GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE & FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2008

+ + + + +

The Council convened at 10:30 a.m. in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the Doubletree Hotel Crystal City, 300 Army-Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Tim Byrne, Chair, presiding.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

TIM BYRNE, Chair
CHRISTOPHER GREER
KATHRYN S. LAWHUN
JOHN A. SHULER
GWEN SINCLAIR
KATRINA STIERHOLZ
VICTORIA K. TROTTA
KENDALL F. WIGGIN
DAVID CISMOWSKI
CARLENE ENGSTROM
SARAH G. HOLTERHOFF
JUSTIN OTTO
SUZANNE SEARS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION PAGE
Plenary Session: Council/GPO
Welcome and Kick-Off3
Plenary Session: Future of the FDLP82
Council Session: FDLP Desktop
Method Behind the Madness152
Adjourn

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

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

2 PLENARY SESSION: COUNCIL/GPO

WELCOME AND KICK-OFF

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: I'd like to welcome everyone here this morning. My name is Tim I'm with the Information International Byrne. Associates at the Department of Energy's Office of Scientific and Technical Information. I am the chair of the Depository Library Council, so I'd like to call meeting to order. I don't get to use that gavel much, so I use it when I can.

said, I'd like to welcome As Ι everyone here in the shadow of our nation's capital. Things have been a little bit gloomy here in the capital. It picked up a little bit yesterday. The Redskins managed to hold on for a win.

have a couple of housekeeping announcements before we get started. I would like to remind everyone of the Regional Selective Lunch. You should check the message boards that we might meet. I've been asked --

Some people are confused because the messages say "Meet in the lobby," and it's not clear which lobby -- whether it's this one out here or the main lobby, so if you could make that clear, it would help some people.

I did get a message that the Texas librarians will meet right outside the ballroom to walk to lunch, and they do have room if you didn't sign up before.

We have one session that has been cancelled, on Wednesday at 10:30. The Documents Data Miner 2 session has been cancelled because the speaker was not able to make it.

I want to remind everyone that if during the session you do come to the microphone to speak that you should start off by giving your name and your institution or affiliation. If you noticed, that was the first thing I gave was my --

So I think at this point, what we'd like to do is introduce the Council and we'll just go around the table and let each Council

1	member introduce themselves starting on this
2	side over here, with the rookie.
3	MR. CISMOWSKI: I'm David Cismowski
4	from the California State Library.
5	MR. OTTO: Good morning. Here we go.
6	I'm Justin Otto from Eastern Washington
7	University.
8	MS. HOLTERHOFF: Good morning. I'm
9	Sally Holterhoff from Valparaiso University
10	School of Law Library.
11	MS. ENGSTROM: Good morning. I'm
12	Carlene Engstrom from the Salish Kootenai
13	College, Tribal College Library.
14	MS. TROTTA: Hello. I'm Tory Trotta
15	from the Ross-Blakely Law Library at the
16	Arizona State University College of Law.
17	MR. SHULER: Good morning I'm John
18	Shuler from the University of Illinois of
19	Chicago.
20	DR. GREER: Hi. I'm Chris Greer. I'm
21	the director of the National Coordination
22	Office and the White House Office of Science

and Technology Policy.

1	MR. WIGGIN: Good morning. I'm Ken
2	Wiggin from the Connecticut State Library.
3	MS. SINCLAIR: I'm Gwen Sinclair
4	from the University of Hawaii at Manoa
5	Library.
6	MS. SEARS: I'm Suzanne Sears from
7	the University of North Texas.
8	MS. LAWHUN: Hello. I'm Kathy Lawhun
9	from San Francisco Public Library.
10	MS. STIERHOLZ: Hello. I'm Katrina
11	Stierholz from the Federal Reserve Bank of St.
12	Louis.
13	MS. DAVIS: Good morning. I'm Denise
14	Davis from the American Library Association.
15	CHAIRMAN BYRNE: Now that you've met
16	everyone on council, I would like to point out
17	that if you do go the FDLP desktop, there is a
18	list of Council members there. You can click
19	on a name and you'll find out address, phone
20	number. You can also get a form for sending an
21	e-mail message to that Council member, so we

do want to hear from you, and that's an easy

way you can find out how to get in touch with

us.

