we have an overall stacks plan that says
2 we'll move this off and we can get this much space
3 because we are losing a lot of onsite space. I looked
4 at this and I looked at our stacks plan and I said, what
5 is our brand? We are losing our brand. If we were
6 going to keep the things that were really useful here,
7 we would not be keeping the same things. We are keeping
8 things that's (inaudible) because of the cataloging
9 issue. And if I were to say our brand is the history of
10 the United States, rich environmental information, rich
11 demographic information, we should be making some
12 different decisions about the collection. So I would
13 like to see more flexibility for the regionals to
14 actually say, you know, we don't need this. It's
15 outdated. If we are running a public library we'd be

16 embarrassed to have this outdated information on our
17 shelves. So I would actually like the ability to -- to
18 the best of my ability collect for the region, but make
19 some withdrawal decisions.

20 MR. SHULER: Two last questions, Suzanne.

21 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
22 North Texas. I wanted to comment directly to you -- I'm
00060

1 sorry you sat down and I can't see. At the University
2 of North Texas before I got there they had to do a
3 major, major move of material to offsite storage to make
4 space. And the solution that we came up with, Robin
5 Mohamed came and did a public access assessment on my
6 library in October and she said it was fine. We don't
7 have time right now for me to go into the details, but
8 if you will see me I can talk to you about what we did.
9 There is no reason to keep things on your shelf that
10 should be in remote storage, against things that you're
11 sending to remote storage that you should keep on your
12 shelf.

13 MS. JOBE: Thanks. I'll look for you.

14 MR. SHULER: Bring us home.

15 MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth, University of
16 South Carolina. I think other than replacing the old
17 cost benefit, which the benefit was if the materials
18 were there and they were benefit to the library, it's
19 now the information, unless you can replace that benefit
20 with some kind of ability to help libraries to cover the
21 cost, what we are left with is the flexibility to be
22 able to do what we can to share the costs along the
00061

1 regionals and among the libraries within each state and
2 that's about all we are left with.

3 MR. SHULER: The time clock has run out and
4 I thank everyone for successfully completing this third
5 plenary. The Council will convene again in a half an
6 hour to begin its first work session in which we will be
7 considering what happened in October. Come if you're
8 interested. It's declared ended.

9 (Break in proceedings.)

10 MR. SHULER: I begin with the handout that
11 was given to us by GPO with the PURLs incident. You've
12 had a chance to review that. Is there any discussion
13 amongst the Council members and GPO about that incident
14 that we wish to do here? Blank looks.

15 MR. OTTO: Justin Otto from Eastern

16 Washington University. This is a question for GPO so
17 yes from that document, just to make sure I understand,
18 a new PURL server and that is be contracted out? So
19 that is going to be a private firm that is running it
20 now on GPO's behalf, is that right?

21 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Yes, Justin,
22 that's correct. As a matter of fact, James Mauldin, in
00062

1 our afternoon two o'clock session as part of the CMP
2 Collection Management Preservation update, is, again, I
3 believe talking about it in some detail. But to answer
4 your question directly, to reaffirm it, it's going to be
5 a hosted solution. It's going to have realtime
6 fail-over. So when we talk about some of those enhanced
7 tools that that will have, that is kind of part of the
8 whole package, but, yes, it would be a hosted solution
9 all the way.

10 MR. SHULER: Other questions from Council
11 about the PURLs? And while they're still considering
12 that, Ted, we can have some assurance that this is going
13 to address the central problem that caused the failure
14 in the first place, does it not? That's an affirmative?

15 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO, that's an
16 affirmative.

17 MR. SHULER: James has a question.

18 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
19 University. Maybe I can talk to Mike and the folks
20 later on, but I was wondering if there is a way that
21 those PURLs can also point to content that is off of GPO
22 servers? There may be libraries that have digital
00063

1 collections that would like to be part of that PURLs
2 system and I think that would be a real incentive for
3 libraries to keep participating in the depository
4 library.

5 MR. SHULER: So you're talking about
6 distributed PURLs?

7 MR. JACOBS: I am indeed talking about
8 distributed PURLs. Something that I know DOI can do.
9 And they are looking into DOI for FDsys, but it is not
10 part of FDsys right now, but I know DOI can point to
11 multiple institutes of the same digital content. If
12 library hosted content can be part of that whole
13 failsafe solution if a GPO server does go down, it
14 automatically points that to a library server somewhere
15 that has that same content. That would be amazing.

16 MR. SHULER: Ted?

17 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Thanks for
18 putting that forward. The one response I'd have is that
19 certainly is an opportunity for GPO. That is something
20 where we would look at if we had a formal partnership in
21 place with that institution, then by all means that PURL
22 using that technology would point to that content. If
00064

1 we don't have a formal partnership in place, based on
2 our permanent public access role, we would want to have
3 that on GPO permanent to enable that.

4 MR. SHULER: So you would be looking for a
5 relationship with the organization. Other questions?

6 MS. MORIEARTY: User testing. I'm sorry.
7 Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I see that the user
8 testing is continuing. Is that inhouse? Do you need
9 anyone externally to test it as hard as we possibly
10 could crank it?

11 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. It's part of
12 the validation process that our in-house folks and James
13 Mauldin and his team have done. They haven't requested
14 that yet, but we can certainly look at that as part of
15 when we get through the internal training of our stuff
16 whether that load testing, outside of what we have done,
17 would be needed or for an additional level of assurance
18 perhaps.

19 MR. SHULER: Chris.

20 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, Office of Science
21 and Technology Policy. This is the first I have heard
22 about outsourcing the PURL server and that's an
00065

1 interesting step. Until now the central strategy at GPO
2 has been inhouse in terms of FDsys and its related
3 services. Can you say a little bit about whether the
4 strategy for inhouse versus acquired services has
5 changed or maybe just summarize that strategy for us?

6 MR. PRIEBE: Welcome, Chris. Ted Priebe
7 GPO. So when Ric Davis had talked about the bridge to
8 stability in this particular legacy technology solution,
9 the best path for GPO and what we felt for the Community
10 was to have that hosted solution with that fail-over,
11 based upon that particular enhanced software utility
12 that they had developed. I think when you look at it
13 from a strategic perspective, it's going to be a
14 case-by-case. If we have a legacy system that is more
15 conducive in the short to midterm to have as a hosted

16 piece, then we are going to look at that. If it's
17 something that can be integrated much like that list
18 technology where we are working multiple legacy systems
19 to bring in-house on a single solution, it's going to be
20 where a case-by-case basis, whether it's stability or
21 the long term piece. So it's not a yes or no answer.
22 We look at the technologies that are in our existing
00066

1 tool belt, as well as the requirements that we have from
2 a community prospective to come up with the answer on
3 any given technology.

4 MR. GREER: Just a followup. Chris Greer,
5 Office of Science and Technology. But case-by-case is
6 not a strategy, it's a tactic. So part of that overall
7 architecture set of issues is how do you integrate the
8 various components, functional components into an
9 operational hold that works for a lot of different
10 settings?

11 So you're in the process of revising how you
12 are going to handle the Enterprise Server Bus, that is
13 an integrating function. It seems like a lot of the
14 integrating elements are kind of up in the air right now
15 and this is not a time for that to be true.

16 So I guess I would like to spend a little
17 bit of time offline hearing a little bit more about the
18 integration strategy, particularly where case-by-case
19 services solutions are going to be on the table.

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
21 State Library. Right now quite a few depositories are
22 using the statistical reporting from the PURL referrals
00067

1 to justify the purchase of bibliographic records that
2 contain PURLs. What affect if any is this hosted
3 solution and the transition going to have on the
4 integrity and stability of that PURL referral
5 statistical reporting.

6 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe GPO. So in answer
7 to your question about the integrity of it, it will
8 actually be an enhanced capability. We've got the
9 requirements there. As a matter of fact, in terms of
10 the whole interface and the ability to enter multiple
11 URL's to provide statistics and be able to drill down
12 into those statistics, you are actually going to be able
13 to see much more then what we have been able to offer
14 with that legacy technology. So it's going to be full
15 access. The exact number of months that we are going to

16 have, we really have to get through that final user
17 testing depending on the size of the data base. But to
18 directly answer your question, it will be equal to and
19 enhanced in many ways from what we currently have.
20 MR. SHULER: Other questions from Council?
21 We have come to a point on whether how we continue this
22 conversation, if we need to continue it. I'd like to
00068

1 get a sense from Council, where do you want to go with
2 this?

3 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP. Maybe a way
4 to do this is to have an offline conversation, bring a
5 couple of us up to speed on a strategy and then defer
6 that discussion to a later session.

7 THE AUDIENCE: Can you speak up please?

8 MR. GREER: I'm sorry. Chris Greer, Office
9 of Science Technology Policy. Let's have an offline
10 discussion and then continue that at a later session.

11 MR. SHULER: Reaction? Is that acceptable
12 to Council? So we will push this to an offline
13 conversation, probably a phone call, here in a couple of
14 weeks, and then see where that takes us.

15 Anything else on the PURLs? All right.
16 Let's go on to the consultant work. Something that
17 Council asked GPO to do a year ago I believe and this is
18 where they are now with it. I believe Ric also gave us
19 a brief update in his presentation yesterday morning.
20 After this moment of consideration, does Council want to
21 do anything further with this?

22 MR. OTTO: Justin Otto from Eastern
00069

1 Washington University. I understand that it's in
2 procurement and, therefore, a whole lot can't be said
3 about it. But I think a little more explanation, if you
4 can please, about how this whole -- just in general how
5 this kind of process works? At this point where you
6 can't really say anything about it, does that mean an
7 outside contractor has been selected like it was put out
8 to bid and someone has been selected and now it's where
9 you've got to be quiet until all the details are worked
10 out, is that how that is?

11 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. No, not at
12 this point. We have sent a statement of work to our
13 procurement folks that outlines the requirements that we
14 need of a contractor. That has to go through the
15 approval process through our general counsel to make

16 sure everything is okay and then it will be posted on
17 fedbisops and contractors will have the opportunity to
18 bid.

19 MR. OTTO: Thank you.

20 MR. SHULER: Okay, any other reaction from
21 Council members? How does Council wish to proceed on
22 this?

00070

1 MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco
2 Public. Once they get them on board is where the real
3 work begins and we really hope that they work with
4 Council -- I mean GPO and Council work together to set
5 priorities and I think that is part of the requirement.
6 So I don't think we can do much until we get somebody
7 selected.

8 MR. SHULER: So we can put this on the watch
9 list until the next time of activity? Chris?

10 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, Office of Science
11 and Technology Policy. Is there a deliverable timeline
12 that you can show us when, what, Council and this
13 Community when will the output be delivered not what the
14 process is. What's the time line?

15 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Chris, that's
16 a fair question. I think in terms of any procurement,
17 GPO as a part of that statement of work has proposed a
18 timeline, but to be totally honest with you, depending
19 on the responses that we get and potential alternative
20 time frames, I think the most appropriate thing would be
21 to wait for that procurement process to come through.
22 But from a general sense, let's talk about it in terms

00071

1 of several months, not several years. But the exact
2 time frame I think we need to let that procurement
3 process come out depending on the responses we get that
4 would be part of the award process and we'd reaffirm it
5 at that time.

6 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP, so would it
7 be fair to expect say some national disaster,
8 deliverable by the next Council meeting?

9 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. When we talk
10 about a deliverable, the statement of work is going to
11 have multiple deliverables with multiple milestones
12 within them. So in terms of the entire process being
13 completed, I don't know if I'd go to that level of
14 detail. There certainly will be things completed.
15 Whether the entire process is done or portions of the

16 study are completed, that's really to be determined, I
17 think. But we will no doubt see a good bit of progress
18 by the fall meeting.

19 MR. GREER: Again, this is Chris Greer, OSTP.
20 What would be the longest timeline that would be
21 acceptable to GPO? What's your drop dead date on
22 completing this? Do you have an end in mind?
00072

1 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I don't think
2 we want to take something as important as this and
3 define a milestone that if it is a day later than that
4 it wouldn't be useful. So to go back to my first
5 response, the defined final deliverable time is going to
6 be something that we agree to and approve, based on the
7 responses that we get to that statement of work. So I
8 think we need to let that process go through, see what
9 kind of responses we got, and what the vendor community
10 can support and go from there.

11 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP. So a
12 consultant is envisioned in order to provide a snapshot
13 in time to help with planning and so on. So a bit of
14 advice that never actually arrives isn't useful. And so
15 setting some kind of timeline on this process so that,
16 you know, there is advice on the table, there are
17 tangibles to act on, I think seems critical. We are a
18 year into this cycle already. We are talking about now
19 maybe another year in that process; that's not agile
20 enough, it really isn't in order to get input. And so I
21 would like to see a revised timeline for this that gets
22 advice, significant advice on the table by the next
00073

1 Council meeting.

2 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. The -- there
3 is a timeline that we developed as Ric had mentioned and
4 as I was trying to reaffirm earlier. We can't really
5 get into that kind of detail before this procurement
6 goes out. I can assure you when it's on fedbisops you
7 will see the definitive time tables that we have opposed
8 or recommended. So at this point that's all we can
9 really get into, I think. When that is posted, you'll
10 see all the information that is there as well as the
11 time frames.

12 MR. SHULER: Does Council think it's
13 reasonable to ask GPO with an official update within a X
14 number of months in the process and where we are in the
15 whole matter say by July 1st? Would that be reasonable

16 and maybe try to address some of that with Chris's
17 concerns that the timeline might be more flushed out and
18 described? That could be an official Council request?
19 Is everyone agreeable? All right. Thanks. Anything
20 else? All right. Let's close that item if there is no
21 other discussion from Council and let's move to the
22 perennial question of statistics and though this was not
00074

1 a specific recommendation, it was a concern that popped
2 up on a regular basis at least to the spring and October
3 meetings. I just wanted to put it back in front of us
4 to see what the -- looking at the statistics might
5 generate. Suzanne?

6 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
7 North Texas. Are we talking about the second page out
8 of the status report on the consulting?

9 MR. SHULER: Yes, that's the one I'm talking
10 about.

11 MS. SEARS: Comments on those statistics?

12 MR. SHULER: Yes, I want to get comments on
13 those statistics to see if it generates anything with
14 you all.

15 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
16 North Texas. I found a lot of things interesting from
17 these statistics, as I'm sure everybody did. The
18 digitized historical collections are needed by 60 plus
19 percentage of the respondents. Also that the FDL
20 Community OPAL conferences are all listed as the five
21 least important services. But I also was curious about
22 the number of respondents because this is a separate
00075

1 survey then the biennial survey and so we will also have
2 the biennial survey statistics to you and I think that
3 those would be important as well.

4 MR. SHULER: I was going to add that as an
5 addendum that we consider these statistics with anything
6 we know about the biennial survey and see if it
7 generates -- comparing those statistical instances and
8 see if it generates any discussion from Council
9 indicating further Council action. It's hard to say.

10 So Suzanne has made a few observations.
11 Does anybody want to throw in a few more?

12 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
13 California State Library. For the benefit of those
14 people who may be out there saying what are we talking
15 about here, there is a handout in your packet that's

16 headed Customer Relationships Program Status Report and
17 it's the second page of that or the flip side of that
18 handout that we are discussing right now.

19 MR. SHULER: Cindy, how are you?

20 MS. ETKIN: Hi, John.

21 MR. SHULER: What have you got to say?

22 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I think if

00076

1 I'm hearing Suzanne correctly, I think there is a little
2 bit of confusion about the different surveys that were
3 done. There have been two surveys; the first one was
4 the segmentation survey and the second one was a
5 combined needs assessment biennial survey. Two
6 different surveys.

7 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
8 North Texas. So, Cindy, these statistics we have at the
9 bottom that says needs assessment, those are the
10 biennial survey responses?

11 MS. ETKIN: The first half of the survey was
12 related to the needs assessment. The second half of the
13 survey was related to the biennial survey because it was
14 that time again to do one and rather over survey you
15 all, we combined the needs assessment and biennial
16 survey. So the first part of the survey was to give us
17 information about your needs, how we are doing on the
18 services we are providing and trying to find out from
19 the depository community what you all need, what you all
20 want that we aren't providing. And what you're seeing
21 here on the backside of that handout is preliminary data
22 from the aggregate. Now I have this. This the

00077

1 aggregated data as well as the segmentation data that I
2 got just before we came here. So what this shows is
3 responses of the whole. And if you look at the
4 segmentation survey, you can see that 71 percent are
5 academic in the program. Seventeen percent public one percent
6 special and eleven percent government. So you can see
7 how these overall data might be skewed toward academic
8 needs, which is why it was so important for us to do the
9 segmentation survey and then get survey results from the
10 needs assessment/biennial survey into those different
11 segments because then we will be able to target what we
12 do to different types of libraries.

13 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
14 North Texas. So, Cindy, up at the top it says the
15 segmentation survey only 868 of the 1240 depository

16 libraries completed it and then the needs assessment is
17 1,127. So really the segmentation survey is still
18 missing quite a few libraries, is that correct?
19 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Yes. That
20 survey only got 868 responses. And what Outsell
21 actually did, was go look at the profiles of the
22 libraries that did not submit and categorize them in one
00078

1 of the segments for us.

2 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
3 North Texas. I'm sorry. I'm still very, very confused.
4 So the surveys were combined, but only -- so the people
5 just didn't answer that question then, the 400 libraries
6 that were missing for the --

7 MS. ETKIN: No, no. The segmentation survey
8 was a separate survey that was conducted in May of last
9 year? May and June of last year followed up by the
10 needs assessment/biennial survey which was done October
11 through February.

12 MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders, Library
13 of Michigan. I may be missing something, but if I add
14 up the number of libraries in this -- these different --
15 what are they, sectors and types? I don't get either
16 the 868 that answered the survey nor the 1240 that exist
17 in the program. So I can't figure out the statistics.

18 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Because they
19 gave us a primary type and a secondary type, so that we
20 could slice and dice data different ways. So, for
21 instance, a depository library like the San Bernardino
22 County Law Library would be a public -- it's a county
00079

1 library, public library and also government because it's
2 county government. Not all librarians got secondary.
3 We left that up to the library to choose.

4 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
5 Michigan. I'm still confused though because I thought
6 you said that Outsell went and looked at the profiles of
7 libraries that didn't respond to the survey and
8 categorize them for you. So shouldn't there be at least
9 1240 in libraries here?

10 MS. ETKIN: I hope I don't have --

11 MS. SANDERS: I mean, it seems like we
12 should have more than 1240 if nothing else and I'm not
13 getting that. I'm a word person not a number person,
14 but --

15 MS. ETKIN: I'm getting 975.

16 MS. SANDERS: Yes, I'm getting 975.

17 MS. ETKIN: I'll go back and make sure I
18 don't have a typo. I think we will review this. What
19 were you going to say, John?

20 MR. SHULER: The reason why I threw this
21 back into our attention circle, if you will, is because
22 I thought with all the important policy advisory things
00080

1 we need to do over the next several months, having some
2 common set of statistics about our Community would be
3 very useful and we need to factor into a more complete
4 reporting of the biennial survey. So what my hope was
5 this would be the first of several conversations about
6 what the state of our libraries are as we move into
7 issues of FDsys, as we move into issues of regional
8 selective relationships, digitization and access. All
9 the big topics we just talked about over the last day
10 and-a-half I think are good theoretical topics, but if
11 we don't have a sound statistical grounding then we are
12 not going to be able to advise very well. So call me
13 crazy. I just thought I'd start the conversation with
14 this piece of paper, see where it goes, see what other
15 statistics we might need. It indicates to me we have a
16 little bit more conversation about it. Would I be
17 wrong?

18 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Well, crazy?
19 You said call you crazy, but this is preliminary data
20 so --

21 MR. SHULER: Raw.

22 MS. ETKIN: Yes. So we still yet have to
00081

1 look at the segmentation data and there were still a
2 couple of questions that I had of the Outsell folks and
3 they are reviewing the data again. So we will get a
4 more complete report out to you, but again this is based
5 on preliminary data.

6 MR. SHULER: Is there any sense of Council
7 of when we would desire that data?

8 MS. SANDERS: Yesterday.

9 MR. SHULER: Does anyone want to suggest a
10 date?

11 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP. Two things;
12 this is a biennial survey. It was completed last
13 summer. So it's almost a year old now. At what point
14 is the survey -- we were taking by events as we are sort
15 of into the next cycle. What would be your optimal

16 cycle for getting this survey data and the analysis of
17 that? What would be the target that GPO would have in
18 terms of time?

19 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The biennial
20 survey was through February of this year.

21 MR. GREER: Okay. I misunderstood. Thank
22 you.

00082

1 MS. ETKIN: And I'm expecting reports back
2 from Outsell next week.

3 MR. GREER: Just some preliminary feedback.
4 I think the strategy for understanding the segmentation
5 and the distinct needs of different sectors is a very
6 good one, very appropriate. Do you have any sense, at
7 looking at the preliminary data, whether there are
8 significant differences, for example, in response to
9 most important services?

10 MS. ETKIN: Absolutely there are
11 differences. That's why it is so very important to get
12 that data, to get that data reported.

13 MR. GREER: Good. So that's an argument
14 sooner rather than later --

15 MS. ETKIN: Yes. For instance when you look
16 at the least important services provided by the FDLP,
17 conferences and online training rank very high, yet we
18 have had very good responses to conferences and to the
19 use of the OPAL for online training. And you'll see in
20 the preliminary data that I have, there's a very high
21 need and a very important need from some of the smaller
22 librarians, from public libraries and some of the

00083

1 smaller to medium size libraries, not so much the large
2 libraries. So we expect to have important services that
3 we are providing to show up differently for each of the
4 segment as well as by library size.

5 MR. SHULER: Jill.

6 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
7 of Utah. John, getting back to what you requested from
8 Council about possibly when we would want this.

9 MR. SHULER: Yes.

10 MS. MORIEARTY: May I just throw out perhaps
11 May 15th? Is that considered to be enough time to get
12 it done and updated well and still get it to Council so
13 we can consider some of these services and these stats?

14 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Maybe.
15 Looking at my schedule, I will also have to review what

16 comes back to me to make sure we are on terra firma
17 there.

18 MR. SHULER: If we turn that around and give
19 that to you by next week, how close can you get to May
20 15th? John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago.

21 MS. ETKIN: More realistically the end of
22 May.

00084

1 MR. SHULER: The end of May?

2 MS. MORIEARTY: I was going to say my
3 tendency is as long as it doesn't take forever. Take
4 the time to do it right and have it be thoroughly
5 informative to the Council. If it takes until the end
6 of May then it's got to be here at the end of May. Is
7 that fair to you? Oh, yes it is.

8 MS. ETKIN: Yes.

9 MR. SHULER: Rest of, Council, how does that
10 rest with you?

11 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
12 Valparaiso University Law Library. This year the
13 biennial survey had a number of different questions
14 which were those -- Outsell helped you generate those,
15 is that correct?

16 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO, yes.
17 Outsell -- we worked with Outsell to create those
18 questions and those are the ones that were part of the
19 needs assessment portion of the survey.

