

Modeling a Sustainable Future for the Federal Depository Library Program in the 21st Century: White Paper on Existing Library Networks

Note: Ithaka S+R has been commissioned by the Government Printing Office (GPO) to analyze the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) and recommend a sustainable and practical model or models, consistent with its existing vision and mission, for its future. This document provides a draft of the section summarizing existing library networks, consortia, and depository programs that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report.

This document examines exemplar networks, and is not meant to comprehensively describe the rich landscape of library networks; the inclusion or omission of any particular network in this document should not be read as providing any judgment, positive or negative, on these networks. Furthermore, any inaccuracies are entirely unintentional, and we will welcome the reader's reactions to help us bolster the objectivity and accuracy of this document.

For more project background or to provide comments, please visit <http://fdlpmodeling.net> or email the project team at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by January 7, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of findings and the modeling exercise that will result from it, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before January 31, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report.

Throughout the library community, there exist a wide range of different organizations and networks that serve a diverse range of valuable functions. This document explores this universe of library networks, consortia, and depository programs with the goal of understanding the different ways that libraries come together towards common ends and identifying possible characteristics or themes that could be of value for the FDLP.

This document does not attempt to comprehensively list library networks, instead focusing on the development of a framework that will have explanatory value in characterizing the different ways in which libraries work together, built around a series of exemplar networks. It certainly leaves out a number of important library networks, and some library networks may cross the boundaries of the categories laid out herein, but this framework helps to bring some structure to the complex range of library collaborations. In this framework, we fundamentally separate those networks that emphasize bringing together *librarians* from those that bring together *libraries*. Within the latter category, we arrange library networks principally based on their main drivers, including those networks that are driven by institution-level connections, state or federal government structures, library-driven consortia, and other organizations and networks through which libraries collaboratively act.

In evaluating these different ways in which libraries come together, we hope to identify features, structures, and characteristics that might valuably inform the development of a new model or models for the Federal Depository Library Program. Our goal is not to simply identify an alternative existing model that could be directly applied to the FDLP; many library networks offer valuable models of how libraries can work together effectively, but relatively few are direct parallels for the Program, and even those that do address similar challenges rarely have the size or breadth of the FDLP. As such, we principally consider the “feasibility for the FDLP” of broad classes of library networks, seeking to extract themes of library collaborations that may be important in developing a sustainable model for the FDLP rather than attempting to apply other models directly to the FDLP.

Librarian Affinity Groups

The first major category of library networks that we consider are actually networks of *librarians*, which we describe as “affinity groups.” These are, generally speaking, professional societies and other groups that bring together librarians for a variety of purposes, which may exist as standalone organizations or as components (either formal or informal) of broader library networks. This category is of interest for this project because it affords opportunities for the library community to define shared values, measure and track library inputs and outcomes, and conduct a variety of other work essential to the successful administration of the mission and values of the Federal Depository Library Program.

Categories and Examples

Affinity groups exist at all levels of size and scope. Generally speaking, the size of a group depends on how broadly or narrowly it has defined its scope; the largest groups are defined around broad themes, while groups that focus on more narrowly defined topics of interest naturally tend to only be of interest to a more limited constituency.

This feature can be seen clearly in the organization of the American Library Association (ALA), which is the major professional society for librarians in the United States.¹ At the highest level, ALA is a prime example of an extremely large and broadly scoped affinity group, with over 60,000 members from all different kinds of libraries from a broad geographical region (as well as non-librarian members, including library students, library vendors, and other affiliated members). ALA concentrates its activities in seven major program areas. Many of these program areas directly support the needs of library professionals, supporting professional education, diversity within the profession, and advocating on behalf of libraries to the public and to legislators; through its support for libraries and librarians, ALA also supports the broader information needs of the general public, promoting literacy, advocating for policies that increase access to information, and advancing the cause of intellectual freedom. ALA publishes a number of professional journals, magazines, and newsletters, supports several centralized offices that perform research, draft policy, and coordinate many of the other activities of the association, and hosts two major conferences a year – the ALA Annual Conference and the ALA Midwinter Meeting – which regularly bring together tens of thousands of librarians. Many of ALA’s activities are coordinated through its eleven major divisions or its many round tables and committees, which generally bring together librarians around more narrowly targeted topics. ALA is governed by a council of members, as well as a number of targeted committees, which are supported by ALA staff.

ALA can attract such a large and diverse membership because it is pitched at a very broad scope – its members have in common that they are librarians (or, for non-librarian members, generally have a professional interest in libraries and librarianship). Although ALA’s largest divisions – including the Association of College and Research Libraries,² the Public Libraries Association,³ and American Association of School Libraries⁴ – may in many ways resemble ALA in their breadth of focus, these organizations provide critical infrastructure for more targeted affinity groups that bring together librarians with much more in common.

ALA supports a tremendous number of smaller affinity groups built around a wide range of themes ranging in scope from the fairly broad to the quite narrow. Without going into a deep analysis of ALA’s extremely complex administrative organization, several different kinds of affinity groups are apparent. Some bring together librarians around a shared professional responsibility; for example, the ALCTS division of ALA (the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services)⁵ supports groups such as its Acquisitions, Collection Management & Development, or Preservation & Reformatting sections, which bring together librarians around a common function within the library. Other groups within ALA bring together librarians in certain kinds of libraries, such as the State Library Agency Section of the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies division of ALA,⁶ or specialize further, focusing on libraries in certain roles within certain kinds of libraries, such as the Reference Community

¹ For more information, see <http://www.ala.org>

² <http://www.ala.org/acrl>

³ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/index.cfm>

⁴ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/index.cfm>

⁵ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/index.cfm>

⁶ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/ascla/ascla.cfm>

of Practice of the Public Library Association of ALA.⁷ Still others focus on broad topics of interest, drawing librarians with a shared interest in a topic together, such as the Intellectual Freedom Round Table⁸ or the Map and Geography Round Table.⁹

Similar themes bring together librarians outside of the ALA. Several other large affinity groups resemble ALA at a slightly smaller scale, drawing together broad categories of librarians on a general shared characteristic: for example, the Medical Library Association,¹⁰ Special Library Association,¹¹ and American Association of Law Libraries¹² all serve as the major professional societies for librarians in their particular part of the library community. For example, the AALL brings together over 5,000 law librarians and other related professionals from across the legal information sector, and – similarly to ALA – hosts an annual meeting, coordinates and supports professional development, organizes librarians into “Special Interest Sections,” and broadly works “to promote and enhance the value of law libraries to the legal and public communities, to foster the profession of law librarianship, and to provide leadership in the field of legal information.”¹³ In addition to these activities to bring together librarians, the AALL has also worked – often alongside ALA and the other major professional associations – to support the interests of librarians in the policy arena, advocating on behalf of their constituents on policy matters at a variety of levels. It is probably not very much more than historical contingency which groups are organized outside ALA and which as divisions of ALA, although it is interesting to note that in an academic library context medical libraries and law libraries often do not report to the main university library but rather to the dean of the respective school.

Some affinity groups have a significant regional component, including a number of state-based library associations like the California Library Association,¹⁴ which acts somewhat similarly to a localized version of the American Library Association by bringing together librarians from across the state in conferences, supporting interest groups, and advocating for libraries within California. Other groups bring together librarians from certain kinds of libraries, such as the Association for Rural & Small Libraries,¹⁵ which provides a venue for librarians at small and rural libraries to focus on common challenges unique to their particular context. Some emphasize shared professional responsibilities, such as the North American Serials Interest Group,¹⁶ which supports a major annual conference and ongoing professional development opportunities for librarians, vendors, and others with an interest in serials issues. And some simply bring together librarians with a common interest, as in the example of code4lib,¹⁷ a loose community of library technologists based around an annual conference and a discussion forum. A

⁷ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/plagroups/placops/index.cfm>

⁸ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/rts/ifrt/index.cfm>

⁹ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/rts/magert/index.cfm>

¹⁰ <http://www.mlanet.org>

¹¹ <http://www.sla.org>

¹² <http://www.aallnet.org>

¹³ “AALLNET About: The American Association of Law Libraries,” n.d., <http://www.aallnet.org/about/>.

¹⁴ <http://www.cla-net.org/>

¹⁵ <http://www.arsl.info/>

¹⁶ <http://www.nasig.org/>

¹⁷ <http://www.code4lib.org/>

variety of themes draw together affinity groups, resulting in a rich spectrum of communities built around librarians' common interests.

The above examples of affinity groups are generally standalone bodies with the facilitation of interactions between librarians as their principal goal. Many other kinds of networks within the library community, however, have given rise to their own affinity groups, either purposefully or as an informal byproduct of their intended goals. Many of the networks of libraries that will be discussed later also constitute affinity groups, drawing together librarians around a common theme of interest; indeed, the boundary between networks that are principally affinity groups of librarians and networks of libraries that also support affinity groups of librarians can be blurry at times, as the cultivation of affinity groups is a major priority for many library networks. For example, the Metropolitan New York Library Council¹⁸ is a New York City-based consortium of libraries that provides shared services to libraries, including facilitating interlibrary lending and organizing discounted licensing, but also serves as a major affinity group for librarians in this region, providing professional development opportunities and bringing together librarians in local special interest groups. Some other affinity groups are complementary to existing structures, rather than being provided through library networks; for example, the Librarians Association of the University of California¹⁹ provides an affinity group for librarians who work at the University of California, providing a targeted affinity group within this community.