Now that we've introduced ourselves, we want to know a little bit more about you. There's probably too many for you to stand up and introduce yourselves, so we'll go into what is traditionally called the "Council Aerobics."

So what I'd like to do first is to ask all those who are first-time attendees to stand up.

And to balance that out, all those who attended their first council meeting before 1990 --

All those from East of the Mississippi -- Quite a few.

West of the Mississippi --

How about west of California?

North of the St. Lawrence?

South of the Rio Grande?

How many public librarians do we

have?

State librarians?

Law librarians?

Federal librarians? 1 2 Special Is there any I'm forgetting? Oh! Forgive me. Go ahead. Stand 3 4 up. (Laughter and applause) 5 I guess that's most of the room. 6 have all the regional depository 7 librarians stand? 8 How about all the former council 9 10 members? Former regional librarians? 11 So how many of you are receiving 12 full funding to come to this meeting? 13 are receiving partial 14 How many 15 funding? 16 And how many from outside the immediate area are receiving no funding to 17 come to this meeting? 18 19 So, that's pretty much the that we traditionally do, but I of course had 20 to add a few of my own. How many of you here 21 consider yourselves a documents librarian? 22

How

many

of

you

depository

23

librarians who first took the job as a depository librarian work in a library with no computers and the multi-catalog was your primary means of access?

How many of you work in a library today with no computers --

How many of you who consider yourself documents librarians are full-time documents librarians?

How many of you are a half-time documents librarian? Three-quarter? A quarter-time?

How many of you spend less time with documents today than you did in the past?

How many have had less staff to work in documents in your library than you did -- ? Maybe that's one of the challenges that are facing us today.

So now that we've gotten plenty of exercise, I think we're ready to go ahead and begin. So I would like at this point to introduce the Public Printer of the United States, Bob Tapella.

MR. TAPELLA: And it didn't even
make a noise. Good morning. Come on. Good
morning. Thank you. I know the first meeting
was, what, at 7:00 this morning? Hopefully,
you've had enough coffee.

Now, following our Chairman's rule at a microphone, I'm Bob Tapella, and I'm the Public Printer. Tim, the rule isn't that complicated. He's expecting you to follow that same rule as the day continues on.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Depository Library Council, friends, and colleagues, I'm pleased to be here at the Fall Depository Library Council meeting.

Now, I'd like to begin -- Even though they were introduced, I'd like to begin by welcoming the newest Council members.

David Cismowski, alright. David.

David is a regional depository librarian at the California State Library in Sacramento, my home state. Welcome to Council.

Carlene Engstrom. Carlene.

Carlene is our first tribal librarian to serve

on Council.

Sally Holterhoff. Sally. In addition to having served on Council -- What, once or twice before? -- Once before. She is the immediate past president of the American Association of Law Libraries.

Justin Otto. Justin. Justin is a GovDocs librarian at Eastern Washington University and I think, in this Council, is the youngest. Sally, he beat you by a year or two, I think.

Suzanne. Suzanne Sears. Now, she's the head of the GovDocs department at the University of North Texas Library. However, she spent a decade or so at the Tulsa City County Library, which was the recipient of the first Federal Depository Library of the Year award in 2003. Congratulations, Suzanne.

Now, I met these new Council members when they attended the new Council boot camp earlier this year in Washington, DC.

And what's interesting about it is our new chairman, Tim Byrne -- This is his first

meeting.

When he became Council chair, he decided he wanted to go through that same boot camp. And so he came up to Washington DC and went through it. And I understand that he had lots of good things to say about it, as have the other members, so to Rick and your staff, thank you. You guys did a great job in getting the new Council members up to speed.

The question is whether we're going to have a boot camp for the existing Council members so that everybody is on a level playing field, right.

Now, I'd also like to make a couple of other introductions. And this is from the GPO world. The first one is the new Deputy Public Printer of the United States and Chief Operating Officer of the US Government Printing Office, Paul Erickson. Paul, I think you're hiding in back, aren't you? No?

Welcome, Paul. Paul joined us this past July. Actually, I guess it was quasi-June when Bill Turri retired after five years of service to

our nation.

Second person I'd like to introduce is the Chief of Staff of the agency, Maria Lefevre. Maria? Now, Maria is an old hand. She's been at the agency, what? Four years now.

And is Janna here as well? Okay, we have one other executive of the three that report to me, and that's Janna Sansone, who is our chief management officer. I guess she's back at the ranch.

You know, a little over a year ago, in this very room, probably at this very podium, I made my first public appearance as the 25th public printer of the United States. I had just been confirmed by the Senate, and the President literally signed my commission, I think, three days before this meeting began.

And to Lance Cummins and his staff, you guys did a great job last year, and from what I've experienced so far and what I've heard so far, this one is even better. So I'd like to publically recognize Lance Cummins.

Lance, are you here? He's probably out doing something.

The folks on his staff that are doing their best to make you all comfortable are Nick Ellis, Yvonne Ellis, Bridget Govan, and Marian MacGilvary. Are any of you in the room? There they are, back door. Thank you all. Also, if you have any issues or problems, those are the folks you want to talk to you.

Now, before I get to what I guess I would consider the meat of my remarks, I'd like to address the latest story that has appeared in the "Washington Times" about the Government Printing Office and our passport business, and I know this latest story made it's way through the GovDocs blog-o-sphere. When I met with you in Kansas City, I thought we were done with the muck-raking. I was wrong.

Unfortunately, even though GPO does buy its ink by the barrel, we still can't compete with the media and their lust for sensationalism fed through half-truths, mis-

truths, and innuendo. And yes, GPO did return \$51 million dollars to the State Department, and it was the right thing to do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As most of you know, GPO operates on a revolving fund and on a cost-recovery basis. All of our pricing for the items we manufacture are priced based on cost-recovery. The electronic passport itself has 66 line items in its pricing structure.

For fiscal year 2008, we price to the State Department based on estimated quantity of 18 million passports. is well-known, there was unprecedented public demand last year which compelled GPO to produce over 24 million passports. In addition, we were able to bring the new secure production facility in Stennis, Mississippi into operation on time and under budget.

As a result, GPO was left at the end of the fiscal year with an over-recovery in its costs in a number of areas. GPO brought the over-recovery to the attention of the State Department and together we worked

out a method of re-payment. It's as simple as that. And it was the right thing to do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, I must confess that if weren't for the tenure of the outrageous allegations being raised in the "Washington Times," I'd be laughing about the utter inaccuracies and the just plain bad writing that we've experienced. I doubt that reporter would get a passing grade from any college journalism 101 class based on his poor writing skills. And based on the number of people here at academic institutions, I know he's never consulted a reference librarian or even a GovDocs librarian because they know about authoritative sources.

And I'm sorry that you guys have to keep reading about us. We're not having fun with it, and maybe one of these days the reporter will move on. But right now, he's trying to create scandal where there is none. It's a mix of inaccuracies, information out of context, rehash of old information on what GPO has already responded to when we've given

correct information.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The dedicated men and women of the GPO have been producing passports for the State Department for more than 80 years. And I think, over this past year, we rose to meet the State Department's demand fueled by the public admirably. So if any of you wander up to GPO this week, if you see any of our production workers, tell them "thank you for doing a great job" because they deserve it, and they've done a great job.

of the most Now, one important issues and highest priority programs of GPO is FDSys. You all have heard of it, I think. Now, it is central to our transformation plans at GPO and we've been working on it now for five Mike Wash and have worked years. I closely on FDSys and continue to monitor it's progress.

In Kansas City, I told you that we had taken made changes. GPO over responsibility all program for management FDSys, aspects of utilizing Harris for software development tasks only. In doing so, GPO assumed more risk. I am happy to report that GPO has been moving forward rapidly since taking over the program management role of FDSys.

And is Selene Dalecky is in the audience? She deserved a lot of the credit. Selene, are you here? Or is she back working, Mike? She must be working.

We have accomplished more in six months than our former master integrator made in 18 months. GPO's approach of bringing in specific subject matter expertise in the areas of content repository and search has been the right choice, and we are on track for the first release.

The changes we made not only allow the team to make better progress, it has also saved money. Under the plan proposed by our former integrator earlier this year, we would have exhausted our fiscal year 2008 funds by last August and would not have been able to deliver a usable system. Under the current

plan, we will deliver a release late this year and are working within our budget.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FDSys will offer enhancements over GPO access including more refined search and faster results. FDSys is currently in final stages of development and integration for the first release. The details of this release will be discussed tomorrow FDSys sessions. Tomorrow's presentation by Lisa LaPlant is a full demo of the system. is not a Power Point presentation. Now Lisa gave me the demo on Friday afternoon, and I can tell you I was really impressed, and I think you will be too.

testing system will Now, start after integration is complete and it's expected to start in about three weeks. test phase is critical to ensure that launch a system that will work reliably and meet your expectations. Once this stage is underway, we'll be able to more accurately identify an actual launch date for the first release.

When I talked about the risk that we were assuming -- The greatest risk that we were assuming is the risk of time -- whether or not we can meet the upcoming deadline. At this point, we are working towards an early January launch and everything I've been told by our folks is that we're going to meet that expectation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

launch FDSys will Now, at be integrated into the gpo.gov website and the FDSys launch will occur simultaneously with the launch of the new re-designed gpo.gov website. This first release of FDSys will include integration with GPO's integrated library system, the bibliographic database of the catalog of US government publications. This will enable the exchange of descriptive metadata between the systems. I've seen a little bit of it and it's pretty cool.

It's also important to keep in mind that the development of this system is occurring in phases. We're not just going to flip the switch and there's FDSys forever.

Given the short time period between release is typically six to eight months, preparation for the launch of one release overlaps the planning and development of the next release.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Looking forward through the next year, will continue to expand the we capabilities of the system, including submission of content by Congress in second phase and submission of content federal agencies in the third phase. This is the vital in creating an step end-to-end digital content life-cycle for government information. And at the end of the day, that's going be probably to the most tremendous piece of FDSys.

One final note on FDSys, and in some ways a sad note for us, Gil Baldwin has retired from GPO. Gil, I know you're here, so stand up. I saw you. There he is. Gil. No, Gil, keep standing. Gil has been with FDSys since the beginning. Keep standing Gil. Up, up, up. First as an advisor from SuDocs and then as an active team member as director in

the program management office.

His good counsel and unparalleled understanding of how the library community will benefit from this system will be sorely missed. But Gil, I wish you the best as you begin this next phase in your life, and on behalf of all of your colleagues and friends at GPO, I want to thank you for your service. Thank you, Gil. Okay, now you can sit down.

Now, moving on. There seems to be a lot of buzz surrounding the study of regional depository libraries that the Joint Committee on Printing directed GPO to conduct in consultation with the library community. I even brought my own draft here, which I think many of you have seen the first draft, right? It's been out in the community. Ric Davis will probably be talking more about this with his remarks.

What I will say about the report is that we've learned a lot, and we'll be sharing our final findings with our oversight committee soon, and then make these findings

publicly available.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I do however, have a concern about what isn't covered in the report and bi-annual survey. And that is the tough economic times and unprecedