

[Please stand by for realtime captions.]

>> [Please stand by for realtime captions.]

>> Welcome back everybody thought it was at the first Title 44 session and welcome to those who may be just coming for this second session. I recognize many faces and I think a few new people sneaked in that I am James Shaw the government documents library and and collection coordinator. Chris at the risk of Nebraska Omaha and I am serving as chair of this session. My goal as chair is to facilitate discussion and give everybody a chance to speak their piece. I will be watching my watch and I will exercise chairs prerogatives to make sure that we are able to work our way through the entire agenda within the hour so I appreciate everybody's participation and understanding if I have to say sorry guys, we need to move on. If there are comments that are left unsaid or you think of something you forgot to say or would like to add, the depository library counsel of contact form is still open at FT LP.gov or as I already said today, you can even scribble remarks and comments on the recommendations and handed to one of the councilmembers and maybe we would be glad to receive it however you wish to convey her thoughts and concerns.

>> And then again for anyone who is speaking either up here, on counsel or out on the floor, please start your remarks in your name and institution of gainful employment so we know. We know you are and where you are from. We will pick up the discussion with section 1911 and what we have on the slides is the counsel recommendation as we have in the packet and the justification I will read through them and I may make a couple of clarifying comments along the way or maybe councilmembers will offer something and then we will open up a central microphone.

>> Amend title 44 U.S. code section 1911 to permit selective depositories that are not served by regional depositories to dispose of government publications after retaining them for five years. Such withdrawal shall be conducted with guidance provided by the superintendent of documents which may include oversight by another regional depository. The rationale, when a regional depository exits the depository program, the selective depository associated with it are currently left unable to withdraw government publications. This places an undue burden on such selective depositories which must manage collection in a manner never intended. I'm sure most if not all people in the room recognize that five-year rule in the recommendations, that had been there since forever with a few exceptions, selective depository receive an item and they keep it for at least five years before they may choose to withdraw with the counsel of their regional but we have had situations in regional have exited and as the plain language words on paper law stand now, it's sort of stuck in the regional goes. There is no way out of that as of that which is written now. This came up many times again, it's probably third or fourth most common of all the comments we received of people asking us to address this concern and that's all we tried to do here. Any comments from counsel?

>> Must be post-break stupor. Comments from the floor?

>> I'm from the University of Hawaii. I would prefer to see something that allows regional in another state to develop a relationship with a selective whose [Indiscernible] they are proving if an organization like GPO or regional that doesn't really know a selective depository another state were to advise them on the the selection process I think it would be difficult to really understand what you're approving or disapproving if you don't have a fairly good knowledge of that library's history and what the Constitution of the collection is.

>> Thank you.

>> University of Kentucky library. My comment is similar to Gwen Stott. Certainly support to be able to discard when there is no regional but I think some thing has to be put in place to make sure we don't lose the last copy of anything. There has to be some way to ensure that those gift cards are brought to the attention of the regional depository committee in some way and there's many ways this could happen and maybe it doesn't need to be in the law but there needs to be a notch to not losing the last copy of anything in the process of allowing selective's to discard once there is no regional. I will add the

elephant in the room is that this may seem a rush to the door for some regionals because right now but keeping some regionals in the system is their devotion to their selective's and they don't want to leave them. If a regional can become a selective and became -- begin discarding you're going to see more and more states without regional. I don't know anyway. That's not if you are going in this direction and not analyze electives for the loss regional but I think counsel needs to think about that and see if there's something else in the language. I would hate to see the regionals system completely unravel.

>> Thank you.

>> University of North Texas. I think in our discussions we did take your comments into account which is why the notion that oversight has to be provided by the [Indiscernible] there. It was our thought that in working with GPO the selective would ensure that there would be counsel accordingly and GPO can help to provide the safeguards that last copy would not be discarded Stott --

>> I'm curious what you mean by in a manner never intended? Every depository library has to keep everything that they selected and when I started the depository library it had everything that they had ever selected, thank God, they did not get rid of a lot of the stuff that my faculty student needed and we didn't get bashed we do not have a regional when I left. We did not had a regional in the state of Missouri but at the time they did not have a statewide plans I'm wondering the manner intended as I would keep everything unless I have originals I don't know what is that supposed to mean. In a never -- in a matter never intended.

>> Depository did not decide to become depositories after the lowest changed to allow those libraries to we think from the collection I think that's what we mean by in large.

>> I think we need to clarify that the were not exactly what you're talking about.

>> Other comments from counsel?

>> I'm curious is there anyone from Wyoming or Nevada here? What I like? What's that like?

>> Wyoming state library we have a workaround, that GPO knows about and have seen in practice where we are also electives, we have had selective who have given up their repository status because of space issues and because of that meditation does not see the value of having it. For those of us who want to create a space on our shelves we withdraw the item from whichever location and they ship it to the state library and we have been in boxes labeled both in the catalog because he had a Wyoming state consortia catalog so the public can still view those documents and then the state library can go downstairs and pull the items and ship them out so it works. But as more library lead -- need more space in the ascending more stuff to us it's becoming more of a burden. Did not answer the question?

>> Yes. I'm curious how you feel about this particular recommendation?

>> We actually commented on this recommendation that I think it needs to be addressed. My fear and I think that's what we put as a recommendation -- comment is that if libraries were looking at space issues and some of the college and academic libraries are not able to withdraw items as needed, they are going to start getting up there status which I think is counterproductive. Being able to remove some of those unused items or several of us have the same items just across the state, and not being able to ever take them off your shelves because of this, that's a problem. Do you want libraries to get up there status completely or do you want to figure out a workaround crack

>> Thanks a lot for that not

>> I would like another clarification that anybody's talking but the paper copies they distributed and the majority of digital so where is the pressure coming from on the paper? You are just talking but much older publications, you're not talking about recent things that are coming in because I hear complaints that are not getting enough of paper certain libraries that every library is different according to what they want of course I'm just wondering there's going to be fewer if your papers in the future so we are only talking about the older collections, is that what we're talking about?

>> Anyone from counsel have a response?

>> If you have a burden collecting paper at all you're just going to be selective right which is probably not good for anybody to be storing stuff rather than the needs of your constituents.

>> I'm Eric, University of Colorado law school.