While most librarian affinity groups could be described as “natural” affinity groups, based on self-identification with the group's shared interests, some affinity groups are limited in membership to those that hold certain positions or are employed in certain organizations. For example, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies²⁰ provides a venue for directors of state library agencies to meet and address shared concerns; although COSLA advocates broadly on behalf of state libraries, its membership is limited to the leadership of these organizations. Even some groups within ALA are similarly limited in their membership; for example, the ALCTS Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Interest Group,²¹ although meeting publicly, is a forum to bring together only this limited group of librarians around the particular challenges unique to their institution type and role. Arguably, the Association of Research Libraries²² falls into this category as well; although ARL is composed of member libraries that fit a certain profile and has launched several programmatic collaborations, it in many ways resembles an affinity group of leaders of the largest research libraries in North America more than it does a conventional consortium, eschewing many of the operational roles that are central to most library consortia. In general, this purposeful limitation of participation ensures a group that will share a certain perspective and experience, and may allow for more of a safe space for the discussion of topics that would be politically challenging to air in a more transparent fashion.

Themes

Librarian affinity groups play a variety of different roles to greater or lesser degrees.

¹⁸ <http://www.metro.org/>

¹⁹ <http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/>

²⁰ <http://www.cosla.org/>

²¹ <http://connect.ala.org/node/71917>

²² <http://www.arl.org/>

- Professional development: A principal role for many of these affinity groups is the provision of opportunities for professional development, such as classes, workshops, conferences, symposia, etc.
- Information sharing: A related role for many affinity groups is the facilitation of information sharing between members. These may be part and parcel of professional development opportunities, or may be more ongoing and ambient, such as the provision of listservs, journals, newsletters, or other communications channels between librarians.
- Definition of shared values: Another major role for these affinity groups is the definition of the shared values of the library community. Sometimes, these groups perform this role formally, via resolutions or statements of shared values, but more often these groups simply promote the development of a shared culture among librarians.
- Identification of best practices: In some cases, a more or less formal role for these affinity groups is to identify and promulgate best practices within their communities of practice.
- Centralized activities: Some affinity groups also perform a degree of centralized activity, often in support of the above roles. For example, affinity groups often support information-sharing roles by programming and organizing meetings, producing publications, or otherwise facilitating communication, and some have taken on lobbying roles to bring the shared values of the library community into broader policy discussions.
- Policy advocacy: Several of the affinity groups maintain Washington or federal relations offices designed to shape the policy conversation and advance policy objectives that are of importance to their membership.
- Strategic planning: In some cases, affinity groups conduct strategic planning activities designed to shape the future of their profession and/or the future of their libraries.

The prioritization of each of these roles may be shaped by which of the above categories a group falls into, as well as other factors about its intended goals and purposes.

Feasibility for the FDLP

Many such affinity groups already exist in and around the FDLP. The Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) of ALA²³ is one of the major affinity groups for government information librarians, providing an official professional community around this topic within the structure of the American Library Association. GODORT supports a number of committees and task forces that focus on more specialized aspects of government information, including the Federal Documents Task Force, and supports professional networking, development, and information sharing through regular meetings and the journal *Documents to the People*. In addition to its major professional development role, GODORT often serves as a venue for the definition and expression of shared professional values, supporting resolutions on topics of importance to the government information librarian community and advocating for government information within the broader organization of ALA.

On a more local level, many states support local affinity groups for government information librarians. For example, the University of Colorado at Boulder organizes the Government Publications Interest

²³ <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/rts/godort/index.cfm>

Group (GoPIG),²⁴ an affinity group for government information specialists and others with an interest in government information in Colorado. Similar groups exist in many other states, providing a local community for information sharing and professional development.

Another affinity group, specifically for librarians within the FDLP, has grown up around the Depository Library Council,²⁵ the official advisory body to the Public Printer. Although membership in DLC itself is strictly limited, the Federal Depository Library Council Meeting has come to serve as a biannual conference for depository librarians and a major hub of professional development and networking within this community. GPO also supports professional development and community building throughout the FDLP community through regular online training sessions using OPAL, an online presentation and discussion suite that enables virtual conferences.²⁶

In addition to these specialized affinity groups, the major professional associations have also worked on behalf of the Program more centrally. Responding to the priorities of their members and to support the values of the library community, the FDLP has become a major priority for many of the major professional associations' legislative and policy offices, including AALL, ALA, ARL, and COSLA. In some cases, the professional associations' advocacy efforts have grown directly out of the efforts of affinity groups of librarians focusing on government information, while in other cases they grow out of the priorities of a central office. The associations have supported the FDLP through legislative advocacy and policy support.

A gap in the existing librarian affinity groups focusing on government information centers around training. While some existing groups emphasize professional development within the government information community, few make basic training a priority. As increasingly few librarians will have the same "on the ground" learning opportunities in a mainstreamed environment, training efforts may become an important role for existing affinity groups. Currently, especially few reach into the broader library community to raise awareness of government information among non-specialist librarians. Greater integration with the existing broad professional associations may enable outreach beyond the typical boundaries of the profession, enabling training of library professionals who may not identify with existing government information-centric affinity groups.

Networks of Libraries

Although some may be tied to library-level memberships, the above affinity groups principally focus on bringing together *librarians*, not libraries; libraries, of course, also have relationships with each other, grouping together in various ways to advance their shared interests and the common good. These arrangements vary widely, ranging from the very limited to the very broad in scope, the very small to the very large in size, and on a variety of other factors including how they are formed, governed, and incentivized. Although there are substantial idiosyncratic differences between these networks, this document seeks to class them together in ways that will draw out thematic differences between them.

²⁴ <http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/govpubs/de/gopig/gopig.htm>

²⁵ <http://www.fdlp.gov/home/about/61-dlc>

²⁶ <http://www.opal-online.org/>

Institution-driven Networks

In some cases, libraries are brought together as a part of broader relationships between their host institutions. This context of institutional partnership may enable libraries to undertake deeper collaborations, drawing on existing relationships and infrastructure that support inter-institutional efforts. In addition to enabling innovative exercises, such an environment may support especially durable partnerships, building on histories of trust and an expectation of long-term relationships not tied to any particular collaborative effort.

The libraries of the Five Colleges of Massachusetts (Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, Smith, and UMass Amherst)²⁷ offer a prime example of deep relationships rooted in broad institutional connections. These libraries share a joint catalog and generally allow borrowing of materials by faculty and students across institutional lines, as well as actually sharing ownership of many of those collections deposited in their shared print repository²⁸ and collaborating on a wide range of other projects to advance their common goals. But the collaborations between these schools go well beyond the library, also including “shared use of educational and cultural resources and facilities; ... joint departments and programs; ... [and] inter-campus transportation.”²⁹ These relationships are formalized through their participation in Five Colleges, Incorporated, “a nonprofit educational consortium established in 1965 to promote the broad educational and cultural objectives of its member institutions.”³⁰ This consortium, which is governed by a Board of Directors composed of the heads of its member institutions and the executive director of the consortium and supported by its members, supports many different forms of collaboration by bringing together interests from across the Five Colleges, sometimes supported by consortium staff and resources. These institutions credit their successful history of collaboration to “their proximity to one another in the Connecticut River Valley of western Massachusetts ... [and] their commitment to the liberal arts and to undergraduate education.”³¹ The Five Colleges are an unusually rich example of regional collaboration among universities; in addition to ongoing programmatic collaborations, the 1970 foundation of Hampshire College in fact grew directly out of the interests of the presidents of the other four institutions creating “a new college in our area... at which major departures in liberal education can be initiated.”³²

Another broad consortium which has facilitated significant library collaboration is the Committee on Institution Cooperation,³³ which “was established by the presidents of the Big Ten Conference members in 1958 as the athletic league’s academic counterpart. An invitation extended to the University of Chicago, one of the founding members of the Big Ten which withdrew from the conference in 1946, was

²⁷ <http://www.fivecolleges.edu/>

²⁸ According to depository policies, “Items stored in the Depository by the University [of Massachusetts, Amherst] remain the property of the University. Items given to the Depository by the four colleges become the property of Five Colleges, Inc.”

²⁹ “Five Colleges, Incorporated: About Us,” n.d., http://www.fivecolleges.edu/about_us/.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² C.L. Barber et al., “The New College Plan: A Proposal for a Major Departure in Higher Education,” 1958, <http://www.hampshire.edu/archives/files/NewColl.pdf>.