20 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Do you plan to like in the
21 not biennial survey have similar help doing needs
22 assessment at that time or will you go back to the
00085

1 traditional biennial survey questions?

2 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'm still
3 looking at this survey. I haven't thought about the
4 next one yet and I know where you are going about the
5 questions. We need to see how useful this information
6 is and whether it's good enough or valuable enough for
7 us to continue this process.

8 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Okay, if you knew where I
9 was going, I'll go there anyway.

10 MS. ETKIN: Okay.

11 MS. HOLTERHOFF: There were a few of the
12 questions that I really felt perhaps made it really
13 difficult to answer. The one about your -- I forget how
14 it was phrased, but your service area verses who you do
15 serve, that was a very hard question to answer. And I

16 can't imagine that the -- based on the facts, the way
17 people were told to answer it was so odd. I can't
18 imagine that is going to be that useful of information.
19 There is something in me that doesn't like
20 to see us asking what are the least important things
21 that we do. Because that seems like such a negative way
22 to look at it. And as you said, it depends on where you
00086

1 are sitting what is the least important, but labeling
2 certain things as unimportant like conferences, for
3 example, seems unfortunate to me. So I was just
4 wondering, getting to a point here, next time if
5 questions are going to be changed, maybe could you run
6 them by the Depository Library Council just to like --
7 as a reality check, a test. Because sometimes testing
8 the survey with some people who are -- or some other
9 group, I don't know, some real depository librarians
10 testing it, to find out what things make it really
11 difficult to answer because I guess I'm wondering if the
12 reason that there are still some nonrespondents to that
13 is people are still trying to figure out how to answer
14 -- maybe not. Maybe someone just forget about it, but
15 some of those questions weren't that easy to answer and
16 I think it was honestly they weren't that good of
17 questions, but my opinion. Thank you.

18 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I think the
19 question you are referring to, the best estimate of
20 approximate number of potential users and actual users?

21 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, that's the question.

22 MS. ETKIN: And there was also an option to
00087

1 say don't know so they can move on. So that shouldn't
2 have been a big deal. If it was don't know, they don't
3 know, but there shouldn't have been a whole lot of
4 discussion about that one, but there was.

5 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
6 North Texas. Cindy, probably the reason there was all
7 that discussion was because as librarians we don't like
8 to say we don't know. So we really try to find an
9 answer and those of us who want to respond to the survey
10 and give you valid data, really struggle with trying to
11 figure out exactly what you were trying to get at there,
12 so we could give you valid data. So I think that that
13 again speaks to Sally's comment that it needs to be run
14 by a test of librarians because you may not realize the
15 way that we read the question that we take it the way we

16 do. And that is one of those because honestly I don't
17 know very many librarians that like to say I don't know.

18 MR. SHULER: James.

19 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
20 University. I wonder if it wouldn't be a good idea for
21 Council to come up with a broad list of points or ideas
22 that we want answered and give that to GPO for them to
00088

1 build a survey before the survey gets built itself. I'm
2 really interested in the idea of incentives to stay in
3 the program and so if there was pointed questions, if
4 GPO knew that Council was interested in finding out
5 about incentives, maybe they could build some questions
6 that were pointed towards that idea.

7 MR. SHULER: What's the sense of Council?

8 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
9 University. Are there capabilities on the Community
10 suite of Web services to have, you know, quick Web
11 poles, those kinds of things, to gather information in
12 ways that don't require a formal biennial or other kind
13 of survey?

14 MR. SHULER: Survey monkeys, for instance?

15 MR. PRIEBE. Ted Priebe, GPO. For the FDLP
16 Community site I think if you have some specific
17 requirements in terms of what Council would like to have
18 in terms of a service offering, we can certainly talk
19 about what those are, but right off the cuff, we don't
20 have generic survey tools on there, but that doesn't
21 preclude the opportunity to investigate one.

22 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
00089

1 University. I think any survey like this that we
2 consider, you know, has to be thought through because
3 there is a burden on the other end of folks diligently
4 wanting to answer the questions validly, but it probably
5 wouldn't be a bad idea for a group of Council members
6 and others to think about what kinds of questions might
7 go forward in terms of not just this question, this
8 round of questions, but over a period of time what kinds
9 of questions and what kind of data we might want to
10 gather from the Community.

11 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
12 California State Library. I'd like to throw out a
13 suggestion for Council that could perhaps turn into
14 recommendations; which is that the spring before
15 biennial survey is conducted GPO asks Council what

16 questions would Council like asked in this biennial
17 survey and then at the fall meeting, before the biennial
18 survey is released, the actual text of the questions be
19 given to Council or maybe even tested by a small group
20 to ferret out ambiguity or bias or things like that.
21 Almost everybody who also conducted a survey knows that
22 the way questions are worded determines outcome.

00090

1 Political groups phrase questions very, very carefully
2 because they want people to answer a certain way.
3 Neutral groups take steps to abolish any ambiguity so
4 that you get consistent results, maybe not a 100 percent
5 but at least 90 to 95 percent consistency.

6 I remember that second question, that very
7 problematic question, I remember reading something on
8 gov.doc.l from a depository librarian who basically
9 said, I'm throwing up my hands here. I'm just going to
10 pick a response because I don't know what the H this
11 person is talking about. And that kind of response
12 indicates to me that whatever data was generated from
13 that question is going to be rather worthless because
14 nobody really understood what the question was asking.

15 Now, I have a question for GPO based on what
16 Sally was talking about. What was the purpose of asking
17 about the least important services? Is the purpose to
18 look at things that could possibly be dropped by GPO? I
19 mean, why ask that?

20 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
21 University. You're asking Cindy, so Cindy will answer,
22 but I think that is exactly why you ask that kind of

00091

1 question. In an environment where you can't do
2 everything you have to begin to look at the kinds of
3 things that are less important for certain segments of
4 the Community. You know, it's not a dictate in terms of
5 the last three things on the list we automatically drop,
6 but it certainly informs the conversation.

7 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
8 California State Library. That's my thought too, Dan,
9 but when I see things like authentication on there I
10 start thinking, how many -- how many hundreds of
11 thousands of dollars has GPO spent building
12 authentication into FDsys? Do we really want to drop
13 authentication?

14 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
15 North Texas. What concerns me about this is because if

16 you look at the top with the segmentation research 70
17 percent out of the depository library, I think it said,
18 are academic and we do have public libraries and we do
19 have law libraries and state libraries and tribal
20 libraries and so are we saying that their concerns are
21 just going to be thrown out because the 70 percent of
22 the academics' concerns are going to be looked at? I
00092

1 don't want to go there at all. So I'm very concerned
2 with looking at the least and the most because I do
3 think that training is a huge issue for public libraries
4 and I do think that authentication is a huge issue for
5 law libraries.

6 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
7 University. I would hope that again it's not a
8 formulaic response to this or any survey result. And I
9 take Cindy and GPO at their word that this survey, in
10 combination with the segmentation survey, addresses that
11 very point. To try to drill down to find out, let's not
12 just take it at the broad brush that because there are
13 71 percent of depositories who are academic that that
14 will automatically drive the results. Let's look at the
15 segments and find out what are the most important things
16 to public or tribal or any other segment of the
17 Community that you want to look at. And then take it
18 the next step and tailor those services to enhance it so
19 that again we are not just creating broad programs that
20 appeal to the widest majority of academic libraries, but
21 they address specific needs for specific Communities.
22 That it sort of my assumption -- please correct me if
00093

1 I'm wrong, but that is my assumption in terms of the
2 intent for doing a survey that looks at segmentation and
3 asking questions about what is most and least important.

4 MS ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks, Dan
5 for that. I'm not going to correct you, but let me just
6 give you an example of why it is so important for us to
7 look at the data, not just aggregately, so we don't just
8 do that broad brush stroke. We do need to look at the
9 survey results by the types of libraries and also by
10 size. Because one of the things that jumped out at me
11 immediately was, more than 40 percent of the public
12 libraries said that they would really like us to do
13 Dewey decimal classification. Forty percent of public
14 libraries is a good number. It's not nearly the number
15 of academic libraries in the program, but it is

16 certainly an important thing to that segment of our
17 Community, so we will be looking at things like that.

18 MR. SHULER: Tori?

19 MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State
20 University. I sort of agree with Dan that I think it's
21 a perfectly reasonable question to ask users to rank
22 services. Where I differ is to me authentication isn't
00094

1 a service, it's a function and a core part of the
2 infrastructure. So there may be some other information
3 when what goes into what category. So I think, no, we
4 are not going to drop authentication, but I don't
5 consider authentication a service. I consider it an
6 attribute of the infrastructure.

7 MR. SHULER: All right. Anything else? The
8 sense I get is we have end of May -- end of this May to
9 get some more concrete results from Cindy and we have a
10 further trunk of discussion that revolves around the
11 biennial scent of questions and more direct Council
12 advice on how to structure them. It isn't clear to me
13 exactly how we will be involved, but we will figure that
14 out. In order to assure a closer alignment with on the
15 ground experience in the libraries as opposed to the
16 questions. We also have suggested the use of more quick
17 survey tools through the Community Desktop as a
18 possibility. It seems to me that these three taken
19 together is constituting some kind of statement about
20 statistics that we would come up as a result of this
21 discussion and further discussions. Is that about
22 right?

00095

1 The only other observation I would make is
2 that I would hope all this discussion, and this comes
3 from a conversation I had with Chris Greer, that the use
4 of the statistics and the use of this kind of exchange
5 of information with GPO leads to a much more concrete
6 notion of what the business plan quote unquote would be
7 for the depository library program. In the sense that I
8 think many of these questions beg the answer, as was
9 raised by folks in the audience in the earlier sessions,
10 why the hell do we have a depository library? What's
11 the purpose? What's our primary core value that we
12 bring from this relationship? As Chris would more
13 adequately say than I would, I think not having a
14 concrete idea of how you affect whatever these
15 statistics develop, whatever plans you might develop in

16 other ways into a much more comprehensive sense of why
17 are these depository libraries important? I'm not sure
18 that I'm leading to a specific product. Maybe, Chris,
19 if you'd like to offer.

20 MR. GREER: Chris Greer, Office of Science
21 and Technology Policy. I'll start out with a bigger
22 picture. This is a government by, for and of the
00096

1 people. There are a lot of good people in this room who
2 contribute to the interest of the nation. All federal
3 agencies serve the interest of the nation and the
4 communities at large. They do that in a mission
5 specific way. So the Government Printing Office has a
6 mission that has to do with access to the records to the
7 products of government and that mission, of course, is
8 central to their spending. But I would argue that in
9 addition to that, the health of the Community at large,
10 including the depository library program, Community is
11 part and parcel of the GPO mission. I suspect I would
12 get a little argument on that from GPO. So this effort
13 that Cindy described to get better granularity on the
14 survey, while it seems sort of programatic, it actually
15 is fundamental. So better understanding your operating
16 model, the things that make a difference to you,
17 prioritizing those in the right way, that response to
18 individual needs and not just to average needs, are all
19 steps in the right direction to enable you to improve
20 your business model and your status.

21 I have been on the Council for awhile now.
22 Every Council meeting the question of what's a business
00097

1 model or a regional or selective comes up and the answer
2 every time is there isn't one and that's a fundamental
3 piece of this landscape.

4 In that the newspaper business a similar
5 sort of thing has happened. The business model ran
6 along the lines of subscription income and ad income.
7 Online access has damaged the subscription model and ads
8 have many other channels. So the newspaper business is
9 being restructured.

10 Same sort of thing is happening in our
11 landscape. And just as nobody is going to go out and
12 rescue individual newspapers by in large, nobody is
13 going to go out and rescue individual depository
14 libraries by in large. I think you have heard that in
15 an indirect way from GPO. So I think it's really

16 important that the effort that GPO is making to try and
17 recognize your needs, you need to respond to that and
18 indicate the degree to which it actually does that and
19 then you have to come up with what is your business
20 model for the future because nobody else is going to
21 solve that for you.

22 So these things as they seem small, but they
00098

1 can be big, so it deserves careful attention, even
2 though it seems like a trivial detail.

3 MR. SHULER: I would think to follow on
4 that, I would think Council has a great role to play in
5 that kind of mediation between these plans and ideas
6 coming from GPO going out to the Community and visa
7 versa. It's a two-way street, actually three-way
8 street. Go back to the three legged stool of yore.

9 So I think it's important as we pursue the
10 granular art, we keep the bigger picture in mind as
11 well. Okay. Anything else I should add about the
12 statistics? Okay. GPO have you got anything further?
13 And perhaps -- and again forgive me, I may be missing a
14 point here and that's not surprising sometimes. We
15 haven't included the audience too much in this
16 discussion. But it strikes me that this may be the one
17 question that if we were to include you would want to
18 contribute?

19 MS. MADSEN: I'm Debbie Madsen from Kansas
20 University. I would just like to second what David and
21 Chris both indicated in terms of improving the process
22 for the next biennial survey and accountability. So I
00099

1 would suggest that Council ask GPO the next -- to have
2 the aggregated but the granular statistical results
3 available from the next biennial survey prior to the
4 spring Council meeting. So that as Council sits and
5 deliberates and discusses you have the data you need in
6 front of you rather than having that data presented a
7 month later.

8 MR. SHULER: Thank you. We will close the
9 file on that one and we will open up the budget file.
10 We have heard some budget figures from our Public
11 Printer and it seems like the typical government
12 situation; we've got more money, we got less money.
13 It's hard to tell where it is sometimes, but we did go
14 into the October conference with some specifics
15 regarding the digitization project. And I believe the

16 consultant project were the two big ones. And then
17 there was the FY11 appropriations issues which I think
18 is what the Public Printer was talking about. So let me
19 put the question directly to GPO. In terms of where we
20 are with the digitization budget, you got your money.
21 Are you able to spend it? Let me put it directly, I
22 suppose.

00100

1 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Are we able
2 to spend it? So Ric had talked about awaiting full
3 approval from JCP that we've got some promising news,
4 but there has been no formal approval based on that
5 request that we put forward, so we still are awaiting
6 that before we can move forward on a lot of the
7 initiative that we talked about.

8 MR. SHULER: Okay. Does the money disappear
9 if you don't spend it by the end of this fiscal year?

10 MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Ross-Blakley Law
11 Library. How come it takes JCP so long to get back to
12 you? Will they be getting back to you soon or maybe
13 never? What can we do to support your request, if
14 anything? Is it useful for Council to communicate with
15 JCP or no?

16 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO, so there is
17 two questions; the first one related to the budget from
18 John. I'm not a comptroller, but in terms of
19 appropriations and how they are exhausted or carried
20 over specifically for the digitization dollars, I'd
21 probably have to followup with you to really ensure a
22 correct answer on that one. But certainly our goal is

00101

1 still with May coming upon us, that we still have
2 several months left in the fiscal year.

3 So the second question from Tori. I don't
4 know that it would be proper from GPO to advocate what
5 Council should do, but I mean certainly it's within your
6 purview, as well as anyone in the Community, to put
7 forward a resolution or whatever would be appropriate
8 from your own prospective. But there is progress. The
9 amount of time that it takes, I certainly can't speak on
10 behalf of members of Congress, but one would assume that
11 from the many priorities that they are working with,
12 that these committees, JCP being one of them, that it's
13 one of the several things they are working on. And it's
14 a big issue. So I don't know that I directly answered
15 your question there, but it wouldn't be appropriate for

16 us I don't think to tell you what path to take, but
17 certainly voicing opinions is something that I can
18 appreciate.

19 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Any other Council
20 input on the budgets?

21 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
22 North Texas. John and I attended -- well, John did by
00102

1 conference call, a meeting in December where it was --
2 the digitization of \$600,000 was talked about. Can you
3 give us an update on how much has been spent because at
4 that time there was the pilot program for the Library of
5 Congress materials to be put into FDsys. I'm just kind
6 of wondering where the breakdown is on that at this
7 moment? How much was spent on that project and how much
8 is left? If you can just give us a little more
9 information please.

10 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. In terms of
11 that request to JCP, that we are still waiting on, that
12 was the first effort in terms of the LC stats at large.
13 So we are still waiting for that approval to expend that
14 first amount of money in terms to ingest that content,
15 make it available through FDsys. So it kind of goes
16 back to that first question earlier in terms of having
17 the approval from our oversight group to move forward
18 with projects, the first of which is what was referenced
19 with the Library of Congress.

20 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
21 North Texas. So you don't have a figure on how much was
22 put forward for the small amount that was done for the
00103

1 test or was it just part of the FDsys spending?

2 MR. MAULDIN: James Mauldin, GPO. In
3 regards to the stats at large, that was some of the
4 internal processing that was being done by PMO, and
5 there -- so we hadn't been given, until recently a few
6 days ago, that we could actually demo that. So in terms
7 of that, what you saw yesterday, that was just made
8 available because we just got word a couple of days ago.
9 So we could provide you how much was spent because we
10 actually manually we had to convert those into PDF. So
11 it was time to convert because what we were actually
12 given from the LC was TIF images. We had to create our
13 submission packages, our archival packages and make that
14 available. And to get a pricing on that we would
15 actually have to work with PMO to price that.

16 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
17 North Texas. I don't know if the rest of Council would
18 agree with me or not. I'd like to know what you think,
19 but I would really like an accounting of the \$6,000,000
20 for digitization because at the December meeting it was
21 said that it could be that much or more to ingest the
22 statutes at large. And at the meeting in April that we
00104

1 were at, I asked specifically of the PMO how much would
2 it cost to ingest a collection and they said a full
3 treatment job about \$150,000. So I'm just curious if
4 it's \$150,000 or is it \$600,000? I just would like an
5 accounting. I don't know if the rest of Council agrees
6 with me.

7 MR. SHULER: What's the sense of Council?

8 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
9 University. I concur.

10 MR. SHULER: Okay, nobody? Are we all in
11 agreement? Okay. So noted. Anything else on the
12 budget? We've got 20 minutes left in this match.

13 MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Not to be
14 forgotten are the OMNIBUS funds that we received from
15 the Obama admission, a million plus dollars. Accounting
16 on that so far, a majority of that money has gone to --
17 well, not all of it, but we haven't spent it all yet, to
18 the shelflist project, several task orders in addition
19 to the shelflist project to do some work to start
20 organizing and start getting serial holdings into the
21 integrated library system for social titles, serials and
22 other serial issues. So you'll be starting to see some
00105

1 of that. And also the funding of the pilot project for
2 the cataloging distribution.

3 MR. SHULER: Anything else on budget? Okay.
4 Now we come to the other categories in the agenda, which
5 is always fun to fill. I would like to suggest and some
6 other suggestions that will come from Council, but I'll
7 start with two. Considering we are in over the next
8 five months probably entering a time of change at GPO
9 and very well, by a nonspecified period of time, of
10 course, have a new Public Printer and new Superintendent
11 of Documents. Is there anything that the Council can do
12 to help facilitate, not necessarily the actual
13 transition, but decide on what we need to carry over to
14 the new leadership in terms of what we are doing,
15 strategies that kind of thing? Suzanne.

16 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sear, University of
17 North Texas. I would like to see Council put together a
18 very brief one to two page document on short term,
19 midterm and long term goals that we believe the Public
20 Printer and the new Superintendent of Documents could
21 focus on in order to move the FDLP forward.

22 MR. SHULER: Any discussion?

00106

1 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
2 of Utah. I think this is reasonable. I mean this is
3 the prep that one does when an administration changes
4 and I like the idea of getting started on it so it can
5 be thoughtful, I mean, well considered and the letter
6 can be -- or whatever we are going to call it, well
7 crafted.

8 MR. SHULER: Anybody else? Dan?

9 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony from Brown
10 University. I think that's a great idea and just to
11 state the obvious, this would not be an effort that
12 would sort of reinvent the wheel. There is a lot of
13 work that has been done both in terms of the GPO's
14 strategic plan and previous Councils have put forth
15 vision statements and other things that serves toward
16 the connection for whatever the next of the
17 conversations need to be.

18 MR. SHULER: Are there elements of what we
19 suggest to either of these two groups in terms of what
20 we should emphasize and not be stopped, in my experience
21 of nearly 30 years experience, with the GPO an
22 organization? It strikes me during these types of

00107

1 transitions that things come to a stop or things become
2 dislocated for whatever reasons and it strikes me that
3 we are at a critical point with FDsys and critical point
4 with other processes that are leading to the greater
5 success of the program that we should emphasize more
6 heavily than others that they not be misrepresented.

7 We may or may not have the numbers necessary
8 for the necessary goal documents I am talking about,
9 thinking more about more qualitative than quantitative.

10 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
11 North Texas. I think we need to try and get that data
12 before we make that document. I don't think the
13 document alone stands as strongly as it would if we had
14 data behind it.

15 MR. SHULER: So now we have linked the

16 statistics work with this short mid and long term goals
17 document, agreed? Okay. Any others from the Council?
18 Suzanne, I believe you had something about Willie?

19 MS. SEARS: I would like to move that
20 Council make either a statement of some sort or
21 accommodation for Willie seen as all the service that he
22 provided to GPO for 40 years and a lot of Council and a
00108

1 lot of members of the audience remember him very fondly
2 and I would like to see something put forward from
3 Council.

4 MR. SHULER: Any discussion? All right.
5 It's on the list of things to do.

6 Any other items? Anything we really feel we
7 need to do left over from last October? Any stones
8 unturned? All right. Throw it back to the audience.
9 Have we forgotten anything from October? GPO, have we
10 forgotten anything from October? No? Okay.

11 We have come to a natural end in this
12 segment of the program and we have about 15 minutes
13 left. I would like to suggest that we break early, if
14 that is agreeable. Grab more lunchtime. We come back
15 here at two o'clock. At that two o'clock session we
16 take up work that has revealed itself from the three
17 plenary sessions. So I would ask each of the groups,
18 not necessarily organize yourselves, but to prepare
19 yourselves for the first discussion about the outcomes
20 we saw from the plenary sessions that would go into a
21 work product to add to this list; is that acceptable?
22 Any discussion? We're good. Let's go to lunch. Thanks
00109

1 everyone.

2 (Lunch break.)

3 MR. SHULER: The one this afternoon and the one
4 this morning would be to organize our thoughts on what
5 kind of work products we want to come out of this three
6 plenaries. Is that agreeable to everyone? Does anybody
7 want to add anything to this afternoon's discussion
8 other than the plenary topics?

9 MS. TROTT: In terms of recommendation?

10 MR. SHULER: No, in terms of do we want to
11 do more than just three? I imagine it's going to take
12 us more than 90 minutes to get through these three. But
13 I'm saying anything additional? No.

14 MS. MORIEARTY: Let's see what happens.

15 MR. SHULER: All right. Let's open it up.

16 Let's open it up with access and preservation. Does
17 that team want to speak to the work products coming out
18 of that session? I am writing them down, yes. Shall we
19 go to progress? Let's do that. Okay, so we have agreed
20 that FDsys is at the top of the list. What does the
21 group say?

22 MS. TROTTA: This is Tori Trotta and I have
00110

1 three to start with.

2 MR. SHULER: All right. I'm ready.

3 MS. TROTTA: Let's see how these go and
4 Camilla and I have been working on them. We have three
5 recommendations at least for FDsys. The first one is --
6 one moment.

7 MR. SHULER: One moment. One moment.

8 MS. TROTTA: Share functionality and
9 requirements for FDsys Release 2 and any other
10 subsequent releases currently planned.

11 MR. SHULER: Okay. And for Release 2 and
12 what was the last part?

13 MS. TROTTA: And if any subsequent Releases
14 are currently planned? So it's share the functionality
15 and requirements with Council, with us, for Release 2,
16 which is the next one up. These are the three we came
17 up with. You're looking at me like I'm crazy.

18 MS. MORIEARTY: No, I'm thinking.

19 MS. TROTTA: Okay. Here is the second one.
20 Notify Council and the Community of changes when
21 functionality is modified in any way, deferred, added,
22 revised.

00111

1 MR. SHULER: All right.

2 MS. TROTTA: Number three, utilize the
3 variety of Web 2.0 methods to notify the Community of
4 plans for FDsys releases and seek input for setting of
5 priorities. Those are the gist of those three. The
6 perfect word smithing.

7 MR. SHULER: It's a start, not to worry.

8 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, that is what I want to
9 say.

10 MR. SHULER: Let me make sure I get the last
11 one down. Inform the Community --

12 MS. TROTTA: Utilize the Community, the
13 variety of Web 2.0 methods to seek the input of the
14 Community on priorities.

15 MR. SHULER: Okay. All right. Got it.

16 Okay. Jill now.

17 MS. MORIEARTY: One of the things that I
18 wanted to come forward is a dialogue or a communication
19 interaction between Council and GPO on the development
20 of FDsys. You said that in a couple of ways. I want it
21 to be much more overt. I want the dialog. I want the
22 conversation to be ongoing and by that I mean certainly
00112

1 let us know the progress. Let us know what is going on
2 as defined in the first three points, but more than that
3 I want them coming back to Council for the next several
4 meetings and we continue this -- this update and
5 analysis and question and answer dialogue that we have
6 started. I think it's helped all of us immensely to
7 understand what they are doing. For them to understand
8 our concern about using it and accessing it. I think it
9 will only get stronger and better.

10 MR. GREER: It would be helpful to me if you
11 clarify what you mean, by share and notify and so at
12 every Council meeting of course there are sessions on
13 FDsys.

14 MS. MORIEARTY: Not like we had yesterday.

15 MR. GREER: What was different?

16 MS. MORIEARTY: Well focused, presentation
17 in the morning, that allowed a lot more access
18 information and question and answer. Our plenary
19 session here that generated a good deal of questions, of
20 many, many questions on both sides about what our
21 expectations are and the product. And then last night a
22 further session that even if possible even further
00113

1 cleared up numbers, dates. We found that many words
2 that people were using had definite meanings for the
3 back end folk versus the front end folk and wound up
4 generating rumors. What was the one that -- excuse me.
5 What was the one that they were saying yesterday, in --
6 ingest.

7 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Submissions versus ingest.

8 MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. I couldn't
9 remember submission. So when they were saying that
10 certain things could not be ingested, rumors had gotten
11 out. People had read this and they believed that that
12 meant that certain collections were not going to be
13 basically added. That is not what it meant. That is
14 not what they meant it to be. If anything it gave me
15 much for confidence after talking -- talking and

16 following this conversation. I've talked too much.

17 MS. TROTTA: The gist of the recommendation
18 is that we would like more communication from FDsys/GPO
19 about what's going on with the FDsys. That's the gist
20 of that recommendation going forward.

21 MR. GREER: Again, it's my sense that the
22 more specific these recommendations are, the more likely
00114

1 we are to get what we want and so certainly GPO has been
2 forthcoming at all stages in talking about FDsys. I
3 wasn't here yesterday so I can't speak to what the
4 special sauce was yesterday, but clearly there was
5 something about that series of presentations that was
6 more effective. And if we could put that fine language
7 for that and the type of presentation and so that is one
8 thing. What is it that we want in the Council sessions?
9 And then there is a separate issue of other vehicles
10 like social media vehicles for interaction and
11 communication. So maybe we should just take those in
12 order. In a Council session it sounds like what we are
13 looking for is how to say this in a politically correct
14 way, the lack of jargon, so plain language explanation
15 and a dialogue as opposed to a briefing.

16 MS. MORIEARTY: No, we came up last night
17 with an understanding because we did talk about how do
18 we get this information back and forth? Last night we
19 had a discussion and we spoke about this. How do we get
20 the information out? Some of the suggestions were
21 clear, concise, bullet points, dates, less verbiage,
22 less tech speak and more to what you really mean. And
00115

1 their concern is -- and as Ric was saying, they have
2 been putting this out, but it's become obviously it's
3 not getting to people. But a 20 page paper does not get
4 to me as much as say the bullet points and the very
5 clear and concise rhetoric that was in their handout
6 that they gave us that is in our package. They made
7 their points. They proved their points and that type of
8 communication. Tori?

9 MS. TROTTA: I'd like to avoid the
10 awkwardness of having to respond to what appears a very
11 negative IG report when the reality for FDsys and GPO is
12 not really that catastrophic. So I would rather hear
13 this information from FDsys GPO than have -- it reading
14 it in an IG report and then coming to my own
15 conclusions. And I wasn't the only one. That's what I

16 would like to avoid and that's the kind of communication
17 that I would like Council to be able to expect as a
18 contemporaneous way prior to the release of information
19 that is more negative than it actually is.

20 MR. SHULER: But I think it's important to
21 remember we ought to not only be reacting to what we
22 heard today and yesterday, but also with the idea that
00116

1 the coming regime change means that we are only going to
2 have to remind of a lot of people about a lot things in
3 a very clear fashion and FDsys is no less of an issue in
4 that regard.

5 MS. TUBBS: And it was my understanding from
6 the IG report that there was a lack of a clear, detailed
7 implementation plan and then with our meeting last
8 night, there is more of an implementation plan. So we
9 discussed having that information shared and just
10 keeping in communication about those implementation
11 plans, when there are setbacks, when there are positive
12 enhancements made on a more regular basis is very
13 helpful.

14 MR. SHULER: I think as this recommendation
15 is being drafted, it can just focus on those issues
16 without having to reiterate every point raised over the
17 last two days. I think we could all agree what we came
18 down to was simply better communication. I think we
19 take Chris's point very well. We have to be very
20 specific what we mean in terms of that communication.

21 MS. HOLTERHOFF: One thing was just having
22 sort of this deep background or the annotation added to
00117

1 that IG report. However often do they come out?

2 MR. SHULER: Quarterly.

3 MS. HOLTERHOFF: All of us in this room will
4 we be off the Council and within three years there will
5 be a whole new group of people and it probably would be
6 good to write down when the IG reports come out, if they
7 have things that are confusing, that it would just be
8 good for Council to have -- at least hear their side of
9 it so that we can make some judgments because it will be
10 new people. They will think oh, yeah, I already told
11 the Council. Well, the Council is a revolving door and
12 we won't be here anymore.

13 MR. SHULER: I think every member -- because
14 I think I made a note of it from the conversation last
15 night, that it was Ric who raised the issue that since

16 he has come out on a quarterly basis why not inform the
17 Council before they are issued. There is a new
18 quarterly report. In fact one is being produced now, as
19 we speak, if we look at the schedule correctly. Why not
20 inform the Council when that is ready to be served we
21 get a first, not a first, exclusive look, but we get the
22 first shot at it so we have less of this dropping in our
00118

1 laps and going, where did this come from.

2 MS. MORIEARTY: Also remember somewhere
3 around the time you said that, he'd also even suggested
4 that having them posted clearly, so they didn't appear
5 to be more secretive that you had to hunt them down and
6 until the link went around, yes, you did kind of have to
7 know where to look and hunt them down. So on their end
8 being willing to put forward this information and
9 understanding that people will see it, which is also
10 very important to you.

11 MR. SHULER: I think we've got strategies to
12 address that.

13 MS. SINCLAIR: I think the one thing about
14 yesterday's meeting that was different than other
15 meetings I attended was the frankness of the GPO folks
16 and they just were able to say some things in that forum
17 that they could not say in other types of situations.
18 Like they couldn't say it in an open session. They
19 couldn't say it using Web 2.0 tools, but they could say
20 it to us in that sort of limited form. So going back to
21 what Chris was saying, when we need to specify exactly
22 what we want, somehow we need to specify the type of
00119

1 communication that we want and the way in which it is
2 done so that they can feel free to be frank with us.

3 MR. SHULER: I should emphasis that instead
4 of putting pressure on us in this very busy meeting
5 because most of you all or at least a lot of you all,
6 are going to be involved in a regional's discussion
7 later this evening. We do have another working session.
8 I would like to propose that we use the same strategy of
9 using a bulletin item of where our recommendations are
10 going rather than investing what little energy we have
11 words smithing this to death. I think this deserves, as
12 other things do, the time necessary to serve it. Is
13 there any question, debate about that?

14 MR. O'MAHONY: No debate about that. Last
15 night was a different kind of tone and intimacy. Aside

16 from that, however, to the extent that the morning and
17 afternoon sessions also contributed to an informative
18 exchange between Council, GPO and the audience. That's
19 as much a control within Council -- that's our doing,
20 you know. And that format may or may not be appropriate
21 for other sessions, other topics, other venues in the
22 future, but it certainly proved well for this particular
00120

1 round and I think Council in the future will take that
2 under consideration when it -- when it formulates and
3 structures how it is that future meetings will go, but
4 that certainly worked well, folks responded well and
5 there was a good exchange of information.

6 With respect to this specific request I just
7 have a question just in terms of clarification because
8 the share, the functional requirements for Release 2
9 that we are asking for, is that different than the
10 documentation that already exists because it has been
11 pointed out there is lots and lots and lots of
12 documentation out there already and, you know, at least
13 five times Ric has said at various points, you know, go
14 back, look at that FDsys requirements documentation and
15 tell me is it still valid. What is missing? Give me
16 feedback on it. So is this different documentation than
17 that or I just don't know.

18 MS. TROTТА: I don't know either. There is
19 a lot of documentation, but some of the documentation is
20 like not -- puts it under operation it seems. We asked
21 for and we received here what in Release 1 was
22 implemented and what has been deferred and I don't think
00121

1 that's anywhere on the Web site or it wasn't when we
2 were having the conversations about planning the
3 plenary.

4 MR. O'MAHONEY: In the handouts that they
5 provided for this session, there was a bullet thing.

6 MR. SHULER: It came out of the PMO session.

7 MS. TROTТА: What we want is that to go on
8 an ongoing basis because apparently it shifts. As they
9 move through the process what they can do and what they
10 can't do shifts or they come up with other issues they
11 have to solve and that, so it shifts. So possibly if
12 it's the case that they are constantly updating that
13 document then they should commit to that and let us
14 know, okay, this is where it's going to be; puts the
15 onus on us to go back and look at it which brings up

16 another point about how Council might want to order
17 their work. But there is a surprise element that
18 appears to continue that we just like the information
19 for us.

20 MR. JACOBS: I think it's more like 11 or 12
21 things that were deferred to Release 2 that need to be
22 on an updated Release 2 schedule. So that we know, you
00122

1 know, what was deferred from Release 1 into Release 2
2 and we are given the opportunity to say here is the 15
3 things that you say you are going to do in Release 2.
4 We want you to prioritize certain of these things to
5 say, you know, RSS needs to really be up there on
6 Release 2, not toward the end of Release 2. Things like
7 that. We need an updated schedule, right?

8 MR. SHULER: We need to keep in mind that
9 what Ric and the FDsys were doing in these sessions is
10 telling us what isn't working, and what we would like in
11 the future, which is a different order of things than
12 what we just discussed because it's actually getting in
13 there using the system, putting it up under quote,
14 unquote a stress test, whatever that means. And then
15 telling them what works for us and what doesn't as a
16 Community and that is a whole other quality of work that
17 we really haven't talked about yet.

18 MS. TUBBS: But it's related to the
19 communication issue. If we had a list like this, 1
20 through 20, of items that are pending and it's really
21 easy to glance through it and it's easier for me to read
22 this than a 20 page report with really technical jargon.
00123

1 If I see this, I can easily take this back to my
2 stakeholders and ask them, okay, what in this list is
3 most important to you?

4 MR. SHULER: Good point.

5 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David. I'd like to
6 add one other thing for the purpose of communication
7 from the FDsys folks; that is if there is going to be
8 any kind of substantial slippage in meeting deadline
9 dates, and we can define precisely what would trigger
10 such a report that is two weeks, three weeks, four
11 weeks. I don't know what we would want to collectively
12 define, but if there is going to be a delay then it
13 would be very helpful to Council if we were informed
14 ahead of time that that delay is going to happen.

15 MR. SHULER: Okay.

16 MR. GREER: My sense from the conversation
17 we have had so far is that Council is not looking to
18 micromanage the project; that is we don't want daily
19 reports or once an hour kinds of things. We don't need
20 to know, you know, some of the fine grain details, but
21 what you are saying is that when there are significant
22 shifts to deliverables and schedules that we would like
00124

1 some alert to that fact when the decision is finalized.
2 In every project there is always an ongoing discussion
3 amongst the project members about pushes and pulls in
4 all directions. And you are never, in any particular
5 point in time, sure which delays will actually happen,
6 which won't, all of those. We don't need to know that
7 day-to-day back and forth, or even week-to-week back and
8 forth. I think what you're saying is when functional
9 items in a Release get pushed back to the next Release
10 or when a deliverable deadline gets pushed back by more
11 than, let's choose four weeks, as an easy number then --
12 and the project decides that is going to happen, not
13 just projections or discussions or that kind of thing,
14 but formal recognition, look, we are going to have to
15 move these things. Everybody agrees let's move this to
16 the next Release or, okay, we have to shift that
17 deadline and we are going to restructure some of the
18 project, particularly the critical path elements, that's
19 when we would need to know. So I think for project
20 managers those are pretty clear things. If it's a
21 critical path element, if it's an element on a Release
22 that is getting moved. If it's change in time line that
00125

1 is more than four weeks on -- you know, a specific
2 deadline then that would be useful for Council to know.
3 Does that cover it? And I really don't want to get in
4 the business of micromanaging these things.

5 MS. MORIEARTY: At no point was there
6 micromanaging and they don't want it and we don't want
7 it. But clear communication, current progress. It
8 was -- this whole discussion was with the idea that we
9 want FDsys. They want FDsys. What can we do to make
10 this a smoother process that is taken, you know, several
11 years to get to where we are now, but by no means was it
12 micromanagement.

13 MR. GREER: And the second half of the
14 equation that I think is important that goes into this
15 recommendation is the why? Let's say they meet this

16 request. What is it that Council does about this?
17 Let's say there is a delay of four weeks. We get
18 notified of that. What's the value added to the project
19 that arises from that? They meet that requirement. It
20 goes out to Council. What is it that we want to hold
21 ourselves to to give back? And so the value that you
22 get for doing that is we'll do the following. What will
00126

1 we do?

2 MS. MORIEARTY: One of the things we agreed
3 to do is give feedback. I mean to their credit they are
4 asking us what we think and there has not been a whole
5 lot of Community or Council response in this, is what we
6 think. So that on our part is part of what we promised
7 to get done.

8 MR. JACOBS: I think part of what we do or
9 what we should do is be more a communication outlet for
10 the Community as well because that is where a lot of the
11 confusion happens. There is rumors abound that the
12 people talk to each other, but don't necessarily have
13 the best or most up to date information. Council can
14 say, hey, look, everyone here is Release 2 schedule.
15 They let us know that this piece is going to be four
16 weeks late and now they finished it. So we can keep the
17 Community more informed and keep the trust between the
18 Community and Council and GPO up to a better level.

19 MR. GREER: So now we have to hold ourselves
20 to just as strong a standard. If we are going to say
21 four weeks is kind of the deadline shift that is
22 relevant. We can't say, well, we get four weeks to turn
00127

1 around and respond to that because then you are into the
2 next shift, right? So are we willing to say we will
3 respond with our feedback on that within, what do we
4 say, two weeks? Any longer than two weeks then it's not
5 relevant.

6 MR. JACOBS: I would hope that the
7 communication tools that we put in place this last time,
8 the Goggle group, maybe the Community tools, those
9 things can allow us to do our work throughout the year
10 rather than, you know, the two weeks of leading up to
11 Council session. And that would -- I think four weeks
12 is crazy too.

13 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, I'd say the phrase
14 within two weeks. The reality is most people as soon as
15 they see this electronically are going to think and

16 respond immediately. So, yes, I would not want to see
17 any longer turnaround period for us.

18 MR. GREER: What's the shortest for us that
19 is feasible, a week?

20 MR. JACOBS: A week.

21 MS. MORIEARTY: A week. What, Tori?

22 MR. GREER: There really could be, if they

00128

1 will provide us that level of notification, we will
2 guarantee a one week turnaround and if they don't hear
3 from us then that's approval, all is well as
4 communicated so that they know they have a window to
5 manage and they will either get a response from us or
6 that's a done deal and we are onto the next issue. That
7 way they can manage the project.

8 MR. O'MAHONY: I think it's good to sort of
9 flush out what we are talking about here. If the one
10 week is one week among the 15 members of Council, you
11 know, that we agreed that we will give due diligence to
12 the information in front of us, consult however we can
13 and respond back accordingly, that is one thing. One
14 week I think is a bit ambitious if it also means somehow
15 tapping in a systematic way the broader sentiment of the
16 wider Community that is a little tougher to turn around
17 in one week.

18 MR. GREER: What would be the right timeline
19 for that? What I heard James say that is an important
20 function that the Council provides. So let's say in the
21 majority of these instances we are going to actually
22 want to get at least some level of community.

00129

1 MS. MORIEARTY: That's why I first suggested
2 two weeks. That really was why I came up with two.
3 Within minutes, seconds after getting the e-mail, we
4 will start talking among ourselves, but within a day we
5 could send potentially something out to our Community,
6 get it back, synthesize it. We are already doing this,
7 I'm sure on one level or another. Two weeks is enough
8 time to get that back and at least perhaps, Daniel, not
9 a full response, only a partial, but it would start to
10 generate discussion and show a direction.

11 MR. JACOBS: It's one of those things where
12 -- and I have told Ric and Mike, the FDsys log has not
13 been updated since the end of October of last year. We
14 can model things, model better communications and get
15 GPO to be more communitive and more forward with their

16 information too, if we in turn communicate back so.

17 MR. O'MAHONY: And theoretically it's
18 certainly an enticement for folks to become more
19 actively engaged and participate in the Community if
20 that is the conduit through which lots of this stuff --
21 lots of that information is going to be exchanged and
22 feedback is going to be solicited.

00130

1 MR. GREER: What I heard from the response
2 to the communications yesterday was that there is some
3 appreciation for two different modes of communication:
4 One was the communication in the plenary where you are
5 talking to everybody and then the other was the
6 communication that happened in the evening in a
7 different setting coming from the executive branch, you
8 can't do that, but apparently the legislative branch you
9 can do that. So that's useful in my mind. At least
10 Congress would pay some attention to that. So I think
11 what this group is saying is that in notifying the
12 Council one of the things that that would probably be
13 useful is for the project office to be able to say, we
14 want this to be an interaction with Council because the
15 sensitive issue is kind of up in the air. We don't want
16 to turn this into a broad public relations issue. We
17 want help with the decision we haven't made yet. We
18 want a consultation, interaction. That can happen
19 pretty fast, as you pointed out.

20 There's another kind of interaction, where
21 we want Community input. We want broad discussion with
22 this because we think it has broad impact and that might

00131

1 be a two week kind of turnaround, but it sounds like
2 this might be helpful if this all falls within the law
3 to have the project office be able to communicate more
4 than one mode and let us know which that is, is that
5 right?

6 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

7 MR. O'MAHONY: For the record, it was a
8 public meeting last night. No one would have been
9 excluded. It may not have been as widely advertised.
10 So I'm not trying to be cute in terms of defining it
11 that way, but it was not a private meeting per se.
12 Along those lines however, we have monthly or bimonthly
13 or however frequent conference calls, you know, which
14 are not public conference calls where the business of
15 Council is conducted. So, you know, that is another

16 forum and another opportunity for whatever level of
17 communication is felt to be appropriate based on the
18 topic.

19 MR. SHULER: I do not think what happened
20 last night was necessarily a brigadoon that we are never
21 going to see again. And I think Dan's point is actually
22 right on. We have other ways to create that opportunity
00132

1 to communicate in effective fashion in between
2 conferences and certainly using the phone is one way to
3 do that. It has been a very effective way.

4 I think going back to Chris' point, we need
5 to be very clear. If we are not going to ask the PMO to
6 engage in this relationship we need to be absolutely
7 clear what our obligations are in that relationship. I
8 think it's a good point to keep in mind.

9 MR. GREER: What I'm trying to get at was
10 this line of conversation is the fundamental role of the
11 Council and it's relationship to GPO. Again, coming
12 from the executive branch, I'm a government in the
13 sunshine endorser and I think that all advisory
14 committees should operate only in the public realm and
15 everybody should have good information about who
16 provided advice and what kind and how the government
17 received it. What I thought I heard, and maybe I heard
18 it wrong, was that you had in mind another level of
19 communication that was more constrained and was trying
20 to explore. Is that the model that, you know, gave you
21 the better communication that you're after? Exactly
22 where you are going with that, that thinking. Is there
00133

1 any sense that this is -- we have had this discussion
2 before with Council. Some of you weren't members at the
3 time, but the general sense was that we would adhere to
4 general principle of open government and that is all of
5 the advice we offered would be offered in public
6 settings and so on. So that constrains the kind of
7 interaction you can have with GPO and the purpose of the
8 conversation in -- I'm trying to have is to sort out
9 whether that was changed at all?

10 MR. SHULER: I don't think it has. I think
11 what happened last night could happen in any
12 relationship and it came after a lot of frank and honest
13 discussion in very public circumstances. The frank
14 exchange of both miscommunication and errors on both
15 sides. And I don't believe, and anybody can correct me,

16 but I don't believe anything that was said in that room
17 hadn't already been said in public. Would I be right?

18 MS. MORIEARTY: Right.

19 MR. SHULER: So, in a sense that it was a
20 sidebar or a sense an exclusionary moment, no, not so
21 much.

22 MR. GREER: So let's backup and we are going
00134

1 to say which I think adheres to our previous model that
2 all our interactions are the same as an interaction with
3 the public. That if GPO shares with us a question we
4 may well share it with everybody, anybody that you want
5 and they should make that assumption this is never a
6 private communication, rather it's an open
7 communication. In that case it doesn't make a whole lot
8 of sense to me to have two different kinds of deadlines.
9 There should just be one. That would be a two week
10 turnaround and consult us, the Council, you know, where
11 the Community is, the Council sees fit. We can respond
12 quicker if we think it's obvious, there is already a
13 Community consensus on this or take more time if we are
14 not sure.