>> I would actually disagree with that because I think a lot of it is historical so it's not a matter of deselecting, in our collection we find is either low use. There's probably -- you can probably count on one hand and her fingers left would libraries who are not taking space issues because the administration want a smaller footprint for the library and we are going to look at the usage of some of these older materials and so I would expect that where a lot of it is coming from and it is for a lot of libraries -- for a lot of libraries it is a crushing burden.

>> University of North Texas. I would also that it's not the smaller footprint of the library, it's the smaller footprint of physical collection is happening in the library.

>> I have a regional now but for several years I did not have a regional. I'm in Michigan and I can tell you that moving the ability to read was hugely problematic for my institution and I know a number of libraries who did end up leaving the program because they could not we got in our case we tripled the library space during that period and we needed space for people, not stuff and some of the things I got rid of I will be frank, were things like slaughterhouse design manuals from the 80s that should have been discarded 20 years before I started in my job and had not been. I am not as an agricultural school, there was no reason for that to be there. So it was a huge burden on us and I'm so excited by this because I really do believe that having the support from the superintendent documents will [Indiscernible] some of those concerns and we are making it clear they can't just go and toss your whole collection. But maybe it will keep some of those libraries that in our case ended up leaving because of that burden in the program so I'm very excited about that.

>> Thank you.

>> In looking at this the counsel consider the trend of what we are seeing across particularly in academic but other libraries, regional cooperation, at the regional level but also the trend where there might have been a couple of states already and a couple of states considering single collections within their state, just single selection -- single collections and states are part of the state pulling the collections in one single location and doing that delivery on demand? A lot of this has gone from the just in case model to the just in time model when it comes to delivering information.

>> Thank you.

>> University of Georgia. Since I have been repository coordinator last majority of our repository who have done major weeding project has been because of trying to create new spaces, information commons what have you and in every case the reason they targeted the government document collection was because it was older materials that were not -- were catalogued and were never used. I'm not going to say we these collections because I don't want you to have whatever. We don't make it easy for are selective in our state and we have a regional to eat the collection. I think this is a very necessary thing. It's not giving anyone permission to just dump the collection this is a practical solution to -- we have been dropping out of the program since regionals have been regional and they're going to continue to do it.

>> University of California Santa Barbara. I had a comment about this discussion. The challenges we always face with managing government documents collection is it's not used and the usage doesn't match the way that traditional monograph six serial selections are used and a lot of the reasons we know is that in many cases these are much more a can to what we think of primary sources and that they are non-substitutable for what it is that they are so it's not that they are really accessed or used as part of academic research in the same way so what I wonder about, and this is not a question but I wonder how these kind of conversations take place among the archival community when they're talking about managing large collections of resources that are in the same way non-substitutable but that have been managed and described and distributed in very different ways from hours?

>> Central Washington University. My institution recently did a collection analysis of Army collection and I did one of our depository collections and one of the things that came out of this collection analysis was that the main collection we found over 70% was older, mostly 20th-century, only 20% was one of from the 21st century and our collection is almost identical. As for a dependable collection. What is interesting about that is that we are primarily a stent institution which means that most materials we have in our tangible resources is not useful. We needed more 21st century and I think a lot of depositories and most of you know, I worked all across the country are facing the space shortages is because we have older collections. You all know I love old government publications. I sit there and read them to my husband and children and our challenge is what we do these older publications? I can't remember who just said about cataloging. That's one of the key access points. My challenge when I took this job was that 90% of the collection was not catalogued. It was at one point but those records were lost. I'm finding the increase goes up and as cataloging this they want to keep a depository, they wanted keep it as a individual unit. I just need to keep cataloging as fast as I possibly can and I think it is a challenge with DLC and the depository community we need to catalog. And there is great cataloging records, we just need to get out there into the online catalogs because then we can access it we can teach it to our users. We are the experts.

>> Thank you.

>> I'm looking at my watch. I'm sorry, I missed that. And looking at my watch and we're going to move on to the next section. Everyone remember, I'm from Nebraska. I just believe it's important to be upfront with everybody. In title 44 U.S. code section 1912 permits regional depositories to share their collections and services across state lines so long as [Indiscernible] and all the involved states agree. Those designated depositories, that's lights they are not rationale regional depositories show great responsibility in accumulated enormous collections since the advent with the depository library act of 1962. The burdens of finding and managing appropriate space for their collections are grown so onerous that some regional depositories may decide to leave the FDLP. Shared regional collection and services have already proven successful within several states and this amendment would amend Ash -- extend this across state lines and there is a real live living example within the last decade the states of Kansas and Nebraska got very very far along to having a shared regional arrangement but near the end of the process, legal counsel decided wait a minute, the way the statute is actually written right now, I don't think we can approve that so that's part of the Genesis of this. Again, the idea of additional flexibility in the program it would encourage institutions to stay with it and that's where we are at. Counsel have anything to add or comments to make?

>> No, I did not like that just because I'm from Nebraska. This actually came up.

>> University of Washington library. I think part of the rationale here to is just looking at the way that consortia in a general outside of the depository library program the way that library consortia, I think we understand at -- as consortia that has been such progress made an inventory and collections and understanding how many extra copies of things we have and I think some of the most vibrant consortia have been multistate consortia. So just understanding a little commentary.

>> University of Georgia. As I mentioned earlier we have been losing regionals since regionals were created and we will continue to lose then and this offset that, absolutely go for it. For that matter in Georgia several of my selective are closer to University of Florida so realistically geography is not necessarily as important as people seem to think it is. I mean if we can serve as a regional for adjoining state that will be perfectly fine for us. Many situations where we have shared collections, there is no reason it cannot go over state lines.

>> University of Kentucky library. And adding this to title 44, chapter 19, my concern about the unraveling of the regional story system. This was something that could happen and we might be able to retain maybe a core across the country. Active and viable regionals that are in consortium arrangements.

>> Stephanie Rogers University of Virginia that. Why senatorial agreement rather than MRU? and does the senatorial agreement end with the term of the sitting senator or does it continue indefinitely after the senator is [Indiscernible] even if they are no longer serving?

>> University of Maryland. Presently senatorial -- senators are involved whether or not a regional -- at the justification because if you're going to have a regional set up and it's somebody else's territory they need to be consulted and make sure they're involved in the process. Thought there was a second party or question.

>> Why wouldn't he be set up as more of a MOU situation?

>> The senator would have to approve and you asked the current city senator about the agreement they are, it would continue.

>> I think this was an issue also that came up with the Nebraska Kansas so this was considered a way to address prior concerns with this type of agreement.