³³ <http://www.cic.net/>

accepted. Following its admittance to the Big Ten in 1990, Pennsylvania State University was invited to join the consortium.”³⁴ This close linkage of CIC membership to the Big Ten athletic league means that the University of Nebraska-Lincoln will soon join the consortium as it becomes a member of the Big Ten. Although this consortium has pursued a broad range of shared initiatives that go well beyond the library, its Center for Library Initiatives has focused on “three objectives – optimizing student and faculty access to the combined resources of our libraries; maximizing cost, time, and space savings; and supporting a collaborative environment where library staff can work together to solve their mutual problems.”³⁵ The CIC is governed by the provosts of its member institutions, and has a relatively small centralized staff, principally serving to coordinate the efforts of the libraries of its member institutions to advance shared programs. In addition to consortial licensing, reciprocal borrowing, and other standard features of a library consortium, the CIC has played an important role in the creation of the HathiTrust Digital Repository, which “began in 2008 as a collaboration of the thirteen universities of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, the University of California system, and the University of Virginia to establish a repository to archive and share their digitized collections.”³⁶

The sets of institutions described above have long histories of multifaceted collaborative enterprises, but ultimately remain fundamentally discrete institutions; other groups of institutions may be more fundamentally linked as a part of the same university system, which may provide additional opportunities for innovative efforts. In these cases, shared governance and funding may support unique efforts to share resources and develop innovative services.

Perhaps the richest example of a university system taking advantage of this opportunity for deep library collaborations is the California Digital Library,³⁷ the “UC’s library without walls.”³⁸ Building on a history of collaboration among these related libraries, including the creation of their joint catalog MELVYL, the California Digital Library works to “provide the infrastructure and support commonly needed by the campus libraries, freeing them to focus their resources on the needs of their users” through centralized shared licensing, technology development, and programmatic support for collaborative efforts by the UC libraries.³⁹ And unlike many other consortial bodies, which often work principally through coordinating activities among their member libraries, the CDL has significant centralized staff devoted to directly supporting their efforts, in addition to serving a coordinating role. The CDL is a unit within the University of California Office of the President, and as such has close linkages with other centralized information services organizations of the university, including the press and other media. In addition to support from the UCOP, CDL has been successful in attracting millions of dollars in grant funding to support its explorations of “strategic innovations in digital libraries.”⁴⁰ But while formally a unit of UCOP,

³⁴ “History of CIC,” n.d., <http://www.cic.net/Home/AboutCIC/CicHistory.aspx>.

³⁵ “Center for Library Initiatives,” n.d., <http://www.cic.net/Home/Projects/Library/Home.aspx>.

³⁶ “Our Partnership | www.hathitrust.org,” n.d., <http://www.hathitrust.org/partnership>.

³⁷ <http://www.cdlib.org/>

³⁸ “UC Announces Founding of the California Digital Library,” October 14, 1997, <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/20579>.

³⁹ “About CDL: California Digital Library,” n.d., <http://www.cdlib.org/about/>.

⁴⁰ “Grants and Partnerships: California Digital Library,” n.d., <http://www.cdlib.org/about/grants.html>.

a complex funding formula and advisory bodies have helped to provide deep linkages with the campuses CDL supports.

CDL is an almost uniquely strong example of a university system supporting collaboration across its libraries, the result of a strong leadership vision for the new opportunities and savings that could be realized by libraries working together in an unprecedented way; many other university systems support much lighter library collaborations, reflecting a prioritization of local independence by libraries. For example, while the California State University system has leveraged “the purchasing power of the largest system of higher education in the nation” to collectively license a wide range of scholarly materials, and does centrally maintain and develop some shared infrastructure, its activities beyond shared licensing pale in comparison to those of the CDL.⁴¹ While institution-level networks may provide a rich environment for deep library collaborations, formal networks do not necessarily entail such strong bonds of trust.

Government-driven Networks

In contrast to the above networks, which arise out of sufficient senses of trust between institutions that their libraries can set aside some degree of independence to achieve common goals, other networks are implemented on behalf of a group of libraries to catalyze such collaboration. For example, state governments may create central offices to provide support institutions in their region, providing opportunities for efficiencies and economies of scale that might otherwise not have naturally arisen, or the federal government may create networks to support certain objectives.

For example, the Florida Center for Library Automation⁴² provides information technology support, infrastructure, and shared licensing for the libraries of the State University System of Florida. FCLA principally supports the technology needs of these universities, centrally licensing electronic resources, managing shared infrastructure like SFX and a union catalog, and developing centralized digital repositories for both preservation and institutional repository purposes. Although governed by the State University System, FCLA is advised by a board of representatives from its constituent campuses on how they can best serve the needs of its users. The College Center for Library Automation⁴³ provides a somewhat parallel set of services for Florida’s community colleges. And, many other state university systems have a similar centralized library office which supports shared licensing and infrastructure for their members, although the particular roles of these centralized offices and their relationships to their member campuses range widely; in some cases, centralized offices principally focus on licensing, with shared infrastructure efforts sometimes being eclipsed by the continuing efforts of individual libraries that prefer their own independent solution.

More broadly scoped in its activities than most such networks, OhioLINK⁴⁴ deserves special consideration as a particularly robust state-supported library consortium that has taken on a wide range of activities in support of libraries at private and public academic institutions within Ohio. In addition to

⁴¹ <http://seir.calstate.edu/>

⁴² <http://fclaweb.fcla.edu/>

⁴³ <http://www.cclaflorida.org/>

⁴⁴ <http://www.ohiolink.edu/>

common activities such as a union catalog and shared licensing, OhioLINK has also developed a rich set of digital services to support the needs of scholars and students in Ohio, including an innovative journal discovery and use system that relies on local loading of journal content, infrastructure for managing digital content, and more. OhioLINK reports to the Ohio Board of Regents and is advised by a set of advisory councils focusing on specific topics; the membership of these boards varies, bringing together staff with appropriate skill sets and interests from across OhioLINK's membership to advise on the consortium's activities.

Although many examples of government-driven networks focus on bringing together academic libraries, other networks bring together public libraries around their shared challenges and priorities. For example, the Ohio Public Library Information Network (OPLIN)⁴⁵ is a consortium of public libraries in Ohio, which originated as a complement to OhioLINK focusing on supporting the unique needs of public libraries in Ohio (as opposed to the academic libraries served by OhioLINK). OPLIN is supported by the State Library of Ohio, and coordinates telecommunications infrastructure and access to subscription databases for public libraries across Ohio, with the goal of "ensur[ing] that all Ohio residents have fast, free public Internet access through the 251 independent local public library systems in Ohio, as well as the use of high-quality research databases not freely available on the World Wide Web."⁴⁶ OPLIN is governed by a board of trustees from public libraries across Ohio.

While public libraries and academic libraries are often brought together in government-driven networks unique to their type of library – for example, the decision in Ohio to have separate networks of academic libraries and public libraries – some networks bring together all kinds of libraries. For example, MINITEX,⁴⁷ which is a program of the Minnesota Office of Higher Education hosted by the University of Minnesota, brings together academic, public, special, and even school libraries. Minitex supports a wide variety of consortial activities, including consortial licensing of shared resources, interlibrary loan, and a high density storage facility, and emphasizes professional development, providing training and consulting on topics including cataloging, digitization, and more. Minitex also supports central shared infrastructure, including the Minnesota Digital Library and the Electronic Library of Minnesota. Some Minitex services reach beyond Minnesota, under contracts between Minitex and the North and South Dakota State Libraries.

In addition to these state-level programs, the federal government has created several different kinds of networks of libraries to pursue national information objectives. For example, the National Network of Libraries of Medicine (NN/LM),⁴⁸ coordinated by the National Library of Medicine, brings together almost 6,000 libraries of medicine across the United States, including academic health science libraries, hospital libraries, and others. The NLM itself forms the backbone of this network; in addition to serving as a central permanent and trusted national library collection, maintaining materials on behalf of the community, the NLM supports the databases that are the principal means of providing access to many materials in this community. The NN/LM is divided into eight regions, with three tiers of libraries

⁴⁵ <http://www.oplin.lib.oh.us>

⁴⁶ "About OPLIN | OPLIN," n.d., <http://www.oplin.lib.oh.us/content/about-oplin>.

⁴⁷ <http://www.minitex.umn.edu/>

⁴⁸ <http://nnlm.gov/>

supporting each region. Each region has one designated Regional Medical Library which serves under renewable contract with the NLM to coordinate activities within its region. In each region, the Regional Medical Library is responsible for coordinating cooperative activities among libraries and serving as a liaison between the NLM and the libraries of its region. Large academic libraries facilitate local outreach and serve as hubs for document delivery, as well as providing services beyond their immediate local communities, and are known as Resource Libraries. Hospital libraries and a variety of other libraries that serve the health information needs of other communities are known as Primary Access Libraries. The NN/LM supports interlibrary lending among network members via the DOCLINE system, as well as supporting collaboration and information sharing among members and providing training and grant opportunities. It obliges members to relatively few responsibilities beyond some basic information sharing with the rest of the network.