15 MR. SHULER: With the understanding as it
16 happened right before this conference, there were some,
17 with a complete respect of transparency and openness
18 there are some documents that GPO shares with Council
19 before they share with the Community because they are
20 asking specifically for Council's advice and it's in a
21 draft form. If we are not comfortable with that and
22 Chris' suggestion indicates that that kind of
00135

1 communication may not be necessarily expected in this
2 spirit of openness and transformation that we are
3 talking about, I think we need to get that out in the
4 front right now.

5 MR. JACOBS: This is James, I think that
6 open government doesn't necessarily mean that you have
7 to share every single draft of every single document,
8 you know. I have a draft of a document right here that
9 I don't want to share even with Suzanne, but she is
10 looking over my shoulder because there's typos, etc.,
11 etc. So, you know, if we wanted to go completely open
12 and have drafts and have those be completely public, I'm
13 fine with that, but I'm also fine with the -- the
14 incongruities of open government on the one hand and,
15 you know, draft sort of communiques on the other hand.

16 Does that make sense?

17 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes. We have all been in
18 situations where administrators have come to us, and
19 said will you read this? What do you think? Don't
20 let -- don't talk about this until we are ready for
21 the -- we have covered all our bases. We put it in
22 acceptable form and we have sent it out. We have all
00136

1 been there. I agree with you it's the incongruities of
2 open government, but the important thing is it gets out
3 and everyone is well informed of it, but usually in a
4 manner that it's put in the right direction, not
5 negative, but fair and balanced. So I guess I don't see
6 this as necessarily being bad. If it was that they only
7 contacted us and nothing got generated out to the
8 Community, that's bad, bad, bad. But, yes, I can see
9 there being situations where they bounce something off
10 us, one week is an acceptable turnaround, but they send
11 that document out a few weeks or months later and they
12 want a larger response. I think that's fair as well.

13 MR. SHULER: Okay.

14 MS. SANDERS: John, let me throw in too, we
15 have had a situation recently that GPO was asking for
16 input and Council was wanting to (inaudible) GPO's input
17 that related to specific institution and nobody wanted
18 that public. Nobody intended that to be public. That
19 wasn't the point of that communication. Those kinds of
20 things are going to happen in our advisory role. I
21 don't think we should shut ourselves off from that.

22 MR. SHULER: I just wanted everybody to hear
00137

1 it at the same time that we are talking about in some
2 degree nuance and complexity.

3 MR. JACOBS: But at the same time if they
4 come to us with a draft saying, we are going to shutdown
5 FDLP tomorrow, but don't share this anybody. I wouldn't
6 feel comfortable with that either. And I would expect
7 that all Council members would feel that, under an open
8 government directive, that we would share that
9 information out and ask for comment from the Community.

10 MR. SHULER: Ah, the litmus test, yes.
11 Well, unfortunately that isn't on our agenda. We may
12 not have to cross that Rubicon, Dave.

13 MR. CISMOWSKI: I want to say this very
14 carefully, but I'd like to remind everybody, who was
15 there last night, that there was one thing said that to

16 me was probably the most important thing said. It had
17 to do with a personnel matter.

18 MR. SHULER: Yes.

19 MR. CISMOWSKI: I doubt very seriously if
20 those words would have been said in a public forum. And
21 I think it was an extremely important piece of
22 information that helped me see some things that I
00138

1 wouldn't have seen otherwise.

2 MR. SHULER: Agreed.

3 MR. CISMOWSKI: And so when we are
4 talking -- it probably won't come up very often, if at
5 all in the future, but if we are talking about actual
6 personnel, that should not -- well, you know, what I
7 mean.

8 MR. SHULER: I believe there is enough legal
9 precedent in both the federal and state level that
10 respects the privacy of personnel discussions that we
11 can easily recognize and respect.

12 MS. HOLTERHOFF: But as John said before,
13 too much communication is not good. I mean 20 page
14 reports that are full of stuff that we can't figure out.
15 So if we are perfectly transparent to the whole
16 depository Community and shared every bit of information
17 we get in every report -- I mean we have to filter it
18 down to what is important, don't you think? Otherwise
19 it's meaningless when you are sending out stuff all the
20 time, nobody reads any of it anymore. So I think that
21 is kind of our responsibility too to make sure that what
22 gets sent forward is understandable to people.

00139

1 MR. SHULER: Agreed.

2 MR. O'MAHONY: I perhaps might put a
3 friendly amendment on that. I absolutely agree that it
4 can be the role of this body here and any number of
5 other folks to connect the dots, to steel information,
6 make it digestible, make it understandable to a variety
7 of audiences, but I don't think that's incompatible with
8 if you go to the FDsys Web page now are you going to get
9 a whole Web screen full of extreme documentation, which
10 I would welcome anybody that wants to look at that to
11 look at it and then some. So I don't think there needs
12 to be a filtering process. There can certainly be an
13 enhancement in terms of communication, but I wouldn't
14 want in any way GPO or anyone else that, that means, oh,
15 well, we don't have to, you know, share that

16 documentation with folks because it's too long and they
17 won't read it.

18 MS. HOLTERHOFF: There have been several
19 examples of people here at this meeting where things
20 have been mentioned that they are on the Web site some
21 place, the Community or the FDLP.gov and we didn't know
22 they were there. They are so hidden there anyway, I
00140

1 mean. And I don't know if they are available to anybody
2 that wants to go poking around there, but we who are
3 most interested in it have come across there and then --
4 and were told that was there and then it wasn't there
5 anymore. So there is a lot of miscommunication.

6 MR. O'MAHONY: Absolutely, I'm in complete
7 agreement with you. I'm just saying let's have -- let's
8 have lots of detail that is available and then let's
9 also let folks know that it is there and further enhance
10 it or make it more meaningful.

11 MR. GREER: I wanted to just digest some of
12 that conversation, that in asking for this kind of
13 interaction we want to set clear standards for GPO for
14 when we expect communication. I think we have tried to
15 do that. We need to be responsible for our part of
16 that, be clear. For example, when we get a document
17 that is way too detailed and this can not be digested,
18 give us a high level view and say that or this is not
19 enough detail, we need some more to react in those ways
20 quickly. So that they can adjust and then to respond in
21 a timely way. So that we actually fit into their
22 project management plan and don't become the critical
00141

1 path for everything. So let's try to hold ourselves to
2 those things. I can say that because this is my last
3 meeting.

4 MR. SHULER: So unless there is anymore
5 discussion on this issue? Anymore?

6 MR. OTTO: I have another issue I'd like to
7 add.

8 MR. SHULER: That's related to this?

9 MR. OTTO: It's related to FDsys.

10 MR. SHULER: Okay.

11 MR. OTTO: I just had a light bulb go on at
12 lunch and maybe you guys already knew this, but I
13 thought the demonstration of the FDsys yesterday morning
14 was really good and I found it really informative. And
15 they kept saying we were just authorized to show this.

16 I think they were only authorized to show it here in
17 Buffalo. So I'm wondering if the people from GPO can
18 clarify that, which means that if you're not here, you
19 don't get to see it. So is that the case?

20 MR. SHULER: It's Cindy.

21 MS. TUBBS: That was my understanding too.
22 If you go to FDsys now that is not there. It was just
00142

1 some dummy thing they were using here, yes.

2 MS ETKIN: Just a second and I'll flip
3 through my e-mail. Selene, do you know whether the
4 permission to do the demo yesterday was just for
5 yesterday? Okay. Just a second let me check my e-mail.

6 MR. SHULER: So while we are finding that
7 information --

8 MR. OTTO: So, if that's the case, I think
9 there were a lot of people who weren't able to be here
10 in Buffalo who would like to see that or see some form
11 of it. So I think it was -- the authorization came from
12 JC Pete, right? So we can't really ask GPO to go ask JC
13 Pete because it doesn't work that way. So I guess it
14 would have to be us asking JC Pete to allow --

15 MR. SHULER: No, it won't work that way
16 either.

17 MR. OTTO: It won't work that way either?

18 MR. SHULER: No.

19 MR. OTTO: Okay.

20 MS. TUBBS: We talked about it yesterday
21 about sending a message that we do want to see this get
22 approved.

00143

1 MR. SHULER: We did get that read into the
2 official record. That can be sent to JC Pete, to get a
3 sense of the Community and that would be an indirect way
4 of achieving that goal, but your point is well taken
5 that if this is frozen in Buffalo, what stays in
6 Buffalo -- no, I've got that backwards. Anyway, you've
7 got the point. But while you guys are looking for the
8 e-mails. Is that it?

9 MR. OTTO: Yes, that was pretty much it.

10 MR. SHULER: So we can continue to pursue
11 that line of inquiry. But I think the more important
12 takeaway from this conversation is can we pull together
13 two sentences, three sentences for tomorrow for our
14 bullet on this issue that we can demonstrate to the
15 Community this is the direction we are going in, is that

16 possible? Do I have to word smith it to death? I'm
17 looking at the plenary group obviously in my vision, all
18 my visions. Okay. Is that a good enough conversation?
19 Does anybody else want to add anything? You've got
20 Ric's e-mails?

21 MS. ETKIN: GPO received approval from JC
22 Pete to show a small demo in Buffalo (inaudible).
00144

1 MR. SHULER: So that would suggest what
2 happens in Buffalo stays in Buffalo. We will need to
3 pursue that along other lines.

4 MR. JACOBS: That doesn't mean that we can't
5 see what is coming down the pipe?

6 MR. SHULER: No, it does not.

7 MR. JACOBS: It just means that we can't use
8 the link to it.

9 MR. SHULER: Exactly.

10 MR. OTTO: So people can't check it out
11 themselves to see how the process is going to work.

12 MR. SHULER: Okay. So we close the book on
13 this one. All right. Let's move to access and
14 preservation.

15 MS. SEARS: I came up with just a few things
16 that I wrote down as main themes from the group. One
17 was discoverability. One was incentives to keep and
18 preserve digital contact. And one was collaboration and
19 I wrote down that we need to recommend to GPO that they
20 need to add a browse feature to their registry to browse
21 by projects that are looking for collaborators. Cindy
22 had said in the meeting that the registry does this

00145

1 already and it does not. The registry has a place on it
2 where you can say that you would like a collaborator,
3 but there is no way to search by that particular
4 donation. So, if you are looking at each individual
5 registered item, then once you're looking at all of the
6 information for that item -- so say like my A to Z
7 digital collection for UNT, if you look A to Z digital
8 collection up then you look up then you look all the way
9 down it, there might be a spot that says, yes, I'm
10 looking for a collaborator. I find that as many items
11 that are there are on the registry and it would be very
12 difficult for somebody who is wanting to collaborate.
13 It would be much easier if they could browse by all of
14 the projects that want a collaborator and then they
15 could go down and look at the different titles and then

16 they wouldn't be looking at every single thing on the
17 registry because it is getting very populated.

18 Also, we would like to recommend that GPO
19 add a link to grant opportunities document which was
20 distributed at the Tampa meeting and the Tampa
21 recommendations that are posted on the FDLP Desktop
22 library Council recommendations that they add a link to
00146

1 that grant opportunities doc to the priority titles for
2 digitization also to the registry. So those two items;
3 links need to be added to the registry.

4 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Suzanne, going along with
5 that, was there something that I heard somewhere about
6 keeping that list updated of grant opportunities that it
7 was going to be Council's responsibility? Did I imagine
8 that?

9 MS. SEARS: I never heard that it was
10 Council's responsibility. I don't know that I would
11 feel qualified to keep that list up to date.

12 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, but the list is
13 already a year old. That's a thought that maybe we ask
14 that be updated.

15 MS. SEARS: Yes, I would say and in the
16 recommendation we probably need to assign the
17 responsibility of who is updated or ask GPO if they have
18 the staff to keep it updated. If not, then maybe we do
19 need to see if somebody can keep it updated.

20 The other thing, and this was something that
21 was told to me after the meeting, so it's something that
22 somebody heard in the meeting, a suggestion for an
00147

1 incentive for digitization projects. Is that Council or
2 GPO or somebody communicate and talk with associations
3 such as SCRL and ARL about their statistics and their
4 indusces? And if they give more weight to E content
5 being counted as volumes in their indusces then perhaps
6 the universities would take that as incentive to
7 digitalize and have E content.

8 MR. SHULER: Any discussion, Council?
9 Keeping in mind -- not quite yet. Keeping in mind of
10 the forward looking aspects of these kinds of documents,
11 given these basic five points, is there anything we need
12 to add or flush out more, given the coming regime
13 change?

14 MS. MORIEARTY: Which regime?

15 MR. SHULER: Public printer and sudoc.

16 Chris?

17 MR. GREER: This is to add something to this
18 set. The one thing that I keep -- trying to keep on the
19 table is the ability of the depository libraries to
20 contribute their only capabilities to the FDsys
21 landscape. And so discoverability and collaboration,
22 particularly collaboration, but the depository libraries
00148

1 themselves are good source of capacity and capability
2 for discoverability, for example. They are kind of
3 interface with the local communities out there that
4 understand both sides of that equation. An incentive is
5 to give them, as part of their business model, the
6 opportunity to contribute to that discoverability and
7 all of that is in a collaborative mode. My issue here
8 is that it should be possible for the depository
9 libraries to build their own applications on top of the
10 FDsys foundation. So if you are at Stanford you can
11 create your own search and match of capabilities that
12 combine, not just FDsys resources, but all the many rich
13 things that are available only at the Stanford Library,
14 or only in California or what have you. So, I have
15 brought this up a number of times, the need for a rich
16 application program interface and engineering that into
17 the frame work. We have been assured a number of times
18 that we would see some examples of that. I'm not sure
19 that is on the table at the moment, but I would like to
20 put it back on the table and say I'd like to see that --
21 that maintained as a high priority throughout the
22 project.

00149

1 MR. JACOBS: Although GPO might argue that
2 putting stuff in their bulk data repository is, in fact,
3 sort of an API. I understand your point and I agree
4 with it.

5 MR. GREER: Even just -- let's just take
6 that very simple model of just highlighting how that
7 bulk repository is available, what the choice of
8 standards are there and how that promotes
9 interoperability and have discussion with this Community
10 to get that thinking going. So wherever that happens,
11 even in a very simple mode like that, let's highlight
12 that and mark it as an important progress for the
13 Community.

14 MR. SHULER: Any other aspects to bring up
15 in regards to this plenary session? The group then

16 ready to roll out a few sentences in this regard to the
17 Community? Okay.

18 MS. MORIEARTY: John, may I have a point of
19 clarification?

20 MR. SHULER: Yes.

21 MS. MORIEARTY: Should we work on this
22 tonight or can we work on this at the eight-thirty --
00150

1 MR. SHULER: Let's get through the next
2 piece.

3 MS. MORIEARTY: Think about that.

4 MR. SHULER: Think about that. Let's go
5 through the next piece and see what work is left and I
6 think we can figure that out.

7 So, James, I think maybe -- maybe one slide
8 on all three topic sentences.

9 MS. TUBBS: Justin, you have the template
10 for that, right?

11 MR. OTTO: Yes.

12 MR. SHULER: Yeah. I'm going to send you
13 all a link from the New York Times that tells you how
14 Power Points is screwing up our military.

15 MR. O'MAHONY: If we save our slides can we
16 use them at a later time?

17 MR. SHULER: Sure, you only have a few more
18 hours to humor me. Okay. Let's close the circle with
19 regional issues.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: Since we just had our session
21 this morning, I personally don't feel that I have had a
22 chance to personally digest everything that went on in
00151

1 the session. But I also felt that we didn't really
2 adequately discuss all of the questions. We didn't
3 really have enough time for all of them and then
4 Michelle McKnelly made a really good point which was we
5 need a whole lot more input from the Community sense.
6 There are a whole lot of people who are not represented
7 here. So I think if I had any sense at all of what I
8 would say tomorrow. It would be we have to get more
9 input.

10 MR O'MAHONY: Building on that intro, that
11 while they weren't regional points per se, some of the
12 issues or points that came up had to do with data
13 gathering, feedback, gathering whatever you want to call
14 it. So two pieces of that could be -- and these are as
15 many recommendations for ourselves as there are for

16 anybody else, but perhaps for Council to work with GPO
17 to do two things at least: One is to figure out ways to
18 utilize the biennial survey or plan for the biennial
19 survey in a timely and transparent way such that if
20 there are issues or if there are questions that need to
21 be put out there for Community response, that those are
22 done in a way that we are asking the right questions,
00152

1 that folks have a little bit of advanced notice that
2 these questions are coming, so that it doesn't hit them
3 cold. And that we in a meaningful way plan for how the
4 biennial survey will feed into an ongoing feedback and
5 information gathering plan for GPO.

6 The second piece of that would be, aside
7 from the biennial survey, would be to explore other
8 means for gathering feedback and information and data
9 through the Community, whether it's through Web tools,
10 whether it's through some feature of the Community site,
11 yet to be developed or other mechanisms, but ways in
12 which to in a more timely way, in a more focused way,
13 have the advantage of soliciting brought in in input
14 from the whole Community.

15 MR. SHULER: I believe that those two
16 points, Dan, were also mentioned earlier today in our
17 first work session where we talked about statistics, so
18 those ideas have been captured on that to do list as
19 well. And about the biennial survey and releasing the
20 questions to the Community early?

21 MR. O'MAHONY: That is exactly what I was
22 just summarizing.

00153

1 MR. SHULER: So that was captured in that
2 earlier discussion.

3 MS. SEARS: I don't know how relevant this
4 is, but something that disturbed me greatly about that
5 session, there seems to be a lot of myths out there. I
6 don't know what we can do about it or even if it's our
7 role to do something about it. But it just concerns me
8 that some of these people are thinking that they have --
9 they were saying that GPO is rigid and I see GPO very
10 flexible on most things. And the one person who was
11 saying that, she couldn't move what she wanted to to
12 storage because of the cataloging she would have to do.
13 I don't know that we have a role there or if there is
14 something we can do about that. But it does concern me
15 greatly that there are all these myths out there that

16 haven't been diffused yet.

17 MS. SANDERS: I agree with that, but one of
18 the other things that did concern me about that session
19 was the dropping of the bomb, to my mind, about no
20 longer needing to provide a monetary return to the
21 superintendent of documents for stuff that is deposited.
22 That was huge and it just was offhanded and it wasn't
00154

1 even in the handout. I'm still trying to get my brain
2 around that one.

3 MS. SEARS: It is in the handout, Ann, but
4 it's buried and I have some background that I really
5 don't know that I can put on the record, but if the rest
6 of Council wants to meet me after the meeting.

7 MS. MORIEARTY: Well, what never fails to
8 amaze me, although I live in a state that the regional
9 does not provide information, does not really provide
10 guidance, and this is not a secret, they do agree with
11 me. But I was surprised at the questions. And it seems
12 to me the other part of this and why all this
13 misinformation is out there, is that people do have
14 regionals who, unlike the regional I grew up with,
15 wasn't keeping people informed, didn't seem to be a lot
16 of these people were saying they didn't hear any of
17 these changes. They didn't know any of these changes
18 and it also seems to be the shifting nature of regionals
19 now.

20 MR. O'MAHONY: A couple of reactions. One
21 of the most compelling points, or just audience comments
22 that I found this morning, was the woman from Clemson.
00155

1 In a nutshell I think that summarized a lot of the
2 issues that a lot of folks are facing in terms of in
3 many cases these are folks very, very new to their
4 environment. There isn't an institutional or broader
5 context for them to grapple with some of the very
6 difficult challenges they are facing. So whether they
7 then view that as rigid or frustrating or perplexing or
8 whatever, you know, that's part of it. I'm not exactly
9 sure how to address that, but I do think whatever
10 outreach and educational and training kinds of things
11 that go on, that that is a huge target audience that
12 needs to be addressed on an ongoing basis because that
13 is just going to get worse before it gets better.

14 The other thing I will just throw out is
15 that, you know, for a long time lots of us in libraries

16 often confuse policies dictated to us from outside our
17 libraries with the way our libraries individually have
18 responded to those things over time and the policies
19 that we set for ourselves. So just using my library as
20 an example, I could commiserate with the person who
21 couldn't send things to storage because we have a policy
22 in place that there has to be piece level cataloging for
00156

1 anything that goes to our remote storage facility. We
2 don't have that for a lot of our older government
3 documents. So we are not in a position thus far for us
4 to do that. That may not be anything that GPO has said.
5 That may not be anything that our regional has said, but
6 that is our own internal policy and at some level those
7 things just sort of meld together for lots of us.

8 MS. SINCLAIR: I just want to throw out that
9 I think Ric has mentioned more than once that he would
10 like to have another regional's meeting similar to the
11 ones we had in 2003 and 2000 --

12 MS. SEARS: One is 2003 where they paid --

13 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes, where they actually paid
14 for the regionals to come. That might address what Jill
15 brought up that the regionals that don't -- you know,
16 either don't know what they are supposed to do or just
17 don't do it. But it doesn't really help with what Dan
18 is talking about where people at the selectives don't
19 know what they are supposed to do.

20 MS. SANDERS: Well, the elephant in the room
21 is still that the last time that GPO held one of those
22 that they paid for us to all come there were regionals
00157

1 that didn't come. Some regionals are more regionals
2 than others, if you'll pardon the paraphrasing. That is
3 still the elephant in the room and there are lots of
4 reasons why that is so. Some of them are beyond the
5 control of individuals who is wearing that title, but --

6 MS. SEARS: I guess I'm just really
7 concerned when I do believe that a lot of it is new
8 depository coordinators who get confused with
9 institutional policies and GPO policies. What concerns
10 me is when they bring those out into an open forum and
11 they are not challenged then other people that are in
12 the audience who don't know think that is a GPO policy
13 and that's how these myths get born and they go around
14 and around. I'm just concerned that we are still
15 hearing the same things over and over again about a

16 ridged GPO when they bend over backwards to be as
17 flexible as possible. I don't know. Like I said, I'm
18 not sure we have a role or what we can do about it, but
19 it does concern me.

20 MS. SANDERS: I think it's in part because
21 we are still singing to the choir. We are still singing
22 to the group that is able to get to these meetings.

00158

1 They are not the people that need the outreach to. It's
2 the people who never -- you know, who can't make it to
3 an individual meeting in their state.

4 MS. SEARS: Right, and they read the
5 transcripts and then they have just what is in the
6 transcript and if it's not been challenged then they
7 just take it as -- because they can't hear tone of
8 voice. And a lot of times when you are reading through
9 the transcript you'll get confused as to who is saying
10 it. And I guess it just really -- again, they don't
11 have anybody they can turn next to you and say, what did
12 they just say? Is that right? And the person next to
13 them says, oh, that is not right because they are
14 reading just a dry transcript.

15 MR. CISMOWSKI: In the hopes that we can
16 craft some recommendations, I'd like to throw out three
17 goals that I see coming out of the session this morning
18 and they are not new -- well, one is brand new, but the
19 other two are not.

20 The first would be the Community is better
21 informed about the shelflist conversion process. I put
22 that out there because before this meeting I really

00159

1 didn't know how many shelflist cards there were, but
2 what the plan was for converting them, what the plan was
3 for digitizing them. I think this information should be
4 disseminated to the Community in a better way than it's
5 been.