>> American Library Association. I'm going to ask a question to counsel which is I think both of these recommendations come out of the fact that regionals drop the program and as Holly mentioned the expectation seems to be there will be more in the future that will drop regional status so the discussion has come up a bit in the context of the legislation, should the law say more differently than it does now about what is the process for a regional to lead -- to leave the program and I'm wondering if that was conversation acting up and counsel and if anybody have thought about other things that the statute should say about how a regional would exit the program?

>> I don't have a satisfying answer for your question but I can say that I think on the whole we spent the bulk of our time in meeting and concerned about possible changes on this subject and we had a diversity of opinions amongst this group. Ultimately this is what we came up with as a way to maintaining the integrity of the regional system without turning a blind eye to the realities of what it looks like and in the future. I will say is one of the focuses that about making any kind of change that we didn't want to make it any easier for regions to drop. I, as a director of a library myself have teams where incredibly shortsighted thinking takes place when demonstrations turnover and I didn't want to make it any easier. This seems like a good middle ground that addresses the majority of our concerns.

>> Jim Shaw University of Nebraska at Omaha. I will add that depository programs are voluntary programs when they are regional or selective, you volunteer to be there. Is in an era where we are very very concerned about institutions leaving the program, if you put something into the law that basically puts hoops into the law that you have to jump through to leave, why would you -- you may be less willing to get involved in the first place. There is a balancing act we're trying to achieve that we alluded to and I think that's important to know that

>> University of Montana that this section of the code also specifically states that you can't have more than two regionals per state. Is that being considered where you might have more than two regionals and more of a center of excellence model?

>> I'm going to try to answer that and the answer is I don't think we have actually considered that specific points. I think personally speaking for myself the shared regional is the regional. And so they would allow was less able to handle this so that might address some of what you were thinking about.

>> University of Kansas. The think I would like to address that not all regionals were voluntarily regionals. I think that having language within this that refers to somebody from the outside making decisions and not just demonstration within the library or the University or that institution that's holding the library, they should not be able to make that full decision and that's the senator and I opinion is very appropriate to keep in that conversation.

>> In terms of the comment about -- Puerto Rico. In terms of Suzanne's comments about the [Indiscernible] that did come out in our counsel discussion. We talked about there have a model in place and for those of us who are participated and in their discard system I think is a valuable thing to look at that the concept that within a shared regional one library can be responsible for a particular agency or a

particular set of documents. In my case I voluntarily started looking for historical documents about Puerto Rico and the Caribbean and collecting them with that idea in mind that yes, the center of excellence idea or even if we did not formally write about it, we to discuss and talk about as part of our rationale in terms of shared regional libraries.

>> This will be our last comment on this section because we have to move onto the next but go ahead.

>> Back in the 80s when we were talking but revising the regional system, part of the argument was that if you are a library, you might be able to go out and help the libraries manage their collections because that's the job that they do, they help people to do that but you could not maintain a collection. So if you shared regionals, perhaps the University was able to maintain a collection, they did not want to go out and work with selective libraries and training in that kind of stuff so have you considered that kind of the partnership? And what Susanna said he could have three libraries that were regionals, they can share different responsibilities that they have is a regional because they have to do quite a few things. One library might agree to do the disposal process, when one might agree to coordinate the collection.

>> Thank you very much.

>> We had one virtual comment from Scott Casper. With regards to 1911 I still don't understand the value of reducing the restrictions on discarding.

>> We are all getting less and less physical material and in our shipments all the time so is it really going to make that big a difference to have less of something that six or seven years old on your shelf in the future?

>> Thank you for participating off-site.

>> Yes, it will make a difference. Back in 2006 or 2007 I attended the conference here in Washington. I got back and the first thing I had in my mailbox was unique to the director right away. I went up to have a his office sat down in the first thing you said how fast can you dismantled the depository and I said what? At that time there were changes not just in the library division but countywide which mandated refurbishing spaces, mandated changes in budgets, staffing, etc. And my question was do I have to get rid of the depository or to have to get rid of the collection? Is it a matter of space, what is the deal? I worked in my regional and talked about various options for going to electronic etc. etc. and suffice to say we agreed that we would keep the depository program because of many of the restrictions relating to weeding the entire saying. Reducing the footprint significantly but without the ability to weed and we significant portions and initially -- short amount of time, we would not be in the program today. The changes to 1911 in 1912 that we are proposing it doesn't sound like it but are actually preservation methods because right now as it's enshrined in law it is either or. You are in the program or you are out of the program. There is no safety on this boiler and it is boiling over, it's that simple. There has to be a way to relieve pressure from universities and public libraries that are undergoing significant changes out there that have to reallocate their space. And this is just the best we can figure out of doing it.

>> We need to move on and I appreciate everyone's patience and comments.

>> This is Jim Shaw, University of Nebraska. Amend title 44 U.S. code section 1911 and 1912 to make authenticated digital copies of government allocations of format which a regional depository library may hold as the posited items as long as they are made available to the public. So rationale, this amendment would permit regional depository libraries to hold authenticated electronic copies and physical copies and reducing their burdens in finding and managing spaces for publications. This amendment also encourages wider distribution of authenticated electronic copies with hopes to ensure their survival over time. Should a technical failure or unfortunately a government shutdown render GPO's authenticated Ella 20 copies unavailable, copies health by regional depositories would remain available. That is quite a mouthful and I would like to start with a comment of my own on this one. When I look at this I think of the overall context of the situation would regionals what all is going on right now with the depository program. And thinking of preservation stewards, and thinking of regional discard process, I'm thinking making electronic documents widely available in a manner that's structurally, architecturally

within the system helps ensure their survival over time and getting lots of copies keeps us safe. There's a lot going on in this and I think it's important to think of the overall context of everything we are trying to bring to bear here to provide more flexibility to libraries to participate while advancing the cause of making information available as widely as possible. That's my comment. I invite others.

>> You're kidding me. This is the one would inspired the most. Come on Bill, my friend Bill.

>> University of South Carolina. The word I have the biggest problem with is hold. In this instance hold sounds like you're performing a function that includes mechanical and physical requirements relating to that information. Which means in some ways some of us may look at this as your substituting one demo for another. We talk about space requirements, somebody's been working with digital projects on top of dealing with tangible product and collections for many years, I don't see where -- I see down the road but there is as much a space problem that is going to be held and is going to happen in electronic environment and there is in the tangible environment. Not every institution that is a regional is also set up to be a fantastic data management storage facility. So the burden is going to have to be distributed and is going to have to be distributed among many partners thought I'm not trying to say absolutely no but the word hold in this context seems very strong, you know, it will be nice to be able to access in the access authenticated electronic copies and I know there is some libraries they are not regionals, there are some regionals that are set up to be excellent beta managers, data storage sites and I support them but it would be interesting for me to hear among current regionals how many could do this all the time. And how long they think it could last.

>> Peggy Jared, University of Washington law library. How does this relate to the regionals [Indiscernible] in the we talked about that, we discussed he does say a lot about a number of physical copies and many of us myself included think that 4 is a much smaller number that actually needed. When I read that that regionals can discard the print if they decide to keep an authenticated digital version that there is no mention of how many copies would be available.

>> University of Georgia. The FLP is a program for access so this really strikes me as an issue of content versus carrier. Your providing people access to the information in the 21st century that the carrier itself really matter? I know in some cases print is preferable to electronic and vice versa but what you're saying here is that so long as the regional agrees to have access to everything that made available regardless of the format, they should be able to choose like everyone else if they want it to be in print or electronic. And I agree with Bill, the idea of holding it a little problematic because again some of us are well situated to become true digital depository library's and some are not. But again, the FDLP is not there for preservation. With potential cash with the tangible materials you have these copies distributed throughout the country and while retention is not equal preservation you have a stupid program where these materials lock. The issue is that we don't have a true digital repository where we are just riveting for free as opposed to the locks U.S.. Does that mean that regionals have to be responsible for that? I would agree no because not all of us are set up to the regional depository but if you take that section out, to me as one who will probably keep our print material, this sounds perfectly reasonable.

>> University of South Carolina. Another point, technical failures yes, those happen. Government shutdowns, we had one of those, a couple of them and I believe that our resources were considered or deemed essential and they were still made available and so I would think that if we reminded Congress that this is their government information and whether they shut the government down or not, we all still function and that the essential aspects would continue.

>> University of Georgia. One of the point on digital deposit is the purpose of this to run basically a mirror site where as the government site goes down you can point to let's say you GAN regarded all? Or is it a matter of we are in the process of establishing a very robust preservation system for our very extensive digital holding so we may be a good place to be a depositor but in our case is to be a matter of we have these as the backup copies that we could give to someone else but we certainly would not be

able to make online on-demand. I think it's asking a lot for any library to set up a mirror site that you can access these resources. If something happens to GPL. That simply is never going to happen.

>> I'm not sure how to respond to a couple of the really thoughtful points except to say I completely disagree. I think if there are regionals that are not set up to or thinking about the future of their institution as being largely digital collection with digital management and long-term preservation and responsibilities, as a regional I'm not sure how to respond to that except to say you have to. You're not going to be able to keep doing what you're doing for the next 25 years. That's just my crystal ball which Christina you can take or leave. And the idea of setting up mirror sites seems to be a very workable solution potentially if there is national corporation -- cooperation to our shared concerns about preservation, long-term preservation of information.

>> University of South Carolina. A response to the beginning of my response is that when I first went to library school I learned that you paid for access to online resources. We dialed the phone and we put it in the coupler, right gin? When you're talking about tangible product and you talking about electronic access, you're talking two completely different worlds because electronic world there is cost and cost has always been a part of it and cost is always going to be figured into it whether you store it or whatever and libraries and their institutions are going to cost this out if it gets required. The other unfortunate thing to this is when you pull a book off of a shelf, if not a possible doorway to some other electronic resources. And it's a very vague topic in this town but in a big topic across the rest of the country which is dealing with Cybersecurity. So it is a different worlds. I can pull a paper edition of the CFR off but if I am to come -- become the digital repository for the CFR, how much and I opening my institution to being hacked and to secure that, what does it cost? I do see the world -- the two worlds at different.

>> There is costs that are tangible to.

>> I guess it is two very distinct types of collections with very distinct needs and issues and again we had a very very robust digital library program at UG a. In fact we are looking upwards of a petabyte of media so we are working towards very robust preservation systems and working towards preference for digital library of Georgia and that gives us opportunities to piggyback things onto that, not just domestic collection, but from our federal collection as well. But again, the point is that there is only 70 things he can do with the way we are set up and to be able to -- I can speak to this because of the baby do with estate documents, that's a huge burden interested collection and the order of the size or smaller and perhaps saying that is not going to happen maybe too pessimistic but it's very challenging I think to ask more than a couple of regional to be able to do that really may not be reasonable. Again, maybe there is libraries that can do this and maybe something down the road could happen but it's significantly more difficult to do that than to maintain a tangible collection.

>> University of Maryland. The reason why we have this hold is because regionals are seeing the kind of institution that guarantees that's out there. So we put this in there is a digital deposit because that was a way of seeing it at the regional guaranteeing access to that information. That's lazy to hold there. I agree and recognize that this is a challenge for main institutions and I'm lucky enough to have a [Indiscernible] was very interested but my mind are goals and shrivel the way of what's like to build up something like this. But at the same token I don't think it's realistic or possible for us to say regionals Candace yard without regional office saying that were able to guarantee access to that information. It's kind of apples and oranges and yes there is trouble that come with each one but there is trouble that come with each one. It's just the trouble that regional libraries have these days because were trying to give libraries some options. Maybe you want to have all digital depositories maybe you want to do some of it where institutions can do but more to create opportunities for regionals to the side. Right now we don't have the ability to decide and I was looking at the financial cost estimating it and I was a soundbite the fact that it was 1020 years -- it was 10, 20 years.

>> Before we have the last two comments, I will have to cut it off then because we will have a break and then the last session.

>> Stanford University. Get a clarification since locks is being tossed around. There 10 regionals in the locks system right now so there are regionals are doing digital preservation of government information. We are currently talking with the Internet archive about putting a cash of that walks content into the Internet archive so it would be technologically fairly easy to if GPO goes down, if they shut down, you can switch DNS, that the addressing system of the Internet to point to the Internet archive cash of that content and it would be relatively easy to point to that. It's a system that's already in place with journals, everybody knows but DOI, so it's not rocket science. It's stuff that can happen and stuff that does happen already so I just want to make that comment.

>> Are those the authenticated versions of this document?

>> Yes. We are collecting all the documents and locks, 36 libraries content regions, it's possible.

>> You can applaud.

>> [Applause]

>> Kevin Baker at the American Library Association. I think it may be helpful to build on what was said that this recommendation really contains two different concepts and one of them is about discard by regionals and the other one is about digital deposits and it is possible to think of those as being separate things or as being tied together as it is here and in fact, in the recommendation we have treated them as separate concept and said they should be digital depository program which GPO can manage and we can define the terms of it rather than having the statute for the reason that Bill mentioned which is once you write it in the statute than 50 years from now do we go why did rewrite that. But to encourage the work that James and folks are doing and make sure that there is a statutory basis for it. Without offering a recommendation one way or another I just want to mention that it's possible to treat them as two separate things.

>> Just one last thing since you mentioned digital deposits. Tomorrow from 12:00 to 12:30 PM just a quick digital depository meeting and I think the Wilson room on the other side.

>> One more. The rationale for the amendment for authenticated a Tronic copy is permitted not required or am I reading this wrong?

>> It is permitted, it's a conditional, you get to choose.

>> Thank you everybody. We will reconvene in about 15 minutes for the third title 44 session. You should all be very excited because you're going to learn a little bit something about a proposal for GPO to have the capacity to make grants, money that can be used for good FDLP purposes.

>> [Event is on a 15 min break.

>> [Captioner standing by]

>> Welcome back everybody. Some of the are hanging in there, the finish line is still 300 yards out, you almost run 5K we are getting down to the third session on title 44 modernization today. Again I am James Shaw the government document library and at Chris Library University of Nebraska in Omaha. Hand on your right my left, Cindy from the library services at U.S. GPO, and we will be your ceremony masters for this last hour of the day. First of all depository library counsel wants to present a recommendation concerning adding, not amending but adding a new section to title 44 chapter 19 regarding grain and then our colleagues Cindy will take over and at some information about GPO's perspective on modernization of title 44 p.m. we are both going to try to bait you into attending tomorrow's session on grantmaking authority for GPO. If I found a little hazy, I am. Here we go folks. At a section to title 44 UNESCO chapter 19 to get GPO grantmaking authority and to enter into contract or cooperative arrangements with depository libraries to enhance access to government publications such activities may include but are not limited to the digitization of government publications, preservation of government publications, and cataloging of government publications. You notice how government publications ended up on the last three lines? Please remember those are broadly defined because a lot

of things to think about here. Here is the rationale not getting GPO grantmaking authority will provide leverage to accelerate efforts to improve access and preservation of government publications and foster greater operations between GPO and depository library that participate in GPO funded projects. I remember years ago when I was grabbing hold cart full of documents and roll them back to our office and I would be so thankful to the catalogers at University of Minnesota and Michigan and a few other institutions that they already created really good catalog records for me so I could give the boilerplate and not have to originate that myself. That would have gone a lot faster if I had gotten a little money. That's what I think.

>> Hello. I really appreciate you containing two talk until somebody comes up to the microphone. I'm at Columbia University and I was curious as to this would go through this grantmaking authority with that change the budget of the GPO in terms of the finances and services currently being offered or would this be a brand item and would not impact any of the budget?

>> In my minds eye it's brand-new, that will be the idea.

>> I'm not sure if this was delivered choice of language but I'm curious about counsel thinking about I think it was on the previous slide and mentioned grant to depository libraries and I thinking that's exclusively to individual libraries or for example would that rule out things like consortia or other libraries that may not actually technically the depositories so I just wanted to understand if that was a deliberate decision or if we want to perhaps think about expanding that so it could incorporate other kinds of entities that would make sense to continue the mission that weren't exclusively just a depository library.

>> I will take a shot at that. When I see the phrase cooperative arrangements with depository libraries I'm reading that expansively. I would presume that a depository library would be involved in some way because it's a depository program but I could can see a situation -- conceived a situation where other libraries might be involved in the project. There is ways to address this and to handle your question. In my mind is not thinking exclusively depositories but we will have to see what language is written and marked up and all of that.

>> I would urge they would be some scrutiny of that just because -- and I would particularly like to make sure that consortia of depository library who may be incorporated separately from the libraries that they serve could be eligible for this kind of scenario. I think that's really important because honestly, grants succeed when there's more than one library collaborating and consortia can often lead the best way to manage some of these bigger kinds of projects that's why I think it's important to make sure it's clear that those kind of entities would also be part of this option. Should it go forward.

>> I have a follow-up question for you. Are you thinking similar like the LSD money for the statewide range, for statement project or what kind of --

>> Not necessarily in that model but I was thinking for example in my part of this country, and the Pacific Northwest there is an academic library consortia the services the cascade alliance that incorporates and has depository library members that goes across different states. We had a shared catalog system so I would see something like a cataloging project it would make so much sense for entities that consortia pursue it rather than at -- had each library pursue it. The grants to states program is more or less in that block grant model which I don't think it is really conceived as. I'm just trying to think of a scenario where it could be -- there are participants in the depository that the entity that receives the grant may not technically be a depository library because an organizational confined.

>> You can't go away, Arlene. Just a question. This thought did not occur to me at all. I recommending that he might be preferable to incentivize a collaborative grant?

>> I think it could be and maybe all of these it may depend on the individual projects where it's an advantage to have that collaborative modeling site but I know my library is a grant -- or a grant offering institution and we always always always will favor a grant that has multiple libraries collaborating over one that's just doing one thing just for their library. In a consortia setting if you've got one library during

this piece of cataloging and he had another one doing this cataloging we can all come together in a shared catalog system, that's benefiting everybody. If we were funding that kind of project we would prefer one where we can see that collaboration as opposed to just benefiting a single library. And I think I'm the last in the way that they do their grants, this favors collaborative grants -- grants.

>> I'm going to make a nice touchy-feely comment. I fear like anything that this community would do would benefit more than one library. If was granted money to your catalog or collection I would hope that in turn he would make those records available to the larger community and even with regards to preservation, and ensure that that copies available long-term to the community as a whole so I understand what you're saying but I'm all touchy-feely and I would give to the greater good anyway.

>> I'm very excited about this and I think one of the benefits of libraries in the repository system getting these grants is to show our values also to administrators also because when you can bring in grant money all of a sudden you look at from a much different light. I have a question about the preservation of how broad that is in with that include things like fixing structures if you have leaks or adding compact shelving and improve the safety of the collection as well.

>> I think we try to leave it as broad as possible to leave to GPO based on what their allotment is as well.

>> I'm going to piggyback on what Arlene was saying because I can also see where depository libraries may want to partner with tribal -- not tribal depositories but tribal libraries to build in government information to reach out to communities that don't have access coming from the West are lots of places where we can build out to places and a grant that could help us serve those underserved populations to be very helpful but they're not depositories and maybe as a leader depository we could do something like that and having the language be a little bit more flexible. I think that could be very useful so I just wanted to champion what Arlene said.

>> Kevin Baker. Just want to go back to the first question. Many federal agencies are not seeing budget increases these day so can I just ask for the sake of a hypothetical, Congress passed legislation that gave GPO grantmaking authority that the Appropriations Committee did not provide additional funding so they are working within their current budget. What is the scope of a grantmaking program that you are envisioning. While there is a were the project that's 10 grant here and 25 grant here would GPO be able to fund it or would be \$2 million go out in structural grant program, help me understand what you're seeing here.

>> Thanks for that question. Tomorrow morning 9:15 AM, that's to be. I will say at this point that Davita Vance-Cooks asked counsel to think about this and we think it's inherent -- you guys jumping if you need to. We think it's inherently a very good idea. How it gets implemented, the funding of it, your questions are very valid but I think this is a case of at this point in history today when we are making initial recommendations, we don't want to let the Internet be the enemy of the good we want to proceed I think counsel wants to proceed with the recommendation and then do everything that we can to be advocates for GPO to help them get as much as they can and figure out how to help the library and depository community get as much as they can do I think that's where we are at right now. I don't think -- I don't take your concerns lightly and I think tomorrow's session will get a little more light on how things are working or could work.

>> I believe it was chairman Harper that first asked Davita if we were able to use grant money. I think they brought it up first.

>> This is Lori Thornton New Mexico state library.

>> At this point we don't know a lot of those details that I would not get too bogged down in the how will the money spent and how much money and where the money is going to come from. We don't really know at least I don't because I was were troll, I was not here so I did not get to meet with director Trent 12. In terms of when that proposal was made but I think in some ways talking that preservation, digitization, there's a lot of more rubber meets the road stuff. We were talking earlier about removing the 10K limit and you have a small tribal library, a small rural college. Well, okay, what if they needed

workstation? A small grant of a few thousand dollars could get them the kind of access they need and they could become a depository. There is another grant, disaster relief, anybody? I mean right now even if GPO wants to help, all they can do is stop shipments into some coordination. What if they could spend some money to help them rebuild collections and things like that. Don't think too narrowly that's where the grant is going to do. We don't know but you have to have the authority to free can do anything.

>> I just want to be clear, it's my job to figure out the details of how this stuff will work so don't necessarily think of it as being a concern but I look for information to help articulate what are the needs and priorities of the community being able to advocate for what is the essential things that we really want to see to get done.

>> Thank you very much. I appreciate that comment. I'm going to exercise our last comment go right ahead.

>> Peggy Jared University of Washington law library. Just some historical perspective. This question is been around for a long time many years ago when I was -- when people resetting to talk about digitizing, that was something we asked about when the answer was always GPO does not have grant making authority, so thank you for putting that in.

>> Thank you for everybody's comments. I'm going to turn the podium over to Cindy, library service and project management U.S. government publishing office.

>> I appreciate having been given time in this discussion of title 44 to give a little bit of a presentation about the view from GPO and I don't want to repeat what counsel has done so again, I'm going to refer you to this document that's in your packet, title 44 modernization and I will leave everything that I'm going to not say is he regarding recommendations for title 44. I heard a lot of attention today about the hearings that have been conducted by the house demonstration committee to where Davita Vance-Cooks testified in July now superintendent Lori Hall back in September and then just recently last week he October 11. After the hearing is conducted there is a period of time where additional questions can be sent for clarification or for finding out information for which there was not enough time during the congressional hearing. After the July 18 hearing we received questions for the record and among the questions received was you have initiated the process of redoing chapter 19 of title 44 U.S. code to ensure it comports with the current needs of the federal repository library. What have you identified as areas in need of improvement or revision. So this was asking GPO what we thought we needed and at the same time we still have the comments coming in and feeding counsel for their information and we were getting those comments as well. We were looking at that and we had some meetings and library services and management and we came up with a lot of ideas and we were using the national plan for access to U.S. government information as our guiding document for where he wanted to go. Our response, the mandate of chapter 19 of the repository library program are rounded in the area of ink on paper, printed publications. They should be revised to allow GPO to administer the FDLP and other public information prevent of the superintendent document effectively in the digital age and provide flexibility to the library to continue to participate in best serve their communities. So changes to chapter 19 should support the vision conveyed at the GPO national pen for U.S. government information which is to provide government information when and where it's needed and to ensure the public has effective equitable and convenient access to government information in all formats that they need. That's how we began our response and then we started our last. -- Our list. I think we had 16 recommendations and some of them are the same as what counsel is recommending and I'm not going to go through all of those and there is some I must say that did not make the cut for the slides because it depends on a whole bunch of other stuff. We were looking broader than chapter 19, we look at chapter 17 where we have 17, 10 and 11, we look at chapter 41 which is system of online access and we were looking at of course chapter 19 as well. So when I decided to put together the recommendations that we put forward on the slides, I was looking at a category recommendation that we at GPO think we need to better administer the program. We were certainly taking in all of the suggestions in the comments that

were coming in from libraries but there's a lot of change it has to go on on the side of GPO, inside the red brick building that you all don't necessarily know about because you're not there every day and working the processes. With that in mind, we wanted to put forward the lifecycle management and this came from actually the national Academy of public demonstration report that came out in January of 2013 in recommendation one where they recommended that there would be a governmentwide committee or commission report, whatever group. That looks at and was responsible for the rest cycle management of digital content. Having not yet had any designation from the Congress, GPO has been taking on this role for digital content and we thought it would be appropriate that we go ahead and say okay, let's ask for it so there we go that lifecycle management. Somebody mentioned what you mean by lifecycle management and here we have identified a choir, catalog, preserve, disseminate, and format and that's reformatting for preservation. The second one is to recognize that GPO administers and a distributed national collection of government information or a national library, either one would be fine of government information and that powers in Federal depository libraries that you are all very critical in this national collection as you well know and we want to work in collaboration with other national libraries and federal agency libraries in this endeavor. We talked about preservation a lot today and you can't have access without preservation so we are recommending that a preservation program must be a component of the public information program for the superintendent of documents. We need to make sure this permanent public access to our information for future generations. The authority to digitize previously printed and historical materials that have been disseminated to the public and to assist in the efforts to provide authority for GPO to accept digitized content, metadata, cataloging information and other products into FDLP info our shared repository for preserving print and digital government information. Regional tangible this card should be allowed when content is available on GPO system of online access or from a GPO partner that meets the criteria for the repository as determined by the superintendent of documents. Right now the regional discard policy says that the region cannot discard anything unless there's a digital copy in the info. Because there's a lot of federal agencies that are maintaining their own repository and because of the cost of redundancy, we know that there is a lot of content that will never come into govinfo so we want to partner with other libraries and we will have discussions with the national agricultural library and have their own mission to keep comprehensive collections so we want to work collaboratively to make sure that there is access to all of this content but we don't want to expand taxpayer dollars to create redundancies because those are huge, huge collections in many many cases. We want to collaborate and work together.

>> Of the 16 those are five that I chose to talk about with you. The others are in that handout and some of them repeat what counsel has recommended. We've also played around with are things really where they need to be in the statute? So this is something that counsel did not get into because they were focused only on chapter 19 per the direction of the director. We didn't have that same constraint so we look at 17, 10, and 11 which is a cataloging and indexing and we look at it and thought well, we need to get rid of all the stuff that says we need to print ask number of copies for the national catalog and index every month. And then it's referring to an index for congressional materials and the catalog of publication which we all have together as one product in the catalog of government publication and you can do a sub search for the congressional material. So we have two different sections referring to creating a product which we now have in one tool. So let's combine these. So we combined the language and we thought this is the perfect place right now where we need to ensure comprehensiveness and I know that those words on the screen are very small but I want to show you what we came up with with what that might look like and that to it and that handout that's in your packet. And I want to make sure we bring in the digital deposit from the agencies to CPM.

>> One of the things that occur to us when we started looking at all of the suggestions that came in and the comments that came in to ensure free access to government publications for the general public which is already in the law. And there were some other things that were coming in on those suggestions

that are already in the law and then it occurred to us that well, if we are looking at a revision of all of title 44 that means putting in new things but it also means the possibility of taking things we like out. And for some of those things there was nothing really grounded in a reason for being, nothing in the statute that said purpose so we put together and we are calling it public information programs for the superintendent of documents where we have all into chapter 19 those parts of 17, 10, and 11 revised and chapter 41 which is the only system of access, put it all into chapter 19 as public information programs for the superintendent of documents. What we also learned from the research study that the Federal research division of the Library of Congress is working on -- we will know more about that tomorrow. The agency never thought that their electronic content was within the scope of the depository library program. We thought okay, everything together and talk about all of this as one big set of programs that work interrelated so that's the reason that we put it all there together. So we came up with this purpose in order to ensure the public's right to free equitable access to government information there is hereby established a public information programs of the superintendent of documents in the government exchange office in the Federal depository library cataloging indexing and online access and preservation so we added the preservation we talked about in the bulletin list. Together they function to identify preserve authenticate disseminate and provide public access to government publication in the form of four needed by the community served. Part B as the superintendent of documents determines appropriate the programs may engage in activities other than those in part a that enhance access to government information dissemination of product or provide services that support federal depository libraries in their efforts to serve the community. This is where we get the support services, education, the support services that we are looking at providing for preservation, this is where we get some of those kinds of things to become the service oriented. All in the name of public access. And part C, superintendent of documents shall collaborate with and coordinate efforts among repository libraries federal agencies, and library organizations to consortium for the development of an information network and freely accessible to stupid national collection for the corporate of government information. This puts together the purpose and some of the broader aspects that we would like to see in the law and we didn't get into specifics. We didn't get into operational issues. We wanted to keep this at a high level and this will allow us to do what we need to do and serve the public and keeping America informed. That and the other bulleted list of recommendations. In moving chapter 41 in here we were also recommending that repeal of 4102 and 4103 which 4102 is the one section that that GPO may charge a fee -- I forget the exact wording so we want to get rid of that. And 4103 is the requirement that GPO provide a biannual report on GPO access and since we don't have GPO access anymore, we don't need to do that. That's kind of our thinking thought we were looking at consolidating, looking at merging, and we were looking from the viewpoint of having to administer a program of different types of libraries with different communities that they are serving with all kinds of different challenges that they have to meet. Who responded to the call for suggestions? When I did this slide there were 118 and we are still getting more and so that's up to 120 now. 58 were repository library coordinator's, 39 library directors or Dean's, 20 came from regional depository libraries and 12 people that submitted comments that were not from a depository library at all. You see the breakdown of the number of comments by library. And who else we had, a list of associations and organizations that responded, you can see them all there from the American Library Association to the University of California campus of California digital campus and everything in between and we think everyone who submitted comments -- we thank everyone who submitted comments. This is what we look at when we put all of the comments and suggestions together that the individual, they wanted preservation, digital preservation and preservation for tangible materials as well. When I was marking the different suggestions, when I had the heading definition of the publication because that's the way counsel talked about how we to change the definition of publication so I had done my little header in my column and there were a lot of suggestions that came in and says change

the scope to include electronic. Because one thing was very clear across the board that there needs to be a change in either the definition of publication or in providing a scope saying that we need to include digital content in our program. Want more digital? Privacy, item selection, more flexibility in being able to add items to their collection. The discard project is not just regional but also for selective to discard what they don't have regional in their state and also there was a lot of comments that related to the time. That people have to wait before they can pull things from their collection to discard to begin with. So the time of need is growing shorter for content coming through the program.

>> A lot of comments said that we needed to leverage what libraries are doing in a way of shared print archive, in the way of sharing digital repositories. A lot of suggestions about GP should the positive files and federal repository library. Regional flexibility and grant authority. That's pretty much the same thing on the organizations side. A little bit of a difference there is that the organization tended to call for new categories of libraries far more frequently than individual responses did. And I think collaboration and cooperation was the word that was used an awful lot in a lot of these. So as we are closing down the day, before we head into questions, I put together this graphic and I want to look at the intersection of ideas so we have that universe that the depository library counsel recommended and then we have that universe that came from you all from the Association and then we have recommendations that GPO was putting forward in response to the questions for the record from the July meeting. And I must say that we have an awful lot of consensus in what is needed. It may not be the exact terminology that was suggested but everybody believes we need to have electronic content specifically digital content specifically identifying as part of this program or change the definition of publication. Either way you go there is still that need and that shows up in all of the areas. And I think that this is a really good place to start. We had lots of good ideas from the Council, from you all in the community and GPO had been listening and we appreciate that hearings that has committee and administration committee has held to give us this opportunity and thank you all for testifying, Beth and Selena. Anybody else out there testified? Lori of course. Thank you. I think we are in a good place. Like so much else there still will be some evolution and we may not get it perfect but what we want to do I think we all want to go into the same direction. We all want free access, we want the public to be able to get to the information they need when they needed and from where they are and I think is just a matter of all different paths are leading to that one place. It doesn't have to be this way or the highway. So I think we are very good place and thank you for your work on that and thank you to all of you and I'm going to another shameless plug on the program tomorrow about grants. Robin Mohammed and Anthony are going to be talking about grants and modules and the possible processes for the FDLP. I will turned back over to Jim.

>> Thank you Cindy for taking us through GPO responses to the house committees question. It is the then diagram is very wonderful because while it's not perfect agreement, I think we are largely all everyone on the same page on what we want to do to help improve this program the federal repository library program so when the time comes, that there is actually a bill proceeding through, we will be able to voice our continued support in a unified way. I think Cindy is right, we are in a good place. At this point I would like to open up the floor to questions and comments. I am James Shaw, from the University of Omaha, Nebraska.

>> University of Washington libraries. I wanted to ask about section 1711 that in the government publishing office white paper. And this is a question that has been asked before and I just want to get it out as a point of conversation. Part the talks about the head of each department and agency and establishment shall deposit and notify [Indiscernible] of tangible versions of every document issued. Do you anticipate language -- were jerk is progressing which is broad enough so that with the proper disclaimers and harvesting can be considered -- how do I put this? Consenting to have -- to having one agency remain harvested as a form of deposit?

>> Thank you for the question. I don't if I would consider harvesting a deposit because that harvest not be pushed to us but I do think that we could harvest content based on a notification from an agency because there is a material that cannot be deposited because the document may not be a PDF file or one file or the whole site might be a dynamic publication so in that case modifications we need to see if there harvested so harvesting might be part of the process not necessarily a deposit.

>> Melissa Bernstein University of Utah. This is more of a process question I would like to know where we are going so now that we have given our recommendations and we gotten GPO's recommendation and harassment all this testimony what is our next step? Are relating to see what's -- if legislation is proposed for where do we go?

>> I'm looking at Andy or Bob.

>> Bob from the committee of house administration. The next step is a bill will be drafted by the committee and I don't have a timetable yet. And it will follow as they have done everything in regular order. And hopefully we will pass the committee past the house and it will be enacted into law. We have just started the drafting process and now it's the last phase is over and that's really have a timetable pushing in terms of getting information. That's sort of the next step they will be a committee bill. The chairman will be offering a bill.

>> Jamie fleet from the Democratic staffer house administration. I just want to echo Bob's comments on the timeline. It is our hope to have a bipartisan proposal on this matter and we appreciate the chairman's regular order on it and we appreciate all of the feedback today and all the testimony that some of the others have provided to the committee. It's very helpful to modernize this program.

>> Lori Hall, GPO. I think if you guys in your timeline that was originally set up in August, I also think that this was meant to the kind of a draft until this meeting was held and then as feedback was made available, there may be some additional changes or corrections to this document as well and then additional possibly additional submissions as well. I don't if you guys remember that part or whether you intended to do that but I remember the timeline so it could or could not be part of the process if you have suggestions here to.com edit and redo this and submit it to Davita post meeting.

>> The very last paragraph in our memorandum is we look forward to the DLC conference in October and we will have for the opportunity to engage with the FDL community and perhaps clean additional ideas to convey to you on when -- Wednesday morning will have a counsel working session and we are going to be taking this information that we have gleaned from all of you. You've noticed a lot of notetaking going on here I hope and we will probably be refining and revising a little bit and maybe offering some more. This is a dynamic process and I presume we will offer some additional counsel to the advanced?. I will see we've had two colleagues from the house committee speak in the last few minutes. I don't know how many people knew that we have had folks from the house committees here all afternoon listening to the comments, listening to the questions, making notes of what's going on and as acting chair of counsel I just want to say to everybody so everyone can hear thank you very much for being here. We do appreciate it. I'm good to speak for myself for just a moment, this is how a legislative process should work that our representatives to reach out, ask questions, sometimes tough questions that we have to try to answer and they're going to go back to their own and try to hammer out something that will improve things for this program and for our country so thank you so very much for being here. We do appreciate it.

>> [Applause]

>> Given the applause I guess I spoke for a few other people. We are very rapidly approaching the end of the scheduled time. There is a few minutes left and I would like to open the floor for any additional comments.

>> University of South Carolina. I would like to echo your thanks for everybody. A comment about the proposed section 1900, elegant.

>> [Applause]

>> Will there be a discussion about the other parts of title 44 to be revised? I understand there are other parts that are possibly going to be revised and GPO as a whole, whatever happens the procurement part of GPO is going to the library program in public access program. My program and material that goes to the library of Congress, national archives, all of the agencies against bylaw publications i don't know if there sometimes scheduled to talk about those other parts and how they will affect libraries.

>> That is an excellent question. I will take a stab at it. Depository library counsel at the Rector's request that focus on the depository library program in chapter 19. Because of time considerations I made a quick decision to pass over our other considerations, part of our memorandum to counsel dated believe these additional counsel requisitions and further strengthen the revision to title 44 and we had several items there that we did look at other sections of title 44. I commend them to your reading if you have not seen them yet but we have not as counsel schedule a discussion for other sections outside of chapter 19. We felt it was important to stick to our charge and provide the support under that. That's where we are at. Anyone else on counsel care to respond?

>> Our last comment of the afternoon. Thank you.

>> That's a lot of pressure. University of Kentucky libraries. I think that's perfect for chapter 19. The federal repository library program is a system of redundancy on purpose in case disasters occur and we lose copies in various parts of the country, we have other copies available. I'm a little concerned that in the realm of digital deposits that redundancy -- I may be misunderstanding what's happening with MLM and ag library but I think we need some kind of digital redundancy somewhere that brings all the stuff together and protect them because we have already seen that that's very fragile information and can disappear in a blink of an eye.

>> Thank you very much to everybody who attended this afternoon and those of you who hung on for all three sessions, while. I appreciate your commitment to title 44. Someone's hands went up there. We will see you all tomorrow.

>> [Applause]

>> [Event concluded]

>>