Other government-driven programs seek to bring together libraries around other kinds of goals. One example includes the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP),⁴⁹ a program to investigate digital preservation challenges in which the Library of Congress provides central leadership and programmatic support as well as coordinating the activities of a large network of institutions including many libraries as well as other partners. This program was funded specifically by the US Congress to “to develop a national approach to digital preservation,”⁵⁰ and is managed by the Library of Congress. The Program has funded a substantial number of projects and programs across its community, including efforts to develop technologies, policies, specific preservation programs, and more. More recently, the Program launched the National Digital Stewardship Alliance, which emphasizes the formation of relationships between “government agencies, educational institutions, non-profit organizations and businesses to preserve a distributed national digital collection for the benefit of citizens now and in the future.”⁵¹

Depository library programs

Depository programs like the FDLP make up an additional important category of government-run programs, working through networks of libraries to disseminate and support the accessibility of publications broadly. Although the FDLP is the largest depository program managed by the United States federal government, it is not the only such program; the US Patent and Trademark Office disseminates copies of “U.S. patents and patent and trademark materials, to make them freely available to the public, and to actively disseminate patent and trademark information”⁵² through a network of Patent & Trademark Depository Libraries and support the intellectual property needs of the public.⁵³ Members of this program acquire and provide public access to a collection of a “minimum of a 20-year back file collection of U.S. utility patents issued 20 years prior to the date of designation,”⁵⁴ received from the

⁴⁹ <http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/>

⁵⁰ “About the Program - Digital Preservation (Library of Congress),” n.d., <http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/library/>.

⁵¹ “National Digital Stewardship Alliance - Digital Preservation (Library of Congress),” n.d., <http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/ndsa/>.

⁵² “History and Background,” n.d., <http://www.uspto.gov/products/library/ptdl/background/index.jsp>.

⁵³ <http://www.uspto.gov/products/library/ptdl/index.jsp>

⁵⁴ “History and Background.”

USPTO in DVD form. Libraries are required to “retain any depository copies of patents until, at the initiative of the library, disposal of them has been arranged through the USPTO. The USPTO retains the right of first refusal to acquire any materials, including microform, being relinquished by a library.”⁵⁵

In addition to national-level depository programs, many states coordinate depository library programs to disseminate and support access to state government documents. For example, the California State Library manages the California State Depository Library Program in order to make California state documents readily available to the citizens of the state,⁵⁶ which currently consists of over 100 libraries across the state. California’s Program contains two main tiers of libraries: “full” depositories, which receive all publications within the scope of the program; and “selective” depositories, which “receive copies of each publication distributed by the Office of State Publishing, and may request other state documents distributed directly by the issuing agencies.”⁵⁷ Similarly to the FDLP, these roles also entail different retention requirements for these tiers of libraries, although with some greater flexibility in required retention even for complete depositories; in addition to these two roles, a different set of retention requirements apply to law libraries, differentiating between legal materials and general documents for retention purposes.

National depository programs similar to the FDLP exist outside the US as well, such as the Canadian Depository Services Program,⁵⁸ which exists to “provide Depository Libraries with free and ready access to the printed and electronic documents and other information products of the federal government, in partnership with Government of Canada departments and agencies.”⁵⁹ The Canadian Program consists of more than 800 libraries in Canada and abroad; less than 100 of these libraries are located outside Canada, including about 30 participating libraries in the United States. Libraries in this Program are categorized either as Full Depository Libraries, Selective Depository Libraries, or Map Depository Libraries. The 51 Full Depositories (all within Canada, with the exception of the British Library) are selected by the DSP and the National Library of Canada, and receive all Government of Canada publications distributed through the Program (either in English, French, or both, depending on their user population) and “commit to preserving and maintaining a permanent collection of Government of Canada publications, and to providing inter-library loan service for some material no longer available from other sources.” Selective Depositories, on the other hand, select materials at the item level from a weekly checklist, and “commit to preserving and maintaining them for at least 5 years,” while Map Depositories “receive topographic and geological printed maps and other cartographic products ... and have qualified map librarians on staff and the equipment and facilities for storing and consulting printed maps.”⁶⁰ The DSP faces several challenges similar to those faced by the FDLP, including working to effectively balance print and electronic materials within the Program, effectively integrating all

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ http://www.library.ca.gov/gps/gps_cal1.html

⁵⁷ “California State Library - State Document Depositories,” n.d., http://www.library.ca.gov/gps/gps_cal3.html.

⁵⁸ <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/index-e.html>

⁵⁹ “Quick Reference Guide for Depository Libraries - Government of Canada Publications,” n.d., <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/depositoryLibraries/dspReferenceGuide.html>.

⁶⁰ “Depository Libraries - Government of Canada Publications,” n.d., <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/locatingOurPublications/depositoryLibraries/index.html>.

appropriate government publications into dissemination and preservation infrastructure, and raising awareness of library services.⁶¹

Depository programs also exist at the international level; the Dag Hammarskjöld Library of the United Nations Secretariat in New York (not a “government,” but discussed here among its closest correlate programs) coordinates the United Nations Depository Library System, distributing “United Nations documents and publications to users around the world through its depository library system,” a network of “more than 400 depository libraries in over 140 countries” (including almost 50 libraries in the United State).⁶² These libraries pay a modest annual fee to participate in this program, and generally receive a “regular deposit” of an established set of UN publications or a “print plus deposit” of this set of materials plus a complement of other specified materials, although libraries are free to select to receive only a desired subset of these deposited materials. In both cases, libraries may choose to substitute online access via the Official Document System for hard copy distribution of materials. These materials must be made freely available to the public, and although libraries may choose to deaccession materials in certain specified categories, “the essence of the collection as a record of United Nations activities from the date of designation to the present must be preserved.”⁶³ In addition to maintaining and supporting access to the public locally and via interlibrary loan, UN depository libraries are encouraged to organize activities regularly to raise awareness of these materials.

The Europe Direct information network⁶⁴ contains a depository component as only one aspect of a broader strategic campaign to meet the information needs of Europeans. Europe Direct also provides centralized chat, telephone, and email assistance with EU topics, coordinates nearly 500 Europe Direct Information Centres across Europe to provide general information to the public, and organizes “Team Europe,” a network of outreach specialists who can “lead presentations, workshops or debates at trade fairs and conferences or within organizations” and “give interviews and write articles for the media.”⁶⁵ In addition to these efforts to coordinate outreach and the provision of basic information about the EU, Europe Direct also coordinates 400 European Documentation Centres principally hosted in university and research institute libraries, which receive and support public access to EU publications. The European Union has also organized “a network of depository libraries across the US to provide Americans with access to many of its official publications,”⁶⁶ automatically and freely disseminating to member libraries a predefined set of EU publications. These libraries can also choose to receive certain sets of additional EU publications.

⁶¹ “Report to Publishing and Distribution Services, Public Works and Government Services Canada,” March 2009, <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Rapports/mar2009/index-e.html>.

⁶² “United Nations depository libraries: Depository Library System,” n.d., <http://www.un.org/depts/dhl/deplib/deplibsystem.htm>.

⁶³ “United Nations depository libraries: About deposit,” n.d., <http://www.un.org/depts/dhl/deplib/aboutdeposit.htm>.

⁶⁴ http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm

⁶⁵ “Europe Direct information network,” n.d., http://europa.eu/europedirect/meet_us/index_en.htm.

⁶⁶ “EUROPEAN UNION - Delegation of the European Union to the USA - DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE US,” n.d., http://www.eurunion.org/eu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=2927&Itemid=9.

Although these programs generally serve a role similar to that played by the FDLP, there are substantive differences between these programs and the FDLP. None have the scale of the FDLP; only the Canadian Depository Services Program comes close, and several others operate on a significantly smaller scale. Some of these programs charge fees for participation, rather than freely distributing materials (although the value of materials generally far outweighs the fee). Several disseminate relatively small and fixed sets of materials, rather than allowing libraries significant flexibility in selecting desired materials; on the other hand, the Canadian DSP enables a much more granular item-level selection process. And some programs seem designed principally as services to support libraries in developing desired collections, lacking the long-term emphasis on maintaining collections that is at the core of the FDLP. Furthermore, many of these programs face familiar challenges in successfully negotiating the print to electronic transition and reaching sustainability in the digital environment. Table 1 provides a brief summary overview of these depository programs.⁶⁷

DRAFT

⁶⁷ As we have been unable to find substantial details on the formal workings of the European Documentation Centres program, this program is excluded from this summary; we would value community input to help us better understand this program.