6 The second, to make sure that the -- the
7 ideal goal, every depository library in the nation knows
8 that it's no longer forbidden to sell unwanted
9 publications as long as those publications have been
10 withdrawn, according to the established processes and
11 GPO has through the agency of the regional, relinquished
12 federal property control over these things.

13 And the third would be more incentives are
14 developed to provide exclusive incentives for both
15 regionals and selectives to remain in the program in

16 those roles. My hope is that once we -- I'm sure that
17 there will be more goals for ideal outcomes, but once we
18 have those outcomes mainly we can craft language in the
19 form of recommendations to try to further those goals.

20 MS. SEARS: Can I just say, I have two
21 really big concerns with the selling of the collections.
22 I understand the concept behind them, but I just took
00160

1 the -- the Fort Worth Public Library dropped their
2 depository and designation in February. They have
3 about, I'm estimating, about 700 to 800,000 items. And
4 I'm taking all of those items. If it's duplicates we
5 are going to digitize them and if it's not we are going
6 to add them to our collection. They have been a
7 depository since 1905. So there's a lot of historical
8 material there.

9 My conversations with the public services
10 director, who was in charge of talking with me when we
11 were negotiating our taking of the collection, there
12 were several times when he said directly to me, and to
13 Tom Roerrig, my regional who was in on these
14 negotiations as well, are you sure these aren't our
15 property? Are you sure we can't sell them? And I am
16 very, very, very concerned with who is going to be
17 policing whether or not they have gone through the
18 proper channels before they start selling this material.
19 We all know that there are libraries who are selling the
20 material and now that they have been given permission
21 to, basically that's a problem.

22 Also, are libraries going to start taking
00161

1 collections with the plan that they can sell them in the
2 future? I mean, you know, if they paid for the shipping
3 to get it there and then a month or two later they put
4 it up on needs and offers and nobody takes it and they
5 can sell it, there are all kinds of ramifications. I
6 mean, yeah, this was just dropped on us and we weren't
7 given any time whatsoever to know that this was even
8 coming. And it's very similar to October when it was
9 dropped on us about regionals and retrospective
10 collections.

11 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David. Regarding --
12 Cindy might want to weigh in on this. Regarding that
13 first point, Fort Worth could not sell any of their
14 existing collection until the regional -- until it goes
15 through the whole regional deselection process, correct?

16 MS. SEARS: And that is correct, but when
17 you are sitting there with the director and you're
18 saying it's government property, that's something they
19 understand. If I showed him that, you know, yes, it's
20 still government property and we want it so it's going
21 to be -- I'm just saying the negotiations would have
22 been a lot more difficult if he knew that if I didn't
00162

1 take it that he would be able to sell it.

2 MR. CISMOWSKI: Well, the process that has
3 to be followed is that the regional makes the decision
4 as to whether it needs to be offered to other libraries,
5 if the regional doesn't want it themselves. And so
6 what's really going on here is that the regional is
7 taking possession of the collection in transferring that
8 to you.

9 MS. SEARS: In a sense, yes.

10 MR. CISMOWSKI: And it's still federal
11 property and once you get it, it's still federal
12 property.

13 MS. SEARS: Theoretically, that's exactly
14 right. I'm just saying the actual practice -- it was
15 already a difficult thing to convince Fort Worth Public
16 to give us their collection. I'm just saying that the
17 thing that we kept coming back to was that it was
18 government property and that was what saved me. I
19 didn't have this, thank goodness, to deal with in
20 February. I'm just saying that it could cause other
21 issues in practicality. I'm not a director, so I don't
22 know exactly how they think, but I know money is a big
00163

1 issue and if they think they can sell that collection,
2 they are going to keep it and maybe list it in some
3 obscure way somewhere so that they can then sell it.
4 I'm just saying it causes a lot of issues. I know there
5 is a reason behind it and I understand that we do need
6 to not be just throwing these valuable documents in the
7 trash. I don't know. It really concerns me and I wish
8 I had had more time to digest it and to look it over
9 before I was -- before it was thrown on me.

10 MS. SANDERS: Well, before it became a
11 matter of public record, if you want to think about it
12 another way, think of Detroit Public. They've got this
13 incredibly rich, incredibly complete collection. They
14 have been winnowing at it for the last four years, but
15 it's still by in large very complete. And there is a

16 whole bunch of stuff there that the Library of Michigan
17 already owns, a whole bunch of stuff that is very
18 valuable. I mean, I could rack up probably \$25,000
19 without using the fingers of my hands. I can probably
20 rack off 10 titles that will probably bring them
21 \$25,000. Is that a direction we really want to go
22 because the mantra has always been you can not
00164

1 financially profit from your status as a depository
2 library. That has always been the mantra. And if we
3 are reversing that, that is a game changing position
4 change. And there are places out there that are going
5 to financially benefit in an extraordinary way from that
6 if they choose to. Now, is that true with the majority,
7 probably not, but if you look at what is out there and
8 you spend a half-an-hour -- I mean, you go on the
9 Antiquated Booksellers Web site and type in U.S.
10 Government Printing Office as a publisher and watch what
11 comes up and watch what is offered for sale at. That's
12 a whole lot of money and it's now going to somebody who
13 left the program rather than comply with the
14 requirements of the program. Is that a message we
15 really want to send?

16 MR. CISMOWSKI: Did Detroit leave the
17 program all together?

18 MS. SANDERS: No. In their case -- and I'm
19 picking on Detroit. I'm not implying that Detroit is
20 going to go out and sell anything. There is an example
21 of an old, rich collection, very valuable, already held
22 in the state, so I don't have -- and I'm certainly not
00165

1 in a position to take multiple copies just to keep
2 somebody from doing the wrong thing with it.

3 MS. SEARS: I mean, it really basically is
4 giving you an incentive to lead your collection --

5 MR. O'MAHONY: It introduces a whole other
6 level of incentive. In the past if you were getting rid
7 of things, whether you were relinquishing regional
8 status or just downsizing your selective, you got rid of
9 things but you held on -- you made the argument to hold
10 onto things because you were going to keep them in your
11 collection. This now introduces a whole other level of
12 incentive of financial gain by not only, you know,
13 leaving the program, but then selling off the
14 collection. Your distinction about that, the Detroit
15 example, where whether you leave or not leave is a good

16 distinction to pursue. A library can only take
17 advantage of this if in fact they are still a depository
18 library. That at least continues some semblance of
19 accountability or --

20 MS. SANDERS: But they don't, Dan. If
21 somebody leaves the program all together ultimately the
22 regional signs off on what they decide to keep and then
00166

1 it is their's free and clear and then they can go sell
2 it now because it's --

3 MS. SEARS: Exactly.

4 MR. SHULER: May I suggest I too was a bit
5 surprised at that announcement and as casual as it was
6 brought up in this fashion. And may I suggest that
7 Council use it's advisory role to either advise GPO to
8 hold off on the implementation until it is more
9 thoroughly researched or, may I be so bold to suggest,
10 that we might advise, based on this conversation and the
11 concerns expensed, this may not be the best thing to do
12 at this moment given the critical decisiontrees that are
13 being decided about all these collections.

14 MS. HOLTERHOFF: I mean to defend GPO, they
15 were doing this on advice of legal counsel, but there
16 might have been some crucial angles on this that we as
17 people that can think of the devious people that are in
18 our Community, might possibly think of that need to be
19 brought forward to the legal counsel and maybe they
20 could look at it again.

21 MS. SANDERS: Absolutely. They were putting
22 it forward to be flexible to make disposal easier.

00167

1 MR. SHULER: I think what is critical here
2 just as it was in the housing market. In this sense the
3 regionals are acting as a financial stopgap. If the
4 regionals were working properly throughout the nation,
5 the nefarious directors that Susan mentioned -- Suzanne,
6 excuse me -- would have a watchdog that would be
7 watching for this kind of activity and saying, okay, you
8 are going to deassemble your collection, but we want to
9 make sure that you give us all parts of your collection
10 we need for our purposes first. In other words, the
11 regional steps back into the relationship and makes sure
12 that the selective is behaving in the responsible
13 fashion as the custodian of the documents that it should
14 before the pecuniary rewards are introduced. I think
15 that is what is missing from this equation more than

16 anything else.

17 MR. GREER: Maybe it makes sense for us to
18 include a recommendation that the Council considers
19 that -- this is implemented as policy may have
20 unintended consequences and potentially negative
21 consequences and that our recommendation be that there
22 be an analysis of those consequences at the next Council
00168

1 meeting prior to any action on the policy itself.

2 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Just on the side, we had a
3 minor sprinkler incident in our library, luckily not in
4 any of our documents area, but a couple of years ago and
5 several ranges of books that were with the international
6 law collection were damaged. And in talking about this
7 with insurance people and people in our administration,
8 you know, just lost some books, how much could that
9 cost? Just part of one shelf, you know, our
10 acquisitions figured out it was \$10,000 and you know
11 what I mean? Then all at once they said, really? We
12 had no idea. And I'm just thinking that people that
13 aren't librarians, that aren't book people, don't really
14 understand the value. It's a bunch of old documents.
15 That's just like recycling paper, right? And, you know,
16 not understanding how much this stuff costs.

17 MR. SHULER: Agreed. Would the regional
18 group be willing to take a stab that at wording or do we
19 need a different group?

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: We'll stab away.

21 MR. SHULER: Stab away? Chris.

22 MR. GREER: Another matter for the

00169

1 regionals, in keeping with what David said earlier about
2 incentives for regionals, I think we ought to use our
3 recommendations also as an opportunity to commend and
4 incentivize GPO when they do good things. And I thought
5 that this segmentation survey, and the effort to
6 understand, you know, the diverse needs of the various
7 sectors represented across the DPO Communities and
8 integrate that into their strategic thinking, that is a
9 good thing.

10 I think we ought to have a recommendation
11 that just says, this approach, understanding the
12 diversity to the various Communities and integrating
13 those needs, in response to those needs into the
14 strategic thinking, is a good direction.

15 MR. SHULER: Does that want to fall into one

16 of the groups?

17 MR. GREER: That falls into the regional
18 discussion and David invited comments of that kind.

19 MR. SHULER: Further stabbing David.

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: I guess the work assignment
21 has been made.

22 MR. SHULER: From the guy who has nothing to
00170

1 lose, right.

2 MS. TUBBS: We were talking about action
3 items for the regionals group. The next time we have a
4 conference call would you just mind checking up to see
5 that the revised discard list with the 30 days is on the
6 Web site and that there is a summary, Ann, of your 50
7 state survey, more prominent or easier to find?

8 MS. SANDERS: I can put that on Community
9 myself and then have Cindy's page linked to it, so yes.

10 MR. SHULER: Okay. What's the sense of
11 Council? Do you guys and gals do this in off time and
12 come back at ten-thirty tomorrow with the bullet points
13 fully engaged or do you want to come back with your work
14 in progress and work at the eight-thirty working session
15 meeting? What's your wish?

16 MR. JACOBS: We'll come back tomorrow.

17 MS. SANDERS: Eight-thirty.

18 MR. O'MAHONY: The eight-thirty session.

19 MR. SHULER: Okay, eight-thirty we will meet
20 here, continue the work and have it prepared in time for
21 our ten-thirty gig which will only give us a
22 half-an-hour between shifts. Is that acceptable?

00171

1 MR. JACOBS: Yes.

2 MR. SHULER: Does Council have any further
3 business that it wants to consider during this work
4 session? Yes? No? Snap to it? We are done. See
5 everybody tomorrow at eight-thirty. See some of you at
6 the regionals.

7

8 * * * * *

2010 FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE AND SPRING
DEPOSITORY COUNCIL MEETING

April 28th, 2010
ADAMS MARK HOTEL
120 Church Street
Buffalo, New York 14202

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. SHULER: All right. I have of what was
3 the latest as of five a.m. this morning. Do we want to
4 do anything?

5 MR. JACOBS: These were the three things
6 that we thought, coming out of the session:
7 Discoverability, incentives and collaboration were the
8 major themes talked about. Are there others that
9 resinate any thought?

10 MR. GREER: It's my impression these are
11 sort of apple pie. They are good. They are quite
12 broad. Almost everything I can think of fits in one of
13 them. So I think that's a set of higher order
14 categories for organizing things. They work well.

15 MR. SHULER: Anybody else? Ready to turn
16 the slide? What do we think of this slide?

17 MS. MORIEARTY: Honestly, that will help
18 Chris, too.

19 THE WITNESS: Recommendation number 1, this
20 is recommended to GPO. Need to browse registry by
21 project looking for collaborator and highlight
22 collaborator needs and offers in the navigation. I
00003

1 didn't put the link in there, but it's talking about
2 registry at FDLP.gov, the digital registry.

3 MR. SHULER: Maybe we should put that word
4 or two in there indicating which registry it is in a
5 brief sentence.

6 MR. JACOBS: So maybe say digital registry?

7 MR. SHULER: Yes, digital registry or by
8 project, yes.

9 MR. JACOBS: Or digitization registry?

10 MR. SHULER: Or digitization registry.

11 MR. O'MAHONY: Why don't we just call it
12 what it is.

13 MR. SHULER: Since people don't often visit
14 the Web site as often as we think they do, it might help
15 to tell them where it is.

16 MR. JACOBS: Yes, I will do that, too. I
17 believe it's registry.FDLP.gov.

18 MR. SHULER: So while James is doing that
19 I'll read the second one. Add link to grant
20 opportunities document delivered in Tampa on Desktop
21 under recommendations and to the priority titles for
22 digitization to registry. Any suggestions, thoughts?
00004

1 Third one?

2 MS. SEARS: Communicate with the
3 associations, ACRL, ARL, etc., that collect statistics
4 and rate libraries based on those statistics to see if
5 they might consider giving weight to E collections,
6 vis-~~vis~~-vis tangible volumes in their metrics.

7 MR. SHULER: Any response.

8 MR. GREER: My question is whether this
9 recommendation is appropriate for the Government
10 Printing Office? What the Council is trying to do is
11 to, as I understand it, try to help the library
12 Community with some better appreciation for the value of
13 E collections and providing an appropriate way to that.
14 Is it appropriate for the Government Printing Office to
15 take a position on the relative merit of one versus the
16 other, as opposed to the Council taking a position on
17 the relative merit of one versus another. I don't know
18 really if we have anybody here from GPO here who might
19 comment on that. But speaking from the government side
20 an agency taking a position on something is a
21 significant step. It requires some consultation. You
22 are kind of putting the government behind a particular
00005

1 position. This would be a significant step, I think. I
2 can't really speak for GPO, but my impression is that
3 would put the agency on record with respect to tangible
4 versus digital collections. Given their current status,
5 with respect to the new printer, things like that, this
6 might be a steep hill.

7 MR. O'MAHONY: I would agree and also just
8 sort of as a very basic background, ARL for one has been
9 looking at this issue for a lot of years and has been
10 testing different metrics, with respect to electronic
11 sources, and like any association has its own realm of
12 politics and controversy surrounding statistics and how
13 those relate to describing or ranking collections and I
14 don't really see the value of sort of inserting a public
15 printer or GPO into that melee.

16 MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski. I
17 agree. I think because of the politics involved here,
18 there might be resentment on the part of some ARL
19 directors to the government inserting itself into this
20 issue and that might negatively impact the depositories
21 and those directors' domain.

22 MR. O'MAHONY: And just to followup. I
00006

1 think the basic point or intent of this actually is
2 already underway. I mean at least not speaking for, but
3 speaking about ARL. They are very, very much aware of
4 the importance of electronic collections and working in
5 a lot of creative ways to try to find the appropriate
6 measure and rank that kind of stuff.

7 MR. SHULER: What is the sense of Council on
8 this then?

9 MR. GREER: My sense is that if Council
10 wants to make this inquiry that is one thing, you may
11 well be inserting yourselves in the politics of this, so
12 I think we should be careful about that, but as a
13 recommendation to GPO, I wouldn't support.

14 MR. O'MAHONY: We could alternatively, as a
15 point for ourselves, rate this as an important issue or
16 topic for us to take back to our respective Communities
17 to be sure that, you know, the value of electronic
18 government publications is included in discussions
19 within our Communities as they move forward in dealing
20 with measuring and describing collections and such.

21 MR. SHULER: I get the sense that there is a
22 feeling that we should step softly here and whether or
00007

1 not this is the theatre to display this particular stage
2 graft at this moment might be considered.

3 MS. SEARS: Specifically, Dan, in your
4 comment do you think that the ARL directors would be
5 offended if Council made it just so that we can weigh in
6 on the side of please, yes, if it's already on its way
7 and there is this pole against it or whatever maybe we
8 could help push towards being done?

9 MR. O'MAHONY: Right. I mean, expressing
10 the importance of digital collections and however it is
11 that we want to describe that value. I think that's
12 perfectly appropriate and would lend value to the
13 discussion, but it's -- it's not directing GPO to do
14 something and it's not telling them how to do it. It's
15 just expressing that we think this is an important thing

16 that should be considered.

17 MS. SEARS: So what words should we changed
18 in here to make sure that Council expresses their belief
19 that E collections should -- how would you change the
20 wording?

21 MS. HOLTERHOFF: I forget who brought this
22 up first, but it was under the heading of kind of
00008

1 incentive to libraries to want to participate in
2 digitization projects, as I recall and it still seems
3 like there is still some germ of an idea there. I don't
4 know if there is something that GPO -- that we would
5 need from GPO, maybe not, but it would certainly be good
6 or if there were a way to make this be an incentive, you
7 know, exist as an incentive.

8 MR. SHULER: Perhaps the question we should
9 be asking ourselves, is this something that we want to
10 address particularly to GPO or to the Community at this
11 time since we are still processing it?

12 MS. SEARS: It sounds like it needs not to
13 be directed at GPO. I mean, I agree with what Chris and
14 Dan both said. I think it needs to be addressed to the
15 Community, but I do think it holds more weight if it's
16 coming from Council and is in a recommendation. I mean
17 associations do look at us as the Community. And I do
18 think that it's important that it is included because we
19 have heard very clearly in the last two days that
20 incentives are a big issue and this would be a big
21 incentive for digitization. If you are going to build
22 your E book collection by digitizing and you get -- if
00009

1 you're losing a tangible volume, if you destructively
2 scan it, which most libraries are doing, but you are
3 replacing it with an E collection book that is still
4 being counted in the same way or you're getting credit
5 for, I think that is an incentive. Otherwise there is
6 an incentive to hold onto your tangible collection and
7 not do the digitization.

8 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Would this be a possible
9 idea for a program for the fall meeting to bring someone
10 that knows about this from ARL and ACRL? I don't know.
11 I mean, I'm not in those organizations so I don't know.
12 Do they have a person that is in charge of this or
13 somebody that could come and do a program on this
14 general topic?

15 MS. SINCLAIR: We could ask Denise Davis to

16 come.

17 MR. O'MAHONY: Well, in terms of just
18 getting to the words, I think the second half of that is
19 great if that's expressing the sentiment that giving
20 weight to E collections in terms of, you know,
21 describing the size and value of collections. I think
22 it's just the first part in terms of rather than

00010

1 directing it at somebody that, you know, Council
2 expresses the importance of digital collections --
3 digital collections of government publications and I
4 don't have the words at the top of my head, but --

5 MR. GREER: So we just might say it
6 directly, let's say Council intends to pursue
7 discussions with associations as the first part of that.
8 And I think a plan to have a session where you are
9 getting input from ACR and ARL is an excellent one. If
10 it would be an open conversation and Everybody could
11 participate. I think that would be fabulous if we could
12 make that happen.

13 MR. SHULER: So we can make the changes?

14 MR. JACOBS: If I can just say something
15 like, Council intends to pursue discussions with
16 associations that collect statistics and rate libraries
17 based on those statistics, etc., etc.

18 MR. SHULER: So agreeable?

19 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

20 MR. SHULER: Okay. Any other discussion?
21 Missing points? All right. Should we close this one?
22 Shall we go to since the regional -- I forget which is

00011

1 the longer one. I think the regional is the longer one.
2 Open that one next? The slide show. Should one of us
3 read this out loud? Council recommends that GPO staff
4 share with the Community a detailed summary of the scope
5 and target completion date of the GPO shelflist
6 conversion project. This summary should include; one,
7 total number of shelflist cards in the project. Two,
8 total number to be transcribed and three, total number
9 to be digitized and four, end users of these transcribed
10 and digitized records including use in a proposed
11 automated disposal list and NO, needs and offers list,
12 automation tool. This summary should be disseminated by
13 May 15th, 2010. Oh the density.

14 MS. SANDERS: I have a little philosophical
15 problem with the terminology shelflist conversion

16 project because we keep calling this thing a shelflist
17 but it's not. It's the remnant of their dictionary
18 catalog. And I'm a little uncomfortable that we are
19 setting up an expectation here that this project is
20 going to answer all of the pre1976 cataloging woes of
21 the Community and I don't think it's going to.

22 MS. SINCLAIR: I was going to add to this
00012

1 recommendation that we ask them to give an explanation
2 of the content of what is being digitized which would I
3 think help the Community to understand exactly what Ann
4 is saying that it's not really a shelflist. I would
5 suggest that they, rather than sending out one of their
6 typical, you know, fact sheet type publications, that
7 they actually do some sort of -- make a video or a OPAL
8 presentation that actually has visuals in it showing
9 what this thing looks like so that people can understand
10 it a little bit better.

11 MR. CISMOWSKI: My purpose in drafting this
12 was to get information about this project out to the
13 Community.

14 MS. SANDERS: Absolutely.

15 MR. CISMOWSKI: I do not believe that GPO
16 ever fully explained the scope of this, the content of
17 this, what they were actually doing and I learn things
18 for the first time here that I don't think have ever
19 been explained to the Community. And so the goal here
20 is not -- not necessarily to do just those four things
21 or five things up here, but to have a -- to ask GPO to
22 explain the entire project.

00013

1 MS. SANDERS: Yes. I'm not taking issue
2 with the draft recommendations. I think they are fine
3 and I think it says it should include, it's not limited
4 to, but I -- I'm word smithing I know, but I have issue
5 with what we are calling it because I think we are
6 adding to -- we are setting up a false expectation about
7 what we are going to get out of it.

8 MS. SINCLAIR: What should we call it
9 instead?

10 MS. TROTТА: That is what they are calling
11 it.

12 MS. SANDERS: From my prospective that is
13 part of the problem.

14 MS. TROTТА: What if we -- what if in the
15 draft recommendation the number one was really to find

16 what exactly is in this group of documents? Does that
17 help you with your problem?

18 MR. JACOBS: What is it that they called it,
19 a dictionary list?

20 MS. SANDERS: A dictionary catalog.

21 MR. GREER: Right, so where it says in that
22 first thing in the goal, the shelflist conversion
00014

1 project, I mean a simple thing would be to just put a
2 parentheses and then the project to digitize the old GPO
3 dictionary catalog, because it is known colloquially as
4 the shelflist project, but if we can help further refine
5 that and move that and then move that discussion along.

6 MS. SANDERS: That helps. That would work
7 for me.

8 MR. SHULER: Anybody in the group type that
9 change in?

10 MR. GREER: Can I propose two friendly
11 amendments? One is we should ask GPO to answer this
12 question, you know, consider that GPO rename the project
13 to reflect its actual goals and intent, maybe that would
14 be recommendation five, which would build on all the
15 other items in that list. What is it that you should
16 call it? The shelflist conversion project is not
17 appropriate. So five would be that GPO provide a -- a
18 name for the project that reflects its actual goals and
19 intentions.

20 For number four is to add examples of
21 intended end uses, since we hope that lots of people
22 will come up with uses that they can think of. So it's
00015

1 not that it is a constrained list, it's just an example
2 of what they hope will be done with it.

3 MS. MORIEARTY: Can you say that one more
4 time?

5 MR. GREER: Number four, start with examples
6 of intended end uses of these transcribed.

7 MR. JACOBS: Just a point of clarification,
8 can someone explain the difference between, what was
9 that, transcribing and digitizing? In my mind I think
10 digitizing includes OCR which is transcription or are
11 they planning on doing snapshots of some --

12 MS. SANDERS: My understanding is that
13 digitizing in this case means digital reproduction of
14 the actual cards.

15 MR. JACOBS: So snapshots of everything, but

16 not necessarily using it?

17 MS. SANDERS: Yes. They are not OCR'ing it
18 is my understanding --

19 MR. CISMOWSKI: I specifically asked Cindy
20 what that was and she said, they are converting every
21 shelflist card into a TIF image. It is not being
22 OCR'd. She showed me an example of a shelflist card. A
00016

1 lot of those things, up until '60's or '70's, were
2 handwritten and so it can't be OCR'd.

3 MS. SANDERS: We are talking about copper
4 plate in librarians' hands. And what the transcription
5 project is doing is turning them MARC. They are adding
6 the subject heading and the name --

7 MR. JACOBS: So they are making some sort of
8 judgment of this card that we've taken a snapshot is
9 crap and this card here is good and we are going to
10 transcribe the information into MARC, correct?

11 MR. CISMOWSKI: Well, the purpose of the --
12 no. My understanding of the purpose of the digitization
13 is so that GPO will have an in-house tool that will
14 replace the actual physical shelflist or whatever we
15 want to call it, which has been sent to NARA. I have a
16 question. I don't have a laptop here. Could somebody
17 else -- are you doing it? Okay.

18 MR. SHULER: So is somebody transcribing --
19 Thanks, Gwen. Shall we move on?

20 MS. SINCLAIR: Do you want me to read what I
21 put in here? Okay. The draft recommendation now reads,
22 Council recommends that GPO staff share with the
00017

1 Community a detailed summary of the scope and target
2 completion dates of the GPO shelflist conversion,
3 parens, project to digitize the dictionary catalog,
4 close parens. This summary should include one, total
5 number of shelflist cards in the project. I guess we
6 need to change that too. Total number of cards in the
7 project? Total number to be transcribed, total number
8 to be digitized. And four, examples of intended uses of
9 the transcribed and digitized records including use in a
10 proposed automated disposal list and needs and offers
11 list automation tool. And, five, rename the project to
12 reflect its actual content and scope. This summary
13 should be disseminated by May 15t, 2010.

14 MS. SANDERS: That makes me happy. Thank
15 you.

16 MR. SHULER: Okay. Next line. Goal two, as
17 soon as possible GPO, Council and regionals will
18 finalize procedural details of GPO's decision to abandon
19 government ownership of depository publications that
20 have gone through the complete regional supervised
21 disposal process. Draft recommendation: Assuming
22 Council approves GPO's proposal to abandon government
00018

1 ownership of depository publications that have gone
2 through the complete regional supervised disposal
3 process, Council recommends that as soon as possible GPO
4 staff work with regional depository coordinators to
5 finalize procedures for declaring ownership abandonment.
6 After finalizing procedures GPO and regionals will
7 inform the broader Community of the new rules for final
8 disposition of abandoned depository publications.

9 MS. SEARS: I have a major issue, which
10 isn't really expressed in this recommendation, but about
11 the -- once it's abandon, being able to sell it. I
12 don't think that I would have as much of an issue if the
13 money wasn't going to the person who was discarding the
14 material, but with the money going to the person who is
15 discarding the material it gives them a very huge
16 conflict of interest and it gives them an incentive to
17 leave and an incentive to withdraw from the program.

18 MS. SANDERS: I don't think they proposed
19 abandoning government ownership because that's always
20 happened. The last step in the disposal rules has
21 always been dispose of it as you see fit. Maybe the
22 phrase abandon government ownership hasn't been in it,
00019

1 but that is not what is new. What is new is the what
2 happens to the proceeds if it is sold. That is what is
3 very new. And I think for me that is what I'm taking
4 issue with more than the new use of the phrase abandon
5 government ownership.

6 MR. CISMOWSKI: I deliberately did not put
7 in any verbiage about selling publications into this
8 because I realize that this is an issue that is going to
9 have to be discussed before -- because of the
10 controversial nature of this, it's going to have to be
11 more fully discussed. But I think that -- I truly think
12 and I was talking with Suzanne and some others at
13 breakfast out there, I think that we need to do
14 something today about this because word has already gone
15 out to the Community that it's okay to sell publications

16 as long as they have been abandoned by GPO. So what are
17 we going to do, folks?

18 MR. O'MAHONY: The next slide. Since we
19 were in different hotel rooms last night, we need to
20 have the same idea, you know.

21 MR. CISMOWSKI: My brother's name is Dan
22 too.

00020

1 MR. O'MAHONY: A similar approach, but just
2 a slightly different tack in terms of identifying
3 specifically the sales stuff. So if you flip to the
4 next slide, I think it's the next slide, slide four, you
5 know, it essentially says we are first of all seeking
6 clarification on this policy, but it also sort of
7 inserts Council into a process of helping GPO develop
8 fuller guidelines for just what this means. And, you
9 know, it could be stronger in terms so folks don't leave
10 this room and start, you know, putting things on eBay
11 but at least it's a start.

12 MR. SHULER: I encourage the act of word
13 smithing in trying to sharpen these as much as possible.
14 I also point out that the purpose of the following
15 meeting is to present to the Community draft of where we
16 are going and I think this is a perfect example that we
17 want to leave it not undeveloped, but developed enough
18 to show the Community where we are going with this and
19 to get their feedback as well. So trying to fine tune
20 it at this point, I don't know if it's going to be worth
21 the effort.

22 MS. SEARS: I agree with David that

00021

1 something absolutely has to be said and I think it has
2 to be pretty strong even before we show it to the
3 Community. This is the exact same thing that happened
4 in October when Cindy had that statement in her slide
5 and it was just nonchalantly put out there and we all
6 know what the consequences of that were in the following
7 months. So I think we need to respond to what we heard
8 in a very strong manner and we can pull back later if we
9 have to, but I think it's really upon us to make sure
10 that this thing doesn't get viral before something is
11 clarified.

12 MS. SANDERS: You know, if we consider that
13 we had more people following the blog yesterday than we
14 had in the room and that is out there. I agree. I
15 think we have to -- we could find ourselves agreeing

16 with this policy change at some point, but the issue is
17 that it hasn't been discussed and we see ramifications
18 that perhaps GPO didn't see.

19 MR. SHULER: Then are our words strong
20 enough as they are right now, in the way that they are
21 organized on these slides, to convey that great
22 importance to Council through GPO, as it is drafted now?
00022

1 MR. GREER: My impression of the discussion,
2 I wasn't here for much of it, but my impression of the
3 discussion is there is not mature policy to reflect this
4 new legal guidance. So what is new is the legal
5 guidance, but what I went didn't hear was implement able
6 policy to act on that guidance. So my picture of this
7 the steps to new policy are, one, to announce to the
8 Community this new legal guidance and characterize it as
9 just that, it is legal guidance.

10 And, two, that GPO intends to implement a
11 process to develop mature policy to act on that guidance
12 and that will be taking place over the next period.

13 And that, three, that policy will be
14 development with input from the Community, including the
15 course of Council. So those seem to me the three steps
16 that we would like to see.

17 MR. SHULER: Where do we want to drop the
18 three steps, in the draft action item or in the
19 recommendation?

20 MR. O'MAHONY: I think that is a great sort
21 of approach to introduce specifically because it also
22 could help set the tone for future, you know, policy
00023

1 development because it isn't always developed in that
2 kind of a way. So I think that is a nice step-by-step
3 approach. And hopefully -- we can even be more
4 explicit, but hopefully that tells the Community that
5 what has happened thus far isn't a full blown change in
6 policy. It's just now we know that the scenery has
7 changed a bit and we have to develop policy to reflect
8 that.

9 MR. JACOBS: I'm trying to get my head
10 around why GPO would make this switch? Was this some
11 onerous process that when a library sold something it
12 had to send proceeds to GPO or something like that?

13 MS. SANDERS: Well, if you stop and think
14 about the average thing. You know, we are not talking
15 about exceptional disposals. We are talking about

16 somebody wants to recycle it and their institution
17 receives money from the recycler. Under the law they
18 were suppose to send a check for those proceeds to the
19 superintendent of documents. I had some just ridiculous
20 cases in Michigan where hearings got mold and were
21 recycled into ceiling tiles so who owned the ceiling
22 tile? You know what I mean. The average situation is
00024

1 different from the one that we have been projecting
2 about somebody deliberating selling valuable --

3 MR. JACOBS: So in clarifying the procedure,
4 they are actually clarifying a really bad outcome. I
5 mean from what I'm hearing, you know, is that true?

6 MS. SANDERS: Well, in clarifying the
7 procedure they are trying to make it easier. They are
8 saying, okay, we have abandoned all interest it, so why
9 shouldn't you be able to stick it in your book sale and
10 that makes perfect sense. But what we are bringing up
11 to them is the reverse of an institution deliberating
12 selling something for profit and thereby profiting from
13 their current or former status as a depository. So we
14 are devil's advocating them.

15 MR. CISMOWSKI: I think the purpose -- the
16 driver behind this is a number of things. GPO has been
17 hearing for a long time from the Community about
18 increased flexibility. There are -- many depositories
19 are massively weeding tangible collections to the point
20 where no other library is picking up what other
21 libraries don't want. So at the end of the disposal
22 progress selectives have shelf after shelf after shelf
00025

1 of publications that they have to do something with. So
2 nobody wants them, so they are faced with basically two
3 choices; they can sell them and send the proceeds to
4 GPO, which is an oenerous process or they can just say,
5 you know, I know these probably have value, but I can't
6 really do anything with them, so I'm just going to take
7 them out to the dumpster. So GPO has been hearing that
8 a lot of valuable publications are ending up in
9 landfills doing nobody any good at all where they could
10 be doing somebody some good. GPO doesn't want these
11 things, but booksellers might want them, individuals
12 might want them for their collections. They could be
13 told in friend's sales and benefit the libraries, that
14 have held these things for years, at their experience.

15 MR. JACOBS: So really what we are talking

16 about is if this is part of the day-to-day -- the
17 accessioning process that is okay, but if it's part of a
18 library dropping its status then that is not okay. I
19 mean, that's what's --
20 MR. O'MAHONY: Exactly. If at the end of
21 the day and somebody has gone through all the due
22 diligence of the national needs and offers and expended
00026

1 all effort to make sure that nobody truly wants it or
2 can use it, then if they sell it, whatever they do with
3 it, that's probably just fine. But what we don't want
4 is this to be an incentive for folks to work around the
5 system and shortcut those procedures.

6 MS. SEARS: I think a point Dan just made
7 that is very important, he said, national needs and
8 offers list, that's still an option. People don't have
9 to list on the national needs and offers list. I think
10 that should be a requirement if they are then going to
11 go ahead and sell it.

12 Also, I just mentioned this before and I
13 want to mention it again. A lot of times those things
14 aren't claimed because of the cost of shipping to get
15 them to another library. It's not that other libraries
16 don't want them, it's that they can't afford the
17 shipping to get it there. So I don't know. I don't
18 know that I have had time to digest it and think about
19 all the possible ways to maybe fix it.

20 I'm just concerned that we are going to have
21 some directors who are going to see this and I know that
22 many of us don't have time to look at the needs and
00027

1 offers everyday or on a regular basis and especially
2 every one of the 50 states. So if it didn't go to the
3 national list, I may not know that it's available. So I
4 do think that needs to be a requirement if we are going
5 to allow the sales.

6 MR. O'MAHONY: We also heard about the
7 development of a tool for national needs and offers, so,
8 you know, if on the one hand that process is
9 facilitated, that could sort of potentially help that.

10 MR. GREER: So my sense is we are probably
11 not in the next five minutes, going to think of all of
12 the unintended consequences of the significant change on
13 all the proper fixes for those, although there are some
14 good ideas on the table. So instead I think what we
15 want in the next five minutes is some agreement on what

16 is the process to get that debate, you know,
17 accomplished so that we do have a thoughtful policy that
18 emerges from that. So I would suggest let's focus on
19 the process of having a policy debate.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: Let me just read what I have
21 for that action item and you all can tell me if I left
22 something out that we might want to add. So this is
00028

1 from slide 4. I guess we are replacing David's text
2 with what Dan had put in, which is pretty much the same
3 anyway. So now it says, Council appreciates GPO's
4 efforts to respond to the needs of regionals and --
5 regional and selective depositories by working with the
6 Community to find ways to streamline the disposition
7 process. Council recommends that GPO seek guidance from
8 it's general counsel on the newly revised policy
9 regarding the sale of abandoned government property and
10 encourages GPO to develop guidelines within input from
11 the Community for interpreting and applying the new
12 policy, in order to minimize any untended negative
13 consequences that might result from the misunderstanding
14 or misuse of policy. Did I miss something?

15 MR. SHULER: Are we good to go?

16 MR. GREER: The sense that I hope we would
17 communicate is that we don't have policy yet, so input
18 on the newly revised legal guidance, and then work with
19 the Community to develop policy for applying that
20 guidance, to minimize any unintended consequences, etc.,
21 etc.

22 MS. SINCLAIR: Could I just say that instead
00029

1 of saying newly revised policy say proposed revised
2 policy?

3 MR GREER: Anything that says that we don't
4 have a true policy yet, that's fine.

5 MR. SHULER: With those further changes are
6 we good to go? Since we can go back a slide since I
7 think we finished with recommendation one -- excuse me.
8 We are at goal two now?

9 MS. SINCLAIR: That was goal two we just
10 finished.

11 MR. SHULER: How about goal three? GPO in
12 concert with Council and the Community will strive to
13 identify and enhance exclusive benefits accruing to both
14 regional and selective depositories. Draft
15 recommendation: Council recommends that GPO work with

16 the Council and the Community to create additional
17 exclusive benefits that will accrue to official FDLP
18 depositories both selective and regional. Those
19 exclusive benefits will serve as positive incentives
20 applying for designations as official FDLP depositories
21 and for remaining in the program. In addition, Council
22 recommends that GPO develop and prominently disseminate
00030

1 a master list of all depository benefits including, when
2 appropriate, those benefits approximate monetary value.
3 Council reactions? Hang on, Roger. The council has to
4 be done.

5 MR. CISMOWSKI: I think it's pretty obvious
6 this needs to be pared down, but the intention of this
7 is to not only identify current benefits, but to provide
8 a recommendation that further exclusive benefits be
9 explored. And also, because directors are asking what
10 is the practical value of being a depository, that's why
11 I put the monetary value, if it can be determined of
12 such a benefit.

13 For instance, all depositories get access to
14 proprietary data bases such as STAT USA. What is the
15 monetary value of that? How much would it cost to get a
16 single license to STAT USA for University X?

17 MR. SHULER: So are you suggesting we edit
18 this or are you just giving --

19 MR. CISMOWSKI: I'm just suggesting that I'm
20 not going to be offended at all to reduce this or put
21 something else in there. I wrote this at eleven o'clock
22 last night after having a beer.

00031

1 MR. SHULER: I'm not arguing it should be
2 edited. I'm just trying to --

3 MR. CISMOWSKI: I don't know if that should
4 go in the record.

5 MR. SHULER: I think it's pretty good
6 actually.

7 MS. MORIEARTY: It's brilliant.

8 MS. SHULER: Is there a -- building on that
9 theme is there any necessary changes that one would make
10 to this?

11 MS. HOLTERHOFF: In 2004 there was a
12 document about the carrot crop about incentives. It's
13 mentioned in the 1995 memorandum thing. Maybe we should
14 reference if that's the that the list that we are asking
15 them to build on. There have been lists of incentives

16 created. I don't know what we can with them. We are
17 trying to see if we can find it. If it still exists on
18 there. Do you remember that incentives document
19 progress report, the carrot crop?

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes, I think they have taken
21 it down.

22 MR. SHULER: Maybe the way we can get around
00032

1 that is to refer in a sentence some way in a previous
2 effort to site incentives, something a long those lines
3 and if we can't remember it --

4 MS. MORIEARTY: Perhaps that would be an
5 appropriate substitution.

6 MR. SHULER: So why don't we refer to the
7 build on previous documentation of incentives?

8 MS. HOLTERHOFF: We found it. It is eight
9 pages.

10 MS. SANDERS: It's from 2004.

11 MR. SHULER: So if we add that to this --
12 what else needs to be done to this particular one? Do I
13 hear the word microfiche? Oh, please no.

14 MS. HOLTERHOFF: It needs to be fixed
15 because there are things in it like published stuff in
16 administrative notes, etc., and things like that that
17 are no more valid ideas.

18 MS. SINCLAIR: For the purpose of the draft
19 for discussion, I just added to the last sentence, in
20 addition, Council recommends that GPO build on previous
21 documentation of incentives and prominently disseminate
22 a master list. Blah, blah, blah.

00033

1 MR. SHULER: I think that works.

2 MS. MORIEARTY: This document has got a
3 title and it's from October of 2004.

4 MR. SHULER: We could add that to the final
5 version.

6 MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you.

7 MR. SHULER: In the spirit of openness and
8 transparency because we allow the bloggers to listen in
9 and perhaps contribute, Roger, take a chance.

10 MS. SANDERS: Excuse me, just a second,
11 John, John, John? Excuse me just a second.

12 MR. SHULER: Yes.

13 MS. SANDERS: There is a page in the Desktop
14 right now called the Explore the Value of and Your
15 Options in the FDLP and there is a document there called

16 The Value of a Federal Depository Library. Both of
17 those are current 2010 documents. So we might want to
18 work some reference to these into that last
19 recommendation.

20 MR. SHULER: Do we need to that now in the
21 drafting process or in the final?

22 MS. SANDERS: No, I just want to point out
00034

1 there are current ones there.

2 MS. HOLTERHOFF: What is the title again?

3 MS. SANDERS: The overall page is called
4 Explore the Value of and Your Options in the FDLP. It's
5 under the Outreach tab. There are two documents there:
6 One called Share With GPO and Your Regional Library and
7 the other is called Value of a Federal Depository
8 Library. Just make sure that those get referenced. I'm
9 sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

10 MR. SHULER: Let's get back to the other
11 agenda item. Maybe I'm being presumptuous, but what is
12 Council's will on this to allow members of the audience,
13 if they have a pertinent suggest to suggest it or how do
14 we want to proceed?

15 MS. SINCLAIR: I think traditionally we have
16 not allowed the audience to participate in our
17 discussions because they have opportunities to provide
18 their input in other venues and other times.

19 MS. SEARS: I agree with Gwen.
20 Traditionally business meetings have been just because
21 we have so much to get done before ten o'clock when we
22 are suppose to break. On the open sessions is when we
00035

1 take comments from the floor.

2 MR. SHULER: So heard.

3 MR. GREER: We are making good progress. We
4 don't have a huge line of people at the microphone. I
5 always think input is good, so I would support hearing
6 from the audience.

7 MR. SHULER: It doesn't sound like we have
8 enough of a quorum to move the question so we will
9 continue with existing procedures.

10 Are we done with goal three? I believe we
11 have draft action item. Council commends GPO for under
12 taking a segmentation survey in order to learn more
13 about the diverse needs of the various types and sizes
14 of libraries in the FDLP and for integrating information
15 about these needs into its strategic thinking. Council

16 looks forward to seeing the results of the survey and
17 stands ready to work with GPO, and the depository
18 Community to help interpret the survey results and use
19 them as appropriate to inform discussions and decisions
20 about FDLP services. Discussion.

21 MS. TROTTA: Did we decide to leave out the
22 request that we get them in May, the final report, and
00036

1 also if they were going to put out another needs
2 assessment survey to have a test or do you think that is
3 included in there, in that language?

4 MR. O'MAHONY: It is not included in this,
5 but there are other action items later that address that
6 directly. The deadline was just an omission so we can
7 stick that in there, sure.

8 MR. SHULER: Any other discussion or changes
9 on this draft action item? Turning the page then.
10 Draft action item: Council offers to work with GPO to
11 develop a plan for utilizing the biennial survey to
12 gather information and solicit input from federal
13 depository libraries in order to provide relevant data
14 on strategic and operational issues facing the FDLP.
15 Such a plan should include timelines for the
16 introduction and testing of new questions with the
17 intent of giving depository libraries reasonable advance
18 notice of new questions. Discussion.

19 MR. CISMOWSKI: I don't know that the --
20 that should be limited to new questions. I think it
21 should be limited to all questions and not limited, in
22 other words. That is all questions that are on the
00037

1 biennial survey should be made public before the survey
2 is launched for Community reaction because that's the
3 only way that ambiguity in these questions is going to
4 be identified and they can be refined before the survey
5 begins.

6 MR. GREER: Maybe just strike the word new?

7 MR. SHULER: Suggestion is strike the word
8 new? Agreed?

9 MS. SANDERS: Yes.

10 MR. CISMOWSKI: And the other aspect is that
11 I think that Council should be approached well in
12 advance of the drafting of the questions to get
13 Council's input on what questions should be asked. What
14 topics are out there that need to be addressed during
15 the biennial survey. So there is really two parts in my

16 mind that is; approaching Council and possibly the
17 Community about what should be asked. And the second
18 part is refining the survey instrument to make sure that
19 the questions are clear unambiguous and are going to
20 lead to data that is usable.

21 MS. SEARS: I concur completely with what
22 David said. I do know that they do start planning the
00038

1 questions two years ahead. I mean, the end of the
2 biennial survey they start planning questions for the
3 next biennial survey. So this is something that we need
4 to act quickly on, getting it off of draft and into a
5 finalized.

6 MR. O'MAHONY: I also agree with both David
7 and Suzanne. The intent of the first sentence was to
8 get to that very thing. It obviously isn't as explicit
9 as that, but the idea was that in developing a plan it
10 would include all of those necessary steps.

11 MR. JACOBS: I think this is a great idea.
12 One of the things that not -- it doesn't necessarily
13 have to be in this draft, but it would really
14 interesting if GPO could work with some social
15 scientists to include experimental questions like some
16 other surveys do and then those social scientists could
17 use that data for their own analysis to publish in GIQ
18 or some other publication. I think it would be really
19 interesting because the questions as they are now really
20 gets to what GPO needs. It doesn't really get to
21 Community needs, as much, you know. The questions that
22 are in the biennial surveys are for GPO working, not to
00039

1 expand that to include --

2 MR. GREER: I hear the Washington assertion
3 that no good deed goes unpunished might be appropriate.
4 I'm a little worried about hijacking the survey for too
5 many different purposes. The GPO, of course, has to
6 satisfy the legal requirement to gather input on the
7 status of depository libraries. They have been using a
8 survey mechanism which I believe is a laudable way to
9 gather that information. We should be careful not to
10 create such an overhead on this that they then have to
11 choose to use another mechanism for that. So be
12 careful. It's just an assertion not to overload the
13 mechanism.

14 MR. O'MAHONY: I agree. And that the two
15 items there on the page try to address that -- partly

16 that very thing and the next one -- I mean the first one
17 is specific to the biennial survey. And part of
18 developing a plan I think would be to sort of sketch out
19 what the role of the biennial survey in an overall data
20 gathering and information feedback group that GPO would
21 development.

22 The second action item, when we get to that,
00040

1 tries to create sort of a separate mechanism for doing
2 things outside of the biennial survey to expand that
3 whole effort.

4 MR. CISMOWSKI: I agree with Chris and also
5 with Dan. I think one of the really good things about
6 the 2009 biennial survey was that some questions, that
7 always appeared to me to be kind of outdated and
8 irrelevant were dropped out. The biennial survey should
9 be focused. It should be as short as possible and
10 should be clearly identifiable as gathering usable data
11 for that period of time.

12 And one of the things that came up yesterday
13 was, when I was discussing something with a member of
14 the audience, was the longitudinal nature of these
15 surveys. That is whether the survey is designed to
16 measure things over time or whether it is more of a
17 snapshot of the issues that are existent at that time.
18 And I think that's a debatable issue because if you are
19 trying to do a longitudinal survey then the number of
20 questions is going to be much more than if you try to
21 focus it on the important issues of that particular
22 biennien. I realize that is a totally other discussion,
00041

1 but anyway, enough said.

2 MR. SHULER: Has the discussion lead to any
3 further changing of the wording?

4 MR. O'MAHONY: Looks good.

5 MR. SHULER: We are good to go? Draft
6 action item: Council offers to work with GPO to explore
7 ways to solicit timely feedback from Federal Depository
8 Libraries through the use of Web surveys or other Web
9 based tools. This work also should include developing
10 guidelines for the timing and frequency of surveys as
11 well as a process to prioritize potential survey topics
12 of area or areas of interest. Discussion. Jill.

13 MS. MORIEARTY: Please forgive me. I'm not
14 sure I understand exactly that this means.

15 MR. O'MAHONY: Well, the intent is to

16 compliment the biennial survey process by introducing
17 another way to gather feedback from the Community about
18 any number of issues or services or other kinds of
19 things that would help inform improvements, decisions,
20 directions, however, whatever GPO, or Council for that
21 matter, might need to have information about.

22 The second part of it, the last sentence is
00042

1 to acknowledge that, you know, there is a cost for every
2 time you ask a question and we don't want to, you know,
3 over question the Community. And that some, you know,
4 priority has to be set so that we are not always asking
5 questions all the time and that, you know, it's fit
6 into, you know, in a programmatic way rather than just
7 ad hoc.

8 MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. I think what
9 threw me off when I first read this was plan. I wasn't
10 sure what that actually met in terms of implementing
11 this and it could be I haven't had enough caffeine, but
12 having it explained makes more sense to me. Every time
13 I see plan without more description, as to how this is
14 done, I start wondering. Thank you.

15 MS. SEARS: I do think it is very important
16 that we clarify that last sentence in the open session
17 because we clearly heard in Tampa from directors who
18 said they had been over surveyed and did not want us to
19 survey. They want us to do things. So I think when
20 this is brought up, during the next meeting, that would
21 clarify that that is what that means.

22 MR. SHULER: Any specific changes to the
00043

1 particular wording at the moment?

2 MR. GREER: Maybe one friendly amendment for
3 that last sentence. Survey is a heavy weight mechanism
4 and that's really what Suzanne was just talking about,
5 but there are lots of social media mechanisms that are
6 light weight that people can choose to participate in.
7 So the friendly amendment is to change timing and
8 frequency of surveys to timing and frequency of surveys
9 and other social media mechanisms as well as a process
10 too. So it's not just surveys, but whatever, blogs or
11 chat posts or whatever we can get through to get
12 Community input in a light weight voluntary way.

13 MS. MORIEARTY: I could agree with this
14 because when I read this I thought we -- we were just
15 talking about a survey monkey. We were talking about

16 using new social networks, you know, something more than
17 just sending out the basic survey again.

18 MR. SHULER: Anything further specific
19 changes? Okay. All right. Cool. That closes that
20 one. Are we sure enough to read or do you want me to
21 continue my reading out loud?

22 MS. SEARS: I think the reading is important
00044

1 because it goes into the transcript, otherwise they
2 don't have any idea what we are talking about.

3 MR. SHULER: Even when they know what we are
4 talking about. Draft recommendations: One, Council is
5 excited about the long awaited and planned release of
6 FDsys and the sunseting of GPO Access by December 2010.
7 Council requests that if there is a substantial slippage
8 and announced deadlines up for schedules or deliverables
9 of one month that they be notified. Did you get the
10 excitement?

11 MR GREER: I would just suggest an addition.
12 I think this language is good, but an addition to this
13 that communicates the value of notification. Just
14 knowing is useful, but acting on that notification. So
15 that they be notified and, I'm not going to get the
16 words right, but informed of project impact and
17 potential mitigation steps and that they be notified
18 including project impact and mitigation steps and then
19 there should be a Council action that follows that, that
20 Council pledges to respond within two weeks with
21 comments on impact and mitigation. That comes in two,
22 but I think parallel to this, when you are notified of
00045

1 a -- so two goes to functionalities, but this goes to
2 timing delays. And again, just being notified is not
3 enough that we ought to assert that Council will have
4 input on impact and mitigation.

5 MR. SHULER: Is the word smithing be noted?

6 MS. MORIEARTY: Including be notified of --

7 MR. GREER: Notified comma including project
8 impact and mitigation provisions. Period. Next
9 sentence, Council, pledges to respond -- maybe just the
10 same sentence. Council pledges to respond in two weeks.

11 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

12 MR. GREER: Period.

13 MR. SHULER: Any further suggested wordings
14 or discussion on this first point?

15 MR. CISMOWSKI: The first part of that

16 sentence talks about a planned Release of FDsys. And I
17 think what's really driving the sunseting of GPO Access
18 is not the release, that has already happened, but the
19 completion of ingest into FDsys of the remaining
20 collections that exist in GPO Access.

21 MS. TROTTA: Did they commit to that? Did
22 you hear that?

00046

1 MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes, it was December of this
2 year they are committing to --

3 MR. O'MAHONY: It's the migration of
4 collections and then the failsafe backup nature of it
5 are the two pieces.

6 MR. CISMOWSKI: So we not really talking
7 about being excited about the release, that has already
8 happened.

9 MS. MORIEARTY: How about something like,
10 the Council is excited about the long awaited migration?

11 MR. CISMOWSKI: Completion.

12 MS. MORIEARTY: Or completion of FDsys and
13 the sunseting?

14 MS. TROTTA: Of migration.

15 MR. GREER: Definitely not completion. So
16 it's a planned migration to FDsys I think is fine.

17 MR. CISMOWSKI: It's the completion of the
18 collections that --

19 MR. GREER: The disconnect there is it's
20 Release with a capital R. If it's Release 1.0, whatever
21 number, that allows sunseting. So we can either refer
22 to the specific Release number, which is an increment

00047

1 because FDsys will probably never be complete and so we
2 either refer to the Release number or the migration two
3 would capture I think the sense.

4 MR. SHULER: Should we use the Release
5 number? It's shorter?

6 MS. SEARS: Do we have any idea what Release
7 number we are at right now? I think it might be easier
8 to do migration. Yes, it's one, but it's one point
9 something, something, something A or something like
10 that.

11 MR. O'MAHONY: I think they have renumbered.
12 It's Release 1 stop and that might be easier just might
13 be easier in terms of the wording because that comes
14 with it, a definition that includes all the different
15 things that we have talked about.

16 MR. SHULER: We can put the one in quotes.
17 MS. TROTTA: Council is excited about the
18 all awaited migration of the remaining collections and
19 planned Release, capital R.
20 MR. SHULER: Release 1.
21 MS. TROTTA: One.
22 MS. SEARS: The document they give us in our
00048

1 packet it says, the current Release called Release 1 and
2 then in parentheses it has R1 and Release 1C.3 as the
3 Release called Release 2 or R2. So the current Release
4 that they are working on is Release 1 and in parentheses
5 it's a capital R1.

6 MR. SHULER: That clears it's up.

7 MS. MORIEARTY: I'm less excited about that.

8 MR. SHULER: I'm so glad that happens. Many
9 Releases of ones. Tori?

10 MS. TROTTA: Sunsetting of GPO Access
11 December of 2010. Period. Right?

12 MR. SHULER: Yes. Number 2? Are we done
13 with that?

14 MS. MORIEARTY: Reread the last sentence.

15 MS. TROTTA: Council requests that if there
16 is substantial slippage and announced deadlines for
17 schedules or deliverables of one month that Council be
18 notified, including project impact and mitigation
19 attempts. Council pledges to respond to notification
20 with advice within two weeks or with the comments.

21 MR. SHULER: Number 3, right? That's where
22 we are at? Two?

00049

1 MS. MORIEARTY: So are we deleting or no,
2 that feature Releases.

3 MR. SHULER: Okay, so number 2. When major
4 features or functionalities announce for future Releases
5 are deferred or pushed back into subsequent Releases,
6 Council recommends that they be consulted. When
7 consulted, Council pledges to respond within two weeks.

8 In the interest of time, there is about 10
9 more minutes left in the match.

10 MS. MORIEARTY: Could we parallel that last
11 sentence? Council pledges to respond with comments
12 within two weeks? Much better than a plethora of
13 comments.

14 MR. SHULER: Any further questions? Tori?

15 MS. TROTTA: When major features or

16 functionalities announced for future releases are
17 deferred or pushed back into subsequent releases,
18 Council recommends that they be consulted. When
19 consulted Council pledges to respond with comments
20 within two weeks.

21 MR. SHULER: Acceptable?

22 MS. TROTTA: Should I capitalize the R's for
00050

1 release?

2 MR. GREER: No, they are generic.

3 MR. SHULER: The next one, number 3.

4 Council recommends that as FDsys PMO reviews system
5 requirements for future releases, they include
6 stakeholders including FDLP Community when updating the
7 priorities for enabling specific system functionality
8 and that they utilize appropriate Web 2.0 methods to do
9 so.

10 MS. TROTTA: That's two sentences.

11 MR. SHULER: Any discussion suggested word
12 smithing?

13 MR. JACOBS: Can we just say communication
14 methods rather than Web 2.0 methods?

15 MS. TROTTA: Okay. Anything else? Council
16 recommends that FDsys PMO review system requirements for
17 future releases. They include stakeholders, including
18 the FDLP Community, when updating the priorities for
19 enabling specific system functionality. Period.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: You could say they use
21 appropriate communication methods to include
22 stakeholders.

00051

1 MS. TROTTA: That's a good idea.

2 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

3 MS. TROTTA: So Council recommends that
4 FDsys PMO review system requirements for future
5 releases. They utilize appropriate communications
6 methods when including stakeholders, including the FDLP
7 Community?

8 MR. MORIEARTY: Such as. Such as.

9 MR. O'MAHONY: Or just to include the FDLP
10 Community and stakeholders.

11 MS. HOLTERHOFF: I have just one question.
12 I don't know what my note means, but I have a note on
13 here that migration does not equal submission slash
14 ingestion. So is migration the word we want or do we
15 want our new word submission or ingestion? Not

16 migration. Does anyone remember what we were told --
17 what we are really waiting for? Is it both of those
18 things, migration and ingestion or -- I don't remember
19 what this note means. I have a big, does not equal.

20 MS. SEARS: In the FDsys system review that
21 John and I went to in the beginning of April, they said
22 that full content submission was not going to be
00052

1 available until October of 2011, I believe. I'd have to
2 look at the slide to make sure, but I believe that was
3 correct.

4 MR. SHULER: That's correct.

5 MS. SEARS: So full content submission is
6 not going to be in this Release 1.

7 MR. SHULER: And there is a distinction
8 amongst those values. I do remember we were corrected
9 several times when we used one word inappropriately in
10 one situation, but for the life of me I can't remember
11 which situation applied to which word. I think
12 ingestion refers to what the Community would ingest.
13 Migration referred from what was going from waste into
14 FDsys.

15 MS. HOLTERHOFF: So migrate is the correct
16 word?

17 MR. SHULER: Migration is the right word,
18 yes.

19 MR. JACOBS: I think from the FDsys point of
20 you view, they say they can ingest now because they
21 bring documents into the system, but we are talking
22 about ingest in terms of libraries large, digital
00053

1 content that can be ingested into the system which can't
2 be done.

3 MR. SHULER: The first big ingestion, if you
4 will, would have been and will be if it gets funded, is
5 statutes at large. That would be the first non WAYS
6 ingestion. So are we good to go with number 3?

7 MS. TROTTA: I'm still screwing around with
8 the last sentence, but it will be there by the time you
9 put it up on the screen.

10 MS. MORIEARTY: Tori, I'll come over there.

11 MR. SHULER: Are we done? So who is going
12 to update -- yes. We have got one more thing to look at
13 and listen to. Suzanne, go ahead.

14 MS. SEARS: This is the in Memorandum.
15 Willie William Thompson. The Depository Library Council

16 wishes to recognize the life and contributions to GPO of
17 the late William Willie Thompson. Willie retired from
18 GPO in 2004, after nearly 45 years of service. He had
19 begun working at GPO as a clerk and in 1994 joined the
20 Library Programs Services staff as a program analyst.
21 It was in this position that many in the Depository
22 Community came to know Willie when he became responsible
00054

1 for the logistical planning of the Depository Library
2 Council Meeting and Federal Depository Conference.
3 Willie served in this capacity for the next 10 years
4 until his retirement in 2004. Attendees of meetings
5 during those years remember Willie for his can-do
6 attitude and smile. Willie passed away suddenly on
7 March 14th, 2010. Our Community has lost a really great
8 man and an even better friend. I'm sorry I get a little
9 choked up.

10 MR. SHULER: So say we all?

11 MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

12 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Suzanne. How do you
13 wish we proceed on the next session? Do you want me to
14 read these out loud to the Community and let them read
15 it on the screen? How do you want to do it? Advice?

16 MR. GREER: I think for the purposes of the
17 record, it's important to read them out loud.

18 MR. SHULER: Does everybody agree I read
19 them out loud? Okay, thanks.

20 MR. GREER: I think it's good to have them
21 on the screen also.

22 MR. SHULER: All right. I assume once I
00055

1 read it out loud those of you who can will jump in and
2 offer a brief comment if needed or do I turn to the
3 audience or GPO and say, what do you think? What would
4 you like to do?

5 MS. SINCLAIR: I think you could just say,
6 does Council have any comment before we go to the
7 audience?

8 MR. SHULER: Okay. It works for me. We
9 have a script. We have two minutes before coffee. If I
10 could ask those with the changed documents just to
11 upload them to the Goggle docs space and I will grab
12 them from there and download them.

13 MS. SANDERS: John? John?

14 MR. SHULER: Yes.

15 MS. SANDERS: Are we doing anything with the

16 recommendations about the survey? We skipped that one.
17 There is a documentation that Tori put up about
18 commending Council for commissioning --
19 MR. SHULER: We read that.
20 MS. SANDERS: Did I miss that? Never mind.
21 MR. SHULER: It was an excellent --
22 MS. SANDERS: Sorry. I just got really
00056

1 confused when I looked at what was left -- never mind.
2 Forget that I said it. I'm just going to slip away now.
3 MR. SHULER: Chris?
4 MR. GREER: With chair's approval I'd like
5 to speak out of order, I suppose. I'm going to be
6 leaving in just a few minutes. This is my last
7 opportunity with all of you in this current mode. It
8 has been a great distinction and honor to serve with
9 this group on the Council. The dedication, the
10 expertise, interest, the level -- the intellectual level
11 of thinking is inspiring. I came from outside this
12 Community. You accepted me into it in a wonderful way.
13 I have learned an immense amount and acquired a much
14 greater appreciation for the value of libraries in
15 general, but of the depository libraries in particular.
16 I commend you for your mission. I envy you in many
17 senses, the importance of your mission and I will
18 continue to work in the White House and other places to
19 try to support you in what you are doing. I'm sure our
20 paths will cross in lots of other ways and I look
21 forward to that opportunity in the future. So thank you
22 all very much.

00057

1 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Chris.
2 (Break in the proceedings.)
3 MR. SHULER: If we could come to order. The
4 third plenary session of the Federal Depository is
5 started. It is generally during this part of the
6 program that we share with the Community our
7 deliberations and where we are going with our
8 interactions and recommendations with GPO over what we
9 have heard these last two-and-a-half days and what we
10 want to do in the future, especially going forward into
11 the October conference we will bring them up. I will
12 ask Council for brief responses and turn it over to GPO
13 and then the audience to get feedback on these points
14 and recommendations which will be more fully developed
15 after we get your input. So stay turned and that will

16 be released through other means. So without further
17 issues, is there any other points that Council needs to
18 raise? You can see that even the Council members are
19 beginning to slip away and we have lost two.

20 First the major points that were taken from
21 the three plenary sessions and what we have developed
22 from those and this is what we have focused on these
00058

1 three sets of slide points coming out of the plenary
2 sessions, discoverability, incentives and collaboration
3 to keep and preserve digital content. Council? GPO?
4 Audience? All right. Our recommendation: Need to
5 browse digitalization registry by project looking for
6 collaborator and highlight collaborator needs and offers
7 in the navigation. Council?

8 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
9 University. So this is just a little context. This was
10 just a little added functionality to the registry site
11 registry.FDLP.gov in order to facilitate for
12 collaborations we have heard in the plenary session.
13 This would be a great way to do it.

14 MR. SHULER: GPO? Anything from the
15 audience? Okay. Going onto the next bulleted item.
16 Add link to grant opportunities document delivered in
17 Tampa on Desktop under recommendations and to the
18 priority titles for digitization to digitization
19 registry. Council?

20 MS. HOLTERHOFF: That list was prepared, but
21 it's been kind -- maybe not everybody has seen it and
22 people have brought up, aren't there grants that could
00059

1 be applied for to do digitization projects? One thing
2 that we don't have in there that we might want to add is
3 about, we had hoped that list could be updated. It's a
4 year old now. I don't know that if we could ask GPO to
5 like update it periodically.

6 MR. SHULER: Okay. GPO? Anybody from the
7 audience? Good.

8 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I just wanted
9 to followup. When this second bullet recommendation
10 came from Council, GPO had responded to that
11 recommendation really in the context that there are a
12 lot of grant organizations and there is a lot of various
13 list servs that people can subscribe to. So we took
14 that as a one time opportunity to show representatively
15 what's available out there, knowing that grant

16 opportunities happen so frequently in the context of how
17 that unfolds.

18 Just to reaffirm again, we were looking at
19 that in terms of GPO saying, here's a one time
20 documentation. If the recommendation is you feel like
21 GPO should keep abreast of all grant opportunities. I
22 just wanted to get some clarification because there is
00060

1 quite a bit of activity that goes on in that arena and
2 if that is something you think strategically GPO needs
3 to do.

4 MR. SHULER: James?

5 MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
6 University. So noted. I think our interest was in
7 providing that information to the Community. Not
8 necessarily every single grant out of the thousands of
9 grants that are in the foundation data base, but to
10 offer pointers to libraries, you know, possibly
11 exploring grant opportunities. The various
12 organizations that do granting for libraries and so
13 sometimes those do change. So pointing to them is a
14 good thing. We don't think that GPO should have a list
15 of every single grant out there but, just keeping that
16 information fresh and up to date.

17 MR. SHULER: Anybody else?

18 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
19 North Texas. I think if we make sure that the
20 documentation that it links to is dated and that it does
21 say that, you know, these are just possibilities because
22 I believe -- I don't have a documentation in front of
00061

1 me, but I believe it is mostly just links to the INLS.
2 So it is not pointing to a current grant. It is
3 pointing to possible people for you to go to look at for
4 possible grants. So, yes, it needs to be looked at, but
5 I'm not sure that it is something that needs to be daily
6 updated. It just needs to be whatever year make sure
7 that this entity is still a good entity or still an
8 entity that gets grants and take them off if they are
9 not.

10 MR. SHULER: Anything else from Council?
11 Anything from the audience? Okay.

12 Bullet 3, Council intends to pursue
13 discussions with associations ACRL, ARL, etc., that
14 collect statistics and rate libraries based on those
15 statistics, to explore the issues surrounding the way of

16 E collections vis-a-vis tangible volumes, their metrics.
17 Council?

18 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
19 North Texas. Just sort of a point of clarification. We
20 are just saying that we think it is important to talk
21 with the associations to see how they do their metrics.
22 We think it can be a big incentive for libraries to
00062

1 digitize if electronic collections were counted similar
2 to the way that paper volumes are counted to go into
3 those indices. So we were thinking possibly either an
4 education session or a Council session in October where
5 we might invite somebody who is an expert in electronic
6 collection metrics and maybe also the statistical
7 individuals at the different associations like Denise
8 Davis, at ALA or somebody from ARL or ACRL or AALL to
9 make sure that everybody is represented

10 MR. SHULER: Anything further from Council?
11 Anything from GPO or the audience?

12 MR. SCHAFFER: Scott Schaffer, University of
13 Vermont. I just have a question about this that I
14 certainly would -- the problem with electronic journals
15 -- that have a huge impact on all academic collections,
16 I just wonder if this hasn't already been -- I realize
17 that electronic journals is somewhat of a different
18 issue than what we are talking about, but I would
19 imagine it has had to come up in some context already
20 somewhat.

21 MR. SHULER: I believe in the Council's
22 discussions they noted the association's extreme
00063

1 interest in this issue, yes. Other comments? Okay.

2 We will go to the next set of slides.

3 These particular slides all revolve around the issue of
4 FDsys and its plenary session. They are a bit more -- a
5 few more sentences. Recommended to GPO, number 1,
6 Council is excited about the long awaited planned
7 migration of the remaining collections and planned
8 Release 1 and 2 of FDsys and the sunseting of GPO
9 Access by December of 2010. Council requests that if
10 there is a substantial slippage in announced deadlines
11 for schedules or deliverables of one month that Council
12 be notified, with information about project impact in
13 mitigation. Council pledges to respond with comments
14 within two weeks. Council?

15 MS. MORIEARTY: I like it.

16 MR. O'MAHONY: Just a point of clarification
17 and maybe a question for the GPO folks. Release 2 is
18 not scheduled for the end of December 2010. Release 1
19 and its followup is scheduled for the release of 2010.
20 Just so that we understand that that is not our
21 expectation.

22 MR. SHULER: Any questions from GPO?
00064

1 Questions? Discussion from the audience? Okay.

2 Number 2, when major features or
3 functionality are announced or future releases are
4 deferred or pushed back into subsequent releases,
5 Council recommends that they be consulted. When
6 consulted Council pledges to respond with comments
7 within two weeks. Council? GPO? Audience? Okay.

8 Number 3, Council recommends that FDsys PMO
9 reviews system requirements and functionality for future
10 releases, they include stakeholders including the FDLP
11 Community. PMO should use appropriate communication
12 methods to do so. Council? GPO? Audience? Okay.

13 Going right along to the third one, which is
14 regionals. Action items from the plenary session on
15 regional issues. Goal 1, by May 15th, 2010 the
16 Community will be better informed of the scope and
17 target completion dates of the GPO shelflist conversion
18 project.

19 The draft recommendation reads, Council
20 recommends that GPO staff share with the Community a
21 detailed summary of the scope and target completion
22 dates of the GPO shelflist conversion project, project
00065

1 to digitize the dictionary catalog. This summary should
2 include one, total number of cards in the project; two,
3 total number to be transcribed; three, total number to
4 be digitized; four, examples of intended end uses of
5 those transcribed and digitized records including use in
6 a proposed automated disposal list and N and O list
7 automation tool; five, rename the project to reflect its
8 actual content and scope. This summary should be
9 disseminated by May 15th, 2010. Council? Any questions
10 from GPO?

11 MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair from
12 University of Hawaii at Manoa. I just wanted to clarify
13 the bit about renaming. We felt that shelflist
14 conversion project gave people a misleading impression
15 of what the project is about and what its content and

16 scope is. That's why we recommend that GPO come up with
17 a name that better reflects the actual nature of the
18 project.

19 MR. SHULER: Any comments from the audience?

20 Okay.

21 As soon as possible, GPO, Council and
22 regionals will finalize procedural details of GPO's
00066

1 decision to abandon government ownership of depository
2 publications that have gone through the complete
3 regional supervised disposal process. Draft action
4 item: Council appreciates GPO's efforts to respond to
5 the needs of the regional and selective depositories by
6 working with the Community to find ways to streamline
7 the disposition process. Council recommends that GPO
8 seek guidance from its general counsel on the nearly
9 proposed revised policy regarding the sale of abandon
10 government property and encourage GPO to develop the
11 guidelines with input from the Community for
12 interpreting and applying the new policy in order to
13 minimize any unintended negative consequences that might
14 result in the misunderstanding or misuse of the policy.

15 Council? GPO?

16 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. We already
17 sought the advice of general counsel and their thoughts
18 and interpretation of the law with this issue which is
19 why we were able to announce what we did.

20 MR. SHULER: Council? Do you have a
21 response?

22 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
00067

1 Michigan. Council appreciates that, but there is a
2 suggestion of a newly revised policy regarding the sale
3 of abandon government property that we feel has -- needs
4 to be further worked out before we have an official
5 policy in place.

6 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. What is the
7 question you want us to ask of general counsel? The
8 specific question because we have already talked to them
9 about the sale issue and about the point of abandonment.

10 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
11 North Texas. It's not that -- we feel legal counsel has
12 already been done. What we feel is a mature policy has
13 not been laid out and we would like to work with GPO in
14 creating that policy to make sure that there are
15 safeguards so that somebody is not benefitting

16 financially. We think that what -- what started this
17 was a good thing, but we have seen negatives to it as
18 well and we just want to make sure that the policy is
19 very strictly outlined and that there are very clear
20 guidelines as to when it's okay to sell so you are not
21 benefitting from dropping from the depository, so there
22 is not an incentive to drop your depository or to leave
00068

1 your collection.

2 MR. SHULER: Another aspect of the
3 discussion, during the Council's deliberation about this
4 particular point, is that it's good and proper to issue
5 a legal finding, but what we are also hoping and
6 expecting is a further policy document that explains how
7 GPO is going to implement that particular finding and
8 being able to discuss with the Council what we think are
9 some interesting implications in terms of the negative
10 consequences perhaps that would come from this very good
11 decision. Council, anything further?

12 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
13 University. Just to sort of drive home the last couple
14 of points. One way of thinking about it would be that
15 the legal -- the new -- the latest released legal
16 interpretation of one of GPO's authorities gives you all
17 authority to do this activity and then as others have
18 said the next step is then developing, based on that
19 authority, a full policy with, you know, guidelines and
20 other guidance as many of your policies have. So that
21 first hurdle has been crossed. We have the legal
22 authority and it's to work with you all in the next
00069

1 steps so that the implementation of this authority is in
2 the way that was intended.

3 MR. SHULER: Any further discussion with
4 Council? GPO? Anybody from the audience?

5 MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict from Chicago
6 Public. I think I sort of brought up the prospect of
7 abuse. I can see two areas; one is financial. The book
8 plates alone from the 19 century serial set probably
9 sell for \$50 a piece on the average, the illustrations.
10 And I don't know if people are aware, but there are
11 people who go through and strip out the illustrations
12 from serial sets; so that is one potential. A library
13 could decide to sell its collections essentially.

14 Another potential is I have seen more subtly
15 a library could throw everything on its needs and offers

16 and say after five years they keep the material, but it
17 is no longer part of the depository system. I'm not
18 sure if that is an unintended consequence either. I can
19 see lots of problems with that. So those are the two
20 issues I see. I would agree that it doesn't seem very
21 clear, the potential for this. Abuses still exists.

22 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

00070

1 MS. AMEN: Kathy Amen, St. Mary's
2 University. I was thinking one way to kind of look at
3 this would be the regionals have a lot of autonomy in
4 developing policies for disposals and all and that is
5 great, but perhaps in this case there need to be
6 national standards or national guidelines that apply to
7 everybody so as to avoid the kind of abuses that have
8 been talked about.

9 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything further
10 from the audience? Okay.

11 Goal 3, GPO in concert with Council and the
12 Community will strive to identify and enhance exclusive
13 benefits accruing to both regional and selective
14 depositories. Draft recommendation: Council recommends
15 that GPO work with Council and the Community to create
16 additional exclusive benefits that will accrue to
17 official FDLP depositories, both selective and regional.
18 These exclusive benefits will serve as positive
19 incentives for applying for designation as official FDLP
20 depositories and for remaining in the program. In
21 addition Council recommends that GPO build on previous
22 documentation of incentives and prominently disseminate

00071

1 a master list of all depository benefits including when
2 appropriate those benefits of approximate monetary
3 value. Council? GPO?

4 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. On this
5 recommendation we have actually, even as early as this
6 year, updated and we've got a value page that is there
7 so we welcome your input in terms of additions to what
8 is there and working with you as a Community seems a
9 great opportunity off of the form site to have that
10 discussion thread of what's missing.

11 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Roger?

12 MR. SCHOENFIELD: Roger Schoenfield, Ithaca,
13 SNR. I'm really interested in this particular
14 recommendation because I'm a strong proponent of the
15 importance of incentives in driving a kind of

16 participation and other characteristics that are needed
17 for any program, but certainly the FDLP as well.

18 I think -- I certainly agree that the
19 incentives right now are not -- not where they need to
20 be, given the direction that participation both at the
21 regional and selective level has been heading.

22 I'd like to urge Council to think a little
00072

1 bit more expansively around the question of incentives
2 here because one of the things that I feel to me to be
3 missing from this goal and recommendations, as is
4 currently drafted, is a sense of what the actual
5 objectives that we are trying to achieve, that you are
6 trying to achieve are. Is the objective to lose as few
7 regional and selective depository libraries as possible
8 in the coming years? That could be an objective. Is
9 the objective to build up the number of regional and
10 selective depository libraries towards some kind of
11 target? Is there some kind of minimum number that would
12 be a minimum that you wouldn't want to go beneath?

13 I think that there is a way -- obviously we
14 can't answer those questions right now, but it feels
15 like talking about incentives in the absence of some
16 kind of vision or framework for what the objective here
17 is, is -- not to say that the incentive work shouldn't
18 be pursued in parallel, but it feels like there is a
19 second set of issues about objectives that is not, at
20 least here, as clearly stated. So I'd welcome
21 discussion about that recommendation in that headed
22 direction as well.

00073

1 MR. SHULER: Does Council have any response?

2 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
3 North Texas. I just wanted to respond to Ted. We did
4 discuss in our previous business meeting all of the
5 great work that GPO has done so far on trying to put
6 together incentives and we did go to the page on the
7 FDLP Desktop so this draft recommendation that's why
8 it's building on previous documentation and we really
9 definitely want to work closely with GPO on developing
10 that and trying to come up with ideas of possibly new
11 incentives.

12 MR. SHULER: Gwen?

13 MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen SinuClear of
14 University of Hawaii at Manoa. I would just like to
15 thank Roger for his comments and we will certainly take

16 those into consideration.

17 MR. SHULER: Anything further from the
18 audience? Okay. Further draft action item. Council
19 commends GPO for undertaking a segmentation survey in
20 order to learn more about the diverse needs of the
21 various types and sizes of libraries in the FDLP and for
22 integrating information about these needs into its
00074

1 strategic thinking. Council looks forward to seeing the
2 results of the survey by May 15th and stands ready to
3 work with GPO and the Depository Community to help
4 interpret the survey results and use them as appropriate
5 to inform discussions and decisions about FDLP services.
6 Council? GPO?

7 The one discrepancy I just noticed reading
8 it out loud the third time is that yesterday we said May
9 31st instead of May 15th, looking at my notes. Does it
10 matter May 15th or May 31st?

11 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I appreciate
12 Council's goal on this and certainly can put forward
13 whatever it feels appropriate, but I think the takeaway
14 we had was that we wanted to all insure that there was a
15 comprehensive document that had all the necessary
16 analysis done on it and that it would be done as soon as
17 possible, but at the same time we don't want to get to a
18 point where we want to push out a document that really
19 isn't complete formally. I completely understand
20 Council's goal. I think we are going to support that.
21 I think the date is just the question.

22 MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University
00075

1 of Utah. I believe you're absolutely right. May 15th
2 is wrong. I believe I suggested truly the end of May at
3 least in going into Memorial Day, we are really talking
4 early June, but I wanted -- you were right. Wrong date.

5 MR. SHULER: Okay.

6 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
7 North Texas. I do recall what Ted is talking about that
8 we did say we wanted to make sure it's a complete
9 document. Will GPO be more comfortable if we said early
10 summer or something like that?

11 MR. SHULER: GPO? They nod their heads.

12 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe GPO. I think that
13 is fine. Whatever you feel is appropriate. Our goal is
14 to get it out as soon as possible. It's not going to be
15 delayed, but at the same time if we have a milestone

16 that we are getting ready to reach on the legacy system
17 migration, I don't want to constrain other projects that
18 are already in existence. I think we can work together
19 and get something out as soon as possible, but make sure
20 that it is comprehensive. I'm not trying to impose what
21 Council feels lie it needs to recommend, but as
22 appropriate we will certainly work with it.

00076

1 MR. SHULER: That's why we need to draft
2 action items because it gives us a chance to have a
3 conversation about them before they become final. Any
4 other points from Council? Audience? Okay.

5 Draft action item: Council offers to work
6 with GPO to develop a plan for utilizing the biennial
7 survey to gather information and solicit input from
8 federal depository libraries in order to provide
9 relevant data on strategic and operational issues facing
10 the FDLP. Such a plan should include timelines for the
11 introduction and testing of the new questions with the
12 intent of giving depository libraries reasonable advance
13 notice of questions. Council? Dan?

14 MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
15 University. This one and the one that follows, which
16 you can't see that at the moment, but they sort of go
17 hand-and-hand in that the overall intent of the two of
18 them is to work with GPO to find ways to continue to
19 build on the good work done in the segmentation survey
20 and find ways to broaden that feedback group with the
21 Depository Community, whether it's for gathering
22 information for improvements to services or testing

00077

1 ideas through Community social interaction network kinds
2 of things, but to broaden that input in a timely and
3 systematic way as much as possible. So one piece to
4 that is utilizing the biennial survey process and to --
5 in helping to both identify what questions might be
6 appropriate for that survey and to test out those
7 questions so that there isn't confusion among the
8 Community and respondents as to what information we are
9 trying to gather and to do all that in an open and
10 transparent way. Whatever plan we hope to work with you
11 all to develop would layout those things step-by-step
12 and work in concert with the next slide when we get
13 there.

14 MR. SHULER: GPO? Anybody from the
15 audience? All right. Next slide. Draft action item:

16 Council offers to work with GPO to explore ways to
17 elicit timely feedback from Federal Depository Libraries
18 through the use of Web surveys or other Web based tools.
19 This work also should include developing guidelines for
20 timing and frequency of surveys and other social medium
21 mechanisms as well as process to prioritize potential
22 survey topics or areas of inquiry.

00078

1 MR. O'MAHONY: So this is the second piece
2 to that strategy in not to just limit ourselves to the
3 standard biennial survey, but to where appropriate seek
4 that feedback through other mechanisms and all the while
5 Council is certainly cognizant of the fact that we all
6 have lots of surveys that we have to take and the intent
7 is not to over burden the Community with too many
8 surveys or too many requests for information. So to
9 work to prioritize those areas where it is most
10 important to gather feedback, find the most effective
11 and least costly, both in terms of human resources and
12 effort in gathering that information and to integrate it
13 into an overall approach, so that it isn't an ad hoc
14 sort of question by question approach, but it all builds
15 into an ongoing conversation with the Community.

16 MR. SHULER: GPO?

17 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Thanks, Dan,
18 for sharing that. I just wanted to reinforce that we
19 look forward to working with you. And there are a lot
20 of mechanisms. I mentioned the FDLP Community site and
21 the form which could be appropriate in some discussions
22 or topics. We can certainly support Council depending

00079

1 on in your roles in an advisory body where you see
2 opportunities to gain feedback perhaps you want to
3 implement and if there are tools that we can help off
4 the Desktop or others, maybe the suggestion is if there
5 is a liaison or two from Council to find some
6 requirements on where we can help you or if there is
7 something that you are using an independent tool we will
8 be there.

9 MR. SHULER: Anybody from the audience? So
10 that concludes the plenary portion of the discussion and
11 our recommendations. I believe those are all of them.

12 So I'd like to move onto our two other
13 points which are the outcome of the 2009 discussions and
14 a little bit of a sketch of where we are going with
15 those.

16 Stemming from the events of 2009, we are
17 going to seek a further conference call between GPO and
18 Council on the PURLz issue within the next few weeks.

19 We are seeking a July 1st deadline for
20 further information about the consultant work from GPO.

21 We have some specific budget questions to
22 send to GPO regarding the status of various projects
00080

1 involving digitization project where the particular
2 fiscal year is -- where it is at with the JCP, if you
3 will, and sort of a break down of omnibus money costs
4 involving the shelflist project and the pilot project of
5 the catalog; this is where we are going with those
6 particular issues.

7 In addition, in the recognition that we are
8 about to embark on a great changeover within GPO
9 involving possibly a new Public Printer and
10 Superintendent of Documents, Council is going to draw up
11 a document reflecting its assessment of the short, mid
12 and long term goals for the program to be given to both
13 the SuDocs and the Public Printer and in particular
14 emphasizing that there are many important projects in
15 play and that they need to keep moving forward.

16 Council, any further discussion on those
17 points? Members of the audience or GPO?

18 MR. JACOBS: Just one thing, John. James
19 Jacobs, Stanford university. It's PURLz.

20 MR. SHULER: PURLz. So noted. That's with
21 a z by the way.

22 The last item officially coming out of the
00081

1 proceedings involves a Memorandum for William Thompson,
2 which I will read. William Willie Thompson, the
3 Depository Library Council wishes to recognize the life
4 and contributions to GPO of the late William Willie
5 Thompson. Willie retired from GPO in 2004 after nearly
6 45 years of service. He had begun working at GPO as a
7 clerk and in 1994 joined the Library Programs Services
8 staff as a program analyst. It was in this position
9 that many in the Depository Community came to know
10 Willie when he became responsible for the logistical
11 planning for the Depository Library Council meeting and
12 the Federal Register Depository Conference. Willie
13 served in this capacity for the next ten years until his
14 retirement in 2004. Attendees of the meetings during
15 those years remember Willie for his can-do attitude and

16 smile. Willie passed away suddenly on March 14th, 2010.
17 The Depository Community has lost a truly great, man and
18 an even better friend. And let me underscore that.
19 It's hard to lose people and especially somebody of
20 Willie's capacity and friendship. If I can ask for a
21 minute of silence in his memory. Thank you.

22 Those are the official actions coming out of
00082

1 the series of meetings that we have had over the last
2 two and-a-half days, at least as I recall. Am I missing
3 anything, Council? Do we have any unturned stones?
4 Okay. Then we come to -- what we are coming to is the
5 conclusion of things.

6 I have had a number of people come up to me
7 over the last few days and tell me how hard it is to
8 give up being Chair and I think they are telling me for
9 all the right reasons and I'm hearing them for all the
10 right words, but I don't think I could ever profoundly
11 express the significant opportunity and the honesty and
12 trust that being Chair of Council means to me
13 personally. I consider it one of -- you know, humble
14 kind of way, one of the best things that I could have
15 possibly done in terms of giving back to the Community
16 after nearly 30 years in this business. And I would
17 like to in particular recognize my cohort generation,
18 class, we all have different terms for it: Chris Greer,
19 Kathy Lawhun, Gwen Sinclair and Tori Trotta. I thank
20 them for their support and I thank them for their -- as
21 freshman in this process you do bind together and I
22 really appreciate that binding.

00083

1 To the other two classes who will continue
2 on this great work I believe we have met our equals.
3 You folks will not be left in terrible hands. You will
4 be left in great hands. And in particular I believe
5 that the leadership, the skill and experience that
6 Suzanne Sears has demonstrated will continue to manifest
7 itself and in the range of good work that she does in
8 her role as chair.

9 And further I would like to add before we
10 have the more awkward moment, I should say these
11 transitions are not mapped out anywhere. I think we
12 make them up as we go along. So many of you know and
13 perhaps some of you know that this too has been a
14 difficult year for me in other ways. And in addition to
15 great professional support that my colleagues around

16 this table have given me and those that are not at the
17 table who have moved on, as well as those of you out in
18 the Community and at GPO, it means a lot to me and it
19 really made a difference in getting through this and
20 being able to come to what is essentially a second
21 family that helped me deal with the loss of my wife.
22 And I will say that I have never been more proud to be
00084

1 associated with a bunch of passionate people who care
2 about what they do. Even though we may use sharp words
3 or sharp elbows to make our points, we always recovery
4 from those contacts and come back and say what can we do
5 next? And what I firmly believe in this transfer from
6 one Chair to another, we will continue to do so.

7 So I thank you again for the comfort and the
8 kindness shown to me over my own loss as well, also the
9 trust and honesty that you gave me during this time for
10 responsibility for these thousand conferences. I don't
11 know if that is what we imagined, but I would like to
12 invite you over to the podium and the sacred chair.

13 MS. SEARS: The 14 of us on Council, I guess
14 it's 13 now, want to thank you for the time commitment
15 that you have put forth to being Chair. We all
16 understand what an enormous time commitment that is and
17 how difficult a job it is. So we have a little going
18 away present for you. We have a card. We have this
19 lovely Snuggie that is our fun gift. It is embroidered
20 with the Depository emblem. We then have the more
21 serious gift, which, since we know that you are referred
22 to quite frequently as Reverend John, we decided to have
00085

1 your plaque in the form of a pulpit.

2 MR. SHULER: There's a further strategy to
3 this, I'll have you know and this surprised me. I don't
4 think many people remember this, but early on in
5 Council's history we knew there should be a system of
6 failure recovery. So somewhere in the history we
7 remember if one gavel is lost, we will always have a
8 replacement. So I give officially to Suzanne to
9 represent the official transfer of power, Suzanne, you
10 get the powerful gavel and then I will use the lesser
11 gavel, but no less powerful, in order to close today's
12 proceedings.

13 MS. SEARS: Okay.

14 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Suzanne. A Snuggie.
15 Can you feel the love?

16 MS. SEARS: It's very, very, very cold up
17 here on the stage, for those of you who don't know this
18 down there. If you do get on down Council, bring your
19 warm underwear.

20 MS. SANDERS: Or be prepared to use your
21 laptop as a true laptop warmer.

22 MR. SHULER: I'm touched. I also want
00086

1 to thank -- I feel like this is the Academy Awards. I
2 want to thank the GPO staff. Especially the staff of
3 Lance, as I call them. They have been indispensable and
4 when other worldly Chairs like myself come aboard to get
5 involved with things, they are indispensable in offering
6 the infrastructure and the support as sometimes in my
7 contemplations I miss and what you see happen could not
8 happen without them.

9 Further, again, I would like to express my
10 much appreciation to Ric Davis, GPO staff, Public
11 Printer Bob Tapella, for all their support and
12 assistance in getting through these six months in
13 meetings. So I'd like to give them a hand. Is there
14 anything else before I bring it to the official closure.

15 MS. SEARS: I do have a few housekeeping --
16 Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I have a few
17 housekeeping items.

18 First off, for Council members I have placed
19 in front of you the packet on the Cost Delivery Council.
20 I would appreciate if everybody would look over the
21 charters and bylaws. Those are in desperate need of
22 revision that's been set in since the '70's that the

00087

1 bylaws were looked at and the '90's for the charter. So
2 I'd really like for us to work on that in the next few
3 weeks and get that done. I don't want to spend a lot of
4 time on it because we have a lot of important things,
5 but it needs to be up-to-date.

6 For the members of the audience, you have
7 the orange evaluation in the back of your packet and we
8 greatly appreciate it if you take the few moments to
9 fill it out and turn it in back at the registration
10 desk. I know in the fall they had an online evaluation.
11 I'm not sure if there will be an online evaluation for
12 this conference or not, but please fill out the orange
13 evaluation sheets and turn them to the registration
14 desk. If you have suggestions for education sessions or
15 Council sessions that you would like to see in the fall,

16 we would greatly appreciated that. I have heard some
17 feedback that people are saying we are discussing the
18 same things over and over again that's because from what
19 we are hearing from you, that's still your concerns. If
20 you have new concerns that you want us to discuss,
21 please the only way we know is if you tell us. You can
22 tell us through e-mail or through those evaluation
00088

1 sheets, but please let us know.

2 And just in case you were interested, I
3 heard from Lance today that the total member of
4 attendees, not counting GPO staff and Council members,
5 is 109. According to James the number by the blog is
6 215.

7 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Suzanne. As we
8 said before we have crossed a Rubicon and I will add
9 that I think it will be a Rubicon that we'll probably
10 being paying more attention to in time.

11 Anything else from Council to bring before
12 us or the Community before I officially bring this
13 session of Council to a close?

14 I have one last gift for you, I believe that
15 one thing that has always been lacking from our sessions
16 has been a recessional. So I'd like to as I close out
17 the Council I would like to have Mr. DJ start off with
18 the official recessional for this session and if you
19 like it enough, I would suggest that you find a theme
20 for the next Council session, and follow, if not, it
21 will be a singular moment we will always remember. Mr.
22 DJ hit the music.