Table 1: Overview of Depository Library Programs

	Participation	Levels of participation	Types of participating libraries	Selection process	Retention requirement	Fees for participation	Governing authority	Changes in digital era
Federal Depository Library Program⁶⁸	1221 libraries in the United States	Regional libraries and Selective libraries	Heavy participation from large and small academic libraries, public libraries, and state libraries	Regional libraries receive all appropriate materials in print form; Selective libraries receive a core set, plus any selected materials	Regional libraries must retain all non-superseded materials; Selectives must retain materials for five years, and then deaccession through their regional	None	44 USC 1901-1916	See Background paper
USPTO Depository Libraries	89 libraries in the United States	All libraries play the same formal role in the program	Heavy participation from state, public, and research libraries; often specialized science libraries	None; all libraries receive all materials in digital form.	Disposal of materials requires permission from USPTO	\$50 annual fee	35 U.S.C. 12	Materials are distributed primarily in digital form, on DVD

⁶⁸ The FDLP is included in this chart for comparative purposes only.

	Participation	Levels of participation	Types of participating libraries	Selection process	Retention requirement	Fees for participation	Governing authority	Changes in digital era
California State Depository Library Program	114 libraries in California	Complete depositories, Selective depositories, and Law Libraries	College & university libraries, public libraries, law libraries, and some state libraries	Complete depositories receive all materials; Selective depositories receive a designated set of materials, and can choose to receive others	Complete depositories retain all materials (with defined exceptions), Selective libraries retain certain materials for at least five years; Law libraries retain legal materials	None	California Government Code 14900 – 14912	Limited central hosting of digital materials; most materials hosted by agency websites
Canadian Depository Services Program	More than 800 libraries, including about 30 in the United States	Full depositories and Selective depositories	Full depositories include government libraries, university libraries, and public libraries; similarly for selectives	Full depositories receive all materials; Selective libraries choose desired materials from a weekly checklist	Full depositories retain all materials; Selective libraries retain materials for at least five years	None	Canadian Order-in-Council	Many materials available through centralized digital “E-collection”

	Participation	Levels of participation	Types of participating libraries	Selection process	Retention requirement	Fees for participation	Governing authority	Changes in digital era
UN Depository Library System	More than 400 libraries in 140 countries, including almost 50 in the United States	Regular depositories and Print plus depositories	Principally research libraries, also law libraries and public libraries	Libraries generally receive a predefined set of materials for their role, although may modify this profile in limited ways	Libraries may only deaccession certain classes of materials	Annual fee, varies with role and other factors (such as development status of nation)	Official Document of the United Nations (Secretariat / Administrative Instruction - ST/AI/189/Add.11/Rev. 2	Many materials available through centralized Official Document System
EU Depository Libraries in the US	55 libraries in the United States	All libraries play the same formal role in the program	Principally research libraries	Libraries generally receive a predefined set of materials for their role, and may choose to receive certain additional materials	Not clearly documented	None	???	Many materials available via europa.eu

Library consortia

In addition to networks for library collaboration that are built upon institutional relationships or at the behest of an external entity, libraries themselves often come together in consortial arrangements, recognizing opportunities for common goals to be more efficiently or effectively realized through the development of partnerships between libraries. These consortia generally draw together libraries out of a perceived commonality of interests, which often has a strong regional component. Libraries may participate in multiple consortia, ranging from broad consortia that bring together a wide variety of libraries in a region to more specialized groupings that focus on the common concerns of smaller groups of more similar libraries. Common activities pursued by many consortia include:

- Facilitating the licensing of electronic resources, either by jointly licensing access for a group of libraries or by arranging for discounts or deals that enable individual libraries to more cost-effectively license these resources
- Supporting reciprocal borrowing, both by supporting the ability of patrons to borrow materials from consortial partners regardless of their own affiliation and often by facilitating interlibrary lending, providing tools to enable patrons to initiate interlibrary borrowing and often providing infrastructure that actually facilitates the delivery of materials between libraries
- Supporting collaborative collections management, ranging from the coordination of distributed collections to the provision of shared print storage facilities.
- Providing centralized technological infrastructure, including centralized instances of common library tools; in some cases, this may simply outsource technology support, while in other cases shared infrastructure may provide the groundwork for information sharing, as in the case of a union catalog
- Supporting professional development and training of librarians by organizing conferences and playing other roles that resemble those supported by many of the affinity groups described above

Many library collaborative endeavors are shaped by one or a very few shared objectives, such as reciprocal borrowing agreements, facilitated interlibrary lending, and shared licensing of electronic resources. While these roles undergird many more complex consortial arrangements, some consortia focus principally on these common functions, and have few other roles beyond facilitating resource sharing.

An example of an especially focused collaboration is BorrowDirect,⁶⁹ a network of seven of the eight Ivy League universities focused around patron-driven interlibrary loan fulfillment. BorrowDirect formalizes relationships between these universities and shares infrastructure to enable users at these institutions to directly request books from BorrowDirect partners without intervention from the library, a streamlined system for a network of interlibrary loan that can offer rapid service. Initially a project by Columbia, the University of Pennsylvania, and Yale, facilitated by RLG, this network now exists as shared

⁶⁹ No central web page

infrastructure for these institutions, with little public face or broader programmatic elements having developed at least to date and no central office to serve as a focal point.

Another example of a focused consortial effort, which grew out of a related group of libraries, is the NorthEast Research Libraries consortium (NERL),⁷⁰ which brings together academic research libraries in the northeastern United States “with the common objectives of access and cost containment, joint licensing, and possible joint deployment of electronic resources.”⁷¹ NERL focuses principally on “licensing on-line products and the deployment of online products and services,” with the goal of “obtain[ing] the best resources, license terms, and prices possible for our institutions and users,” especially for expensive resources.⁷² Hosted by Yale University and governed by representatives of its member institutions, NERL has several dedicated staff based at Yale, but relies on coordinating efforts by its members to advance its work.

Although there are many examples of library networks driven principally by a focused set of programmatic activities, many groups of libraries take on a wider range of responsibilities, often also including these basic roles, recognizing the substantial value that print and licensed resource-sharing can offer to libraries, reducing local costs and expanding access to resources for local users in ways that would not otherwise be cost-effective. These consortia serve a variety of different self-selected constituents, shaping their roles to address the needs of their member libraries, and so may take on very different sets of responsibilities or patterns of activities based on the unique needs of their constituents.

Many regional library consortia serve the full range of libraries in their state or region, ranging from small public libraries to the largest academic institutions. For example, the Midwest Collaborative for Library Services⁷³ (which serves libraries in Indiana and Michigan) encompasses school, corporate, public, and academic libraries in their region, from high school libraries to the University of Michigan. MCLS arranges for discounts on databases, provides some central support to facilitate licensing, supports a union catalog, offers workshops and training on a variety of topics, and provides several other services and tools to their community. Other states and regions have similar consortia which play a range of roles with accompanying varied service offerings. In addition to their consortial roles, which often emphasizing facilitating access to resources through the aggregation of libraries, these broad regional consortia often play an important role in forming local affinity groups of libraries, often also supporting professional development and job seeking activities.

Regional consortia that focus on serving academic libraries (occasionally also including a handful of large non-academic libraries such as the state library) are also common. Although there is substantial variation between these consortia, PALCI (the Pennsylvania Academic Library Consortium, Inc.)⁷⁴ offers a good example of this model. PALCI brings together academic libraries principally in Pennsylvania, with some additional membership in New Jersey and West Virginia. In addition to facilitating cooperative

⁷⁰ <http://www.library.yale.edu/NERLpublic/>

⁷¹ “NERL Public Web Site,” n.d., <http://www.library.yale.edu/NERLpublic/>.

⁷² “Letter of Introduction to Vendors,” n.d., <http://www.library.yale.edu/NERLpublic/RFPIletter.html>.

⁷³ <http://mlc.lib.mi.us/cms/sitem.cfm>

⁷⁴ <http://www.palci.org/>

licensing of electronic resources and reciprocal borrowing and interlibrary loan, PALCI is also working to develop a distributed print journal archive, as well as facilitating cooperative planning and setting of standards on other print and digital collections management issues and providing professional development activities for librarians at member institutions. Although the specific menu and weight of services may vary, many similar consortia – Louisiana’s LOUIS,⁷⁵ the Pacific Northwest’s Orbis Cascade (a consortium that has served as the basis for a GPO-sanctioned distributed Regional collection),⁷⁶ and several others – play these sorts of roles for regional groups of libraries nationwide.

Other library consortia draw together a more select set of libraries, often focusing on research libraries or other unique communities within a region. For example, the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL)⁷⁷ supports a variety of collaborative activities, ranging from shared licensing and reciprocal borrowing to professional development to programmatic collaborations around print collections, government documents, digital collections, and more. Although some of ASERL’s activities are shared broadly across its membership, such as some of its infrastructural roles like rapid interlibrary loan support, some more programmatic activities include only a subset of ASERL members interested in a particular topic. ASERL is governed by a board of directors elected from among ASERL members, and has a small central staff that principally facilitates programmatic collaboration driven by its members.

The Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA)⁷⁸ similarly forms multifaceted relationships between a group of research libraries in the Midwestern and Western United States. As with ASERL, GWLA has a small central staff and is governed by representatives of its member libraries, and emphasizes both standing programs (such as resource sharing agreements, jointly negotiated licenses, and professional development activities) and collaborative projects that bring together some or all of its members. Programmatic projects are typically championed by one or more libraries and address one of four broad programmatic goals for the Alliance, reflecting both an interest in advancing the shared objectives of members and addressing broader thematic goals that could have benefits well beyond the GWLA community.

Other library consortia focus on the unique challenges faced by particular sectors of libraries, again often with a regional component. For example, the New England Law Library Consortium (NELLCO)⁷⁹ brings together 25 New England law libraries as full members of the consortium, as well as affiliate member law libraries from across the country and internationally. While many are academic libraries, NELLCO also includes government libraries and independent law libraries; although there is substantial diversity among these libraries, their shared emphasis on serving the needs of the legal community enables them to work together on common ground to address challenges and priorities unique to law libraries. NELLCO provides many familiar features of a library consortium, including collaborative licensing, reciprocal interlibrary loan, and shared infrastructure (including a shared digital repository), as

⁷⁵ <http://appl006.lsu.edu/ocsweb/louishome.nsf/index>; thanks to Lori Smith for suggesting this consortium for inclusion.

⁷⁶ <http://www.orbiscascade.org/>

⁷⁷ <http://www.aserl.org/>

⁷⁸ <http://www.gwla.org/>

⁷⁹ <http://www.nellco.org>

well as emphasizing professional development and information sharing through special interest groups. NELLCO has limited permanent staff, and is governed by board composed of the directors of all full member libraries.

Other library collaborations

Libraries also come together in a variety of other configurations to accomplish shared objectives, sometimes more informally than the above consortial examples and sometimes through different kinds of formal organizations. Like the library-driven consortial examples described above, these collaborative efforts principally bring together libraries that self-identify with a shared goal or challenge.

Ad hoc collaborations

While many of these consortial activities and collaborative efforts seek to build stable networks of libraries to continue to support shared goals over time, libraries also come together in more ad hoc collaborative efforts, bringing together a group of libraries or librarians to address a specific project through collaborative effort. Many such projects are grant-funded initiatives, focused on short-term collaborations with a defined goal in sight. For example, the Government Information in the 21st Century project⁸⁰ was a collaborative project, funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services, by five libraries to implement “a five-state continuing education program to train reference and public service librarians and library workers in the use of electronic government information.”⁸¹ Through this project, participating libraries worked together to develop content resources, train government information staff throughout their region, and coordinate outreach and training to non-specialist librarians throughout the region. This grant-funded, limited-term, ad hoc collaboration between libraries is a common model for joint efforts by libraries to address shared priorities. Although numerous further examples of such short-term, ad hoc collaborations could be listed, many of the most successful and longest-lasting collaborations that begin with ad hoc groups of libraries eventually grow to take on more formal organization structures or are integrated into existing and more formal organizations.

Programmatic collaborations

While these ad hoc collaborations typically take on a project that is relatively limited in scope and timeline, aiming to accomplish a set task, other collaborations between libraries seek to set up long-term networks to support shared goals. In many ways, these collaborations are similar to consortia, but the collaborations described here are principally oriented towards programmatic action around a relatively focused goal; they are goal-oriented rather than relationship-oriented.

One example of such an organization is the LOCKSS Alliance,⁸² which brings together libraries that have implemented the LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe) technology to maintain local replicated copies of scholarly journal contents. Members of the LOCKSS Alliance have self-identified based on a shared interest in the LOCKSS technology, and through their membership fees support the central development

⁸⁰ <http://www.webjunction.org/gi21>

⁸¹ Kirsten Clark and Jennifer Gerke, “Government Information in the 21st Century: A New Model for Academic Outreach,” in *Academic Library Outreach: Beyond the Campus Walls* (Libraries Unlimited/Teacher Ideas Press, 2008), <http://www.webjunction.org/gi21>.

⁸² http://lockss.stanford.edu/lockss/LOCKSS_Alliance

of this technology as well as receiving technical support and access to certain premium content. Other private networks have also been built up around the LOCKSS technology, supporting groups of libraries in collaboratively maintaining complementary digital collections. Although the use of LOCKSS technology is predicated on the existence of a multiplicity of partner institutions, these libraries' relationships with each other are principally technical, as their digital collections interact to regularly audit and propagate materials. The LOCKSS Alliance is governed by a board of librarians, with input into technical directions provided by members of the Alliance. (The LOCKSS-USDOCS initiative is discussed separately in a section below.)

Other networks bring together libraries in the active development of shared community infrastructure. For example, HathiTrust⁸³ is a growing network of libraries that is working towards the development of shared infrastructure to support the goal "that the cultural record is preserved and accessible long into the future."⁸⁴ HathiTrust has taken on a broader life of its own as a collaborative effort among libraries, as a growing range of other research institutions have become members of HathiTrust, supporting its vision of developing shared infrastructure for the management and preservation of digitized collections. All of the current partners "have deposited content in HathiTrust and are paying for preservation and access services for that content. However, HathiTrust has introduced a new cost model that allows institutions to join that do not necessarily have content to deposit, but wish to contribute to the curation of existing volumes in return for specialized services and participation in governance."⁸⁵ To evolve in accordance with this growing membership, a Constitutional Convention will be held for HathiTrust in 2011, "to create new governance, partnership, and cost models for HathiTrust."⁸⁶

While HathiTrust focuses on the collaborative development of shared digital infrastructure to support the goals of its member institutions and the broader community, other collaborative projects focus on supporting members in more efficiently managing their print collections. The WEST project,⁸⁷ which began as a grant-funded project of the University of California, brings together "U of California libraries, Washington, Washington State, Oregon, Oregon State, Arizona, Arizona State, other members of Orbis-Cascade Alliance, GWLA, and others" with the goal of developing "shared retrospective journals repository among research libraries in the Western Region of the U.S."⁸⁸ With the support of the Center for Research Libraries, WEST seeks to formalize relationships and facilitate information-sharing between research libraries about their respective holdings, enabling libraries to confidently deaccession local holdings of materials sufficiently maintained elsewhere within the WEST group of libraries. Although WEST builds on existing relationships between partner libraries, a major goal of this network is to formalize bonds of trust between member libraries, enabling libraries to feel greater confidence in their ability to rely on remote collections.

⁸³ <http://www.hathitrust.org/>

⁸⁴ "Welcome to the Shared Digital Future | www.hathitrust.org," n.d., <http://www.hathitrust.org/about>.

⁸⁵ "Eligibility and Agreements | www.hathitrust.org," n.d., http://www.hathitrust.org/eligibility_agreements.

⁸⁶ "Features and Benefits | www.hathitrust.org," n.d., http://www.hathitrust.org/features_benefits.

⁸⁷ No central web page

⁸⁸ Lizanne Payne, "Models for Shared Print Archives: WEST and CRL" (presented at the 156th ARL Membership Meeting, Seattle, WA, April 28, 2010), <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/mm10sp-payne.pdf>.

National or international collaborations

Although most library consortia – even the larger examples discussed above – have a strong geographical component, some library consortia have grown to serve a much broader spectrum of libraries across the community. These large-scale consortia often play very specialized roles in the community.

The world's largest library network is OCLC,⁸⁹ which was founded in 1965 as the Ohio College Library Center, with the goal of being a “cooperative, computerized network in which most, if not all, Ohio libraries would participate.”⁹⁰ OCLC has since grown well beyond Ohio, and currently is made up of tens of thousands of members world-wide. OCLC's original programmatic goal – “merg[ing] the catalogs of Ohio libraries electronically through a computer network and database”⁹¹ – remains one of its most important community roles, serving as the basis for what has become Worldcat, “the world's foremost bibliographic database.”⁹² Through OCLC's system for sharing bibliographic records (supported by a system of credits and charges associated with various activities), libraries worldwide have been able to realize substantial efficiencies in their cataloging activities, reducing redundancy by drawing on work done elsewhere to more easily and rapidly catalog their own materials. In addition to this core activity, OCLC also offers a wide range of other products and services to the library community, as well as pursuing research and programs on behalf of the library community, a function enhanced by OCLC's 2006 merger with RLG, a former competitor. OCLC is governed by a board of trustees from the library community and beyond, and is advised by a Global Council and Regional Councils world-wide, which provide a major venue for member libraries to communicate their concerns and priorities to OCLC leadership.

Another large network of libraries is the Center for Research Libraries,⁹³ a consortium of hundreds of international libraries that focuses on “acquir[ing] and preserv[ing] newspapers, journals, documents, archives, and other traditional and digital resources from a global network of sources.”⁹⁴ In addition to its primary role gathering, preserving, and providing access to these materials, CRL offers a variety of other services and professional development activities largely focused around helping libraries navigate the print to electronic transition, including certification and audit of digital repositories and coordination among print archiving initiatives. CRL began in the 1940s as the Midwest Inter-Library Corporation, a shared depository and collection for ten Midwestern universities; since then, CRL has broadened its membership and taken on more affirmative collecting responsibilities, especially for serials, prioritizing the development of collections that were “costly, ... required critical language skills to catalog, ... or were difficult to obtain.”⁹⁵ CRL is governed by its member organizations, which elect its board of directors and shape CRL's broad collecting priorities, via a council of representatives.

⁸⁹ <http://www.oclc.org>

⁹⁰ “In the beginning [OCLC - Heritage],” n.d., <http://www.oclc.org/about/history/beginning.htm>.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² “Benefits [OCLC - Membership],” n.d., <http://www.oclc.org/uk/en/membership/benefits/default.htm>.

⁹³ <http://www.crl.edu/>

⁹⁴ “Center for Research Libraries - About CRL,” n.d., <http://www.crl.edu/about/>.

⁹⁵ “Center for Research Libraries - History of CRL,” n.d., <http://www.crl.edu/about/history/>.

LYRASIS,⁹⁶ a relatively new entrant to this category of library networks, was formed in 2009 by the merger of PALINET, SOLINET, and NELINET, former OCLC regional networks. LYRASIS currently emphasizes professional development activities and shared licensing of tools and content for its members, and is beginning to serve a role hosting grant-funded workshops and discussion groups to advance shared research agendas. LYRASIS is governed by a board elected by its membership, and is currently forming a set of advisory groups composed of members that focus on particular topics of interest, which will serve both a professional development role and to advise LYRASIS on strategic directions.

New models

Several other innovative models have been pursued across the library community to bring together libraries in collaborative efforts, typically aimed at realizing savings and enabling service innovations. For example, the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Library in San Jose, CA⁹⁷ represents a relatively unique collaboration between academic and public libraries, housing both the San Jose Public Library's main branch and the San Jose State University Library. To satisfy the growing space needs of both libraries, the city and the university "agreed that by pooling resources they could build one new facility that would provide both city and university library users with access to more materials and services than either constituency would enjoy in separate locations."⁹⁸ In addition to sharing space, the libraries have merged several services, under the "guiding principle... 'Merge everything that it makes sense to merge.'"⁹⁹ Although balancing the needs of these diverse communities has been challenging, this collaboration has enabled significant economies of scale and enhanced collections and services available.

Although research libraries in particular have a long history of prioritizing independence, experiments in deep collaboration exist even within this community. For example, Columbia and Cornell University Libraries have recently announced their intention to "pool resources to provide content, expertise, and services that are impossible to accomplish acting alone" through a partnership called 2CUL.¹⁰⁰ This collaboration seeks to "fill gaps in the scholarly record that exist because our separate institutional resources are insufficient to meet inflationary publisher costs and an expanding scholarly output," and early efforts are focused on "enabling infrastructure, such as a shared back-end cataloging/acquisitions system, a shared long-term digital archive, fast and reliable book and digital document delivery, a better sense of collection strengths and gaps, and a more refined understanding of user expectations."¹⁰¹ As this project evolves, it may serve as a valuable model for how even the largest research libraries can transition into a much more collaborative mode of working.¹⁰²

⁹⁶ <http://www.lyrasis.org>

⁹⁷ <http://www.sjlibrary.org/>

⁹⁸ Paul Kauppila, "Economies of scale in the library world: The Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Library in San Jose, California," *New Library World* 104, no. 7 (2003): 255.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ <http://2cul.org/>

¹⁰¹ "Home | 2CUL," n.d., <http://2cul.org/>.

¹⁰² Ithaka S+R is currently providing consulting services to the 2CUL collaboration.

Themes

As becomes clearly apparent in exploring the substantial differences between library networks, the ways that libraries collaborate are highly idiosyncratic and vary substantially even among networks that serve similar roles within their communities; there is no “one size fits all” model for library collaboration. For example, while there are many state-wide library consortia (sometimes open to all libraries within a state, other times emphasizing only academic libraries), they range widely in governance, function, and strength; while most university systems have some kind of centralized library office, the scale and scope of these vary substantially, with few systems supporting efforts like the California Digital Library. Although these differences are to some degree idiosyncratic, some common factors that support the development of strong networks can be identified.

Incentives

Broadly speaking, libraries participate in collaborative enterprises because they perceive benefits of some kind in doing so. The degree of incentives required to motivate participation are of course closely related to the costs of participation; libraries may be much more willing to participate in a network that offers only minimal benefits if doing so only incurs minimal costs, while collaborative enterprises that require the commitment of more resources may be required to demonstrate more concrete and substantial returns to the library.

In many cases, incentives come in the form of direct rewards. For example, many library networks support local cost savings for participating libraries by collectively negotiating discount rates for licensed resources, allow participants to take advantage of shared infrastructure that would be beyond their reach individually, or support the collaborative achievement of projects that benefit from broader participation. In such cases, the incentives for participation are clear, enabling a relatively straightforward evaluation by a library of the benefit it will receive from participating in a network. And for a library network, finding opportunities to provide more concrete benefits to participants may be an important way to demonstrate the value of participation.

Not all incentives for participation, however, are nearly so concrete. Libraries may seek to participate in a given network because of a perceived reputational or otherwise abstract benefit. For example, membership in the Association of Research Libraries affords a signal of status that many libraries aspire to hold. This principle of exclusivity is an important feature in several other library networks, as demonstrated by the choice of some library networks to limit membership to only certain kinds of libraries, even if expanding membership might not affect the concrete benefits to participating libraries.

In other cases, libraries may choose to participate in networks in order to “be a good citizen,” supporting community endeavors out of a recognition that their participation will advance system-wide objectives even if they will realize little concrete benefit locally in the near term.

Of course, different libraries may respond to different incentives. In some cases, library consortia may attract less well-resourced libraries by offering concrete benefits that are of value to them locally but draw in better-resourced libraries by appealing to their sense of citizenship, as the benefits they can provide are only of limited value to such a library. In other cases, networks may tailor their activities

around those roles that are of greatest value to their participants. This principle of tailored services underlies the existence of many library networks that focus on certain classes of libraries such as academic or research libraries; by focusing on a limited universe of libraries, the network can focus on activities that will be of greatest value to their unique constituency.

The incentives that drive library participation, however, can change over time, posing a challenge for library networks to appropriately evolve their services to match the changing needs and priorities of their constituents or risk losing relevance and value. Such programmatic change may be easier for smaller groups of libraries with a deep history of collaboration, as their network's activities can be more immediately responsive to the changing needs of constituents. Larger networks may have a harder time changing their strategic direction, especially if the changes in the needs of their constituents are not equally distributed; many network members may continue to value the network's historical benefits, leaving it difficult to redefine roles and services to meet the expected future needs of the community, even while leading-edge libraries may grow increasingly uninterested in network activities.

Trust

An essential factor in the formation of any collaborative network of libraries is trust; to work together, libraries must be willing to rely on an outside party – either another library in particular or a network of libraries in the aggregate – to effectively perform a role. Although practically speaking, relationships between libraries sometimes are concretely realized through contracts or memoranda of understanding, often they are not. Whether founded in contractual arrangements or less formal mechanisms, relationships are built ultimately on mutual trust.

The level of trust required to facilitate different kinds of collaborations may vary substantially. A short-term collaborative effort or basic shared licensing activity may require only low levels of mutual trust between libraries, reflecting the relatively low stakes and clarity of shared interests and roles. In these cases, equity in terms of contributions and benefits may be of great importance.

On the other hand, networks that emphasize shared collections or deeper programmatic collaboration may require a deeper level of trust that partners can be relied upon, as these may commit libraries to long-term relationships in which critical roles rely on outside partners. This poses a challenge in an increasingly networked environment, as in many cases, libraries may recognize significant concrete incentives to deep collaboration, but have a difficult time feeling sufficient trust to rely on critical roles or collections provided by a third party, preferring to remain self-reliant even if collaboration might realize significant benefits.

Generally speaking, trust is built up between institutions over time and through repeated engagements that demonstrate mutual reliability and ability to work together successfully. Especially in supra-library collaborations, such as institution-driven networks and government-driven networks, trust may to a certain degree become implicit. In such cases, institutions begin to be able to barter work in one area in exchange for benefits in another. Some of the strongest bonds of trust between libraries are those that exist within a broader context of collaboration. Over time, libraries may build up a sense of partnership, which may make it easier to launch new collaborative initiatives; in addition to reducing start-up costs,

as mechanisms for cooperation may already be in place, libraries may be more willing to join into a cooperative endeavor even if their local immediate benefit is unclear within the context of a deep trust relationship, as supporting the partnership becomes an important priority. But building up trust in the short term can be a challenging exercise; in addition to the logistical challenges necessary to work together effectively, libraries may have a difficult time feeling comfortable relying on an outside party for critical tasks even if the potential benefits are great.

Theory of action

Most projects pursue one or both of two major strategies or theories of action: coordinating work performed by participants, or supporting the central performance of work. These different approaches offer strengths and weaknesses that may be appropriate for different goals or contexts, and may be applied complementarily.

Many collaborative projects draw on the support of their member libraries to perform work centrally. For example, many of the California Digital Library's projects utilize this strategy, applying centralized technical expertise and staff resources to centrally develop solutions to problems shared across the University of California system. On one hand, this model supports the accomplishment of tasks that would be difficult to disaggregate or distribute or especially benefit from long-term dedicated resources or staff. Furthermore, this model may be far more efficient in accomplishing tasks that have high fixed costs by requiring the acquisition or maintenance of expensive hardware. And even CDL "outsources" some of its "centralized" functions into its member libraries.

Many other programmatic collaborations take a very different approach, and accomplish their goals principally by coordinating the work performed by the members of the collaboration. One of OCLC's core roles has been to support and facilitate community-wide cataloging efforts; although OCLC provides centralized infrastructure to support this activity, actual cataloging is performed by members of the community. The LOCKSS Alliance also takes this approach, providing centralized software development and guidance to enable its members to collaboratively archive digital materials. This approach works well for tasks that can easily be broken down into chunks of varying scale, especially those that are performed according to standards and best practices to minimize variation and enable reuse of one library's work in another context. This model can be especially effective if a project can harness and coordinate work libraries are already doing, enabling the elimination of redundant effort across libraries and reducing necessary effort rather than requiring libraries to find ways to accomplish additional tasks. Conversely, however, this model can also be valuably applied in situations in which duplication of effort is important in order to achieve breadth, such as for programs that believe they can best have an impact over a broad geographic area through distributed local efforts rather than through a centralized, less localized program.

Of course, many projects apply elements of both approaches; for example, although OCLC's cataloging program principally functions through the actions of member libraries, significant central work is performed to facilitate these interactions. These are not mutually exclusive approaches, but many projects can be broadly characterized by their principal reliance on one model or another.

Feasibility for FDLP

Few other networks offer a close enough parallel to the FDLP to imagine the direct application of an existing network model to the FDLP. Most library networks are driven principally by the needs of libraries, and seek to leverage collaborative effort to enable libraries to more efficiently or effectively perform a set of shared goals; the FDLP, on the other hand, aims to work *through* a network of libraries to accomplish an external goal of supporting broad access to government information. In many ways, this goal aligns with the interests and values of libraries, but this difference makes it difficult to directly apply another model of arranging libraries to the context of the FDLP, and even similar programs – such as other depository programs – may have only limited value.

Specific networks as models for the FDLP

Although most existing network models could not simply be applied directly to the FDLP, some of the models that are most closely related to the FDLP may offer valuable lessons, highlighting features that could be productively applied within the context of the FDLP.

For example, the Patent & Trademark Depository Library Program offers a comparable model of public dissemination of government materials through a network of libraries. But the “bargain” entailed by participation is very different than in the case of the FDLP. The patent & trademark collection is substantially more focused, and indeed smaller, than the FDLP collections, and is a fairly high value collection for certain clearly-defined audiences, providing a valuable resource “for small businesses, research and development firms, university and governmental laboratories, and independent inventors and entrepreneurs.”¹⁰³ In addition to having a high value and a defined audience, participation in the Program has a relatively low cost to member libraries. Members of the Program have a great deal of flexibility about their collections; they are mandated to acquire an electronic collection of relatively recent patents from the USPTO, but may collect more broadly or in alternate formats at their own discretion, and have significant flexibility in disposing of unwanted collections in direct partnership with the USPTO. The Patent & Trademark program thus demonstrates a balance that has been disrupted in the FDLP, offering benefits that outweigh any perceived burden for many participants. Although the specifics of this program are very different, due to its significantly narrower mandate, this principle of balance may be valuably applied in the FDLP context.

The National Network of Libraries of Medicine also offers valuable thematic lessons for the FDLP, although its goals and particulars are also sufficiently different from the FDLP as to make direct comparisons challenging. Unlike the FDLP, which is structured around collections, the NN/LM emphasizes coordination among libraries. Most members have minimal formal responsibilities, with coordinating responsibilities vested with only eight libraries nationwide, which serve to organize activities within their region. Regional libraries serve on a contract basis, and both the regional library and the NLM must agree to renew these contracts every five years. These regional libraries, as well as many of the projects pursued alone or collaboratively among member libraries, are funded directly by grants from the NLM. Although some themes from the NN/LM may be relevant to the FDLP – notably, the reliance on time-limited, renewable responsibilities and emphasis on coordinating library services

¹⁰³ “History and Background.”

and training – several fundamental differences make it difficult to directly apply the model of the NN/LM to the FDLP. The FDLP brings together a significantly broader diversity of libraries than the NN/LM, around a much wider array of materials, including many that are not available online. Furthermore, the NN/LM centers around a national library which maintains collections and supports online access to materials; it is outside the scope of this project to consider whether the FDLP should be centered in a national library or whether GPO should attempt to play such a role itself.

Although other formal depository programs may more closely mirror the FDLP than these other networks, there remain significant differences between these programs and the FDLP, and there are few indications that any of these programs have developed especially robust models for a depository program in an increasingly digital environment. Other depository programs generally include a smaller and sometimes less diverse group of libraries, and in many cases deal with a far narrower set of tangible materials, limiting their direct applicability to the FDLP. More importantly, however, many of these programs face the same challenges as the FDLP in adapting to a rapidly changing environment. The FDLP remains a leader among depository programs in confronting the challenges facing this kind of network in the digital age; the models in place at other depository programs generally share many characteristics with the existing FDLP, and offer few obvious solutions to the challenges facing the Program.

Networks in the FDLP

In addition to considering how these specific examples of library networks could offer insight into potential structures for the FDLP, broader themes emerge in considering how existing library networks could potentially play a larger role in the Program.

GPO has supported and facilitated a number of library networks in working together to address Program priorities, including supporting networks of libraries in coordinating their activities and collections management, as in the example of the ASERL Centers of Excellence project. But with a few limited exceptions – such as, for example, the distributed Regional collection in Oregon – these efforts generally exist outside of the Program, as informal supplements to the Program’s underlying structure that, in some cases, require not only custom planning but also approval. Not only does the current Program largely not anticipate groups of libraries taking on formal roles, many types of collaboration have been explicitly barred. For example, the proposed Kansas/Nebraska collaboration was blocked by the Joint Committee on Printing, as it was deemed inconsistent with the Program’s legislative structure. Most of the collaborations that do currently exist are independent of the formal structures of the FDLP and lack any official status within the Program, and several classes of collaboration – especially those around collections – are made complicated if not impossible by the restrictions of the Program.

Despite this lack of support for collaborative efforts taking on official status within the Program, many existing library networks have demonstrated an interest in working together to play a role, and GPO has offered important support and flexibility to facilitate these networks in collaborating around Program goals. For example, ASERL has begun to self-organize around government documents, assigning

responsibilities for the development of “Centers of Excellence” within its community.¹⁰⁴ These collaborative roles and responsibilities, however, remain solely governed by the relationships among ASERL members, and as a collaboration lack formal status within the Program (beyond any formal partnerships individually between an ASERL member library and GPO). The LOCKSS-USDOCS project is another example of a community-organized collaborative effort that replicates digital FDLP content across a network of libraries. But again, while GPO has cooperated with this project by putting permissions statements in FDSys and formally joined the LOCKSS Alliance as a member, the USDOCS project nevertheless lacks formal status within the FDLP. With regard to the ASERL and the LOCKSS-USDOCS initiatives, a lack of formalized responsibilities within the FDLP structure yields a lack of clarity for the community on the extent to which others can (or should) formally rely on these contributions. These and other examples suggest appetite across the community for working together, through existing networks or new collaborations, to address Program priorities, but currently the Program insufficiently leverages the strengths of libraries working together.

Different kinds of networks may have different strengths to contribute to the Program in taking on more formal roles. Existing strong trust networks of libraries, for example, may be best suited to roles that require durable collaboration, such as supporting preservation collections. These roles can build upon firmly established trust relationships between libraries that support sharing of critical collections and infrastructure, and may complement existing activities to build and maintain shared collections for other material types. Other kinds of networks, such as ad hoc networks purpose-built around a particular problem, may offer greater flexibility, enabling experimentation with digital collections and services, potentially forming the basis for the development of new formalized networks of libraries around common interests. Broad-based library consortia, on the other hand, may be well suited to coordinate training across a region, extending the professional development roles that many consortia already support. Were library networks enabled to take on formal roles within the Program, existing and potential networks would be empowered to take on a spectrum of roles and responsibilities that could be more efficiently or effectively accomplished through collaboration.

¹⁰⁴ “ASERL’s Collaborative Federal Depository Program,” n.d., <http://www.aserl.org/projects/gov-doc/gov-doc-intro.htm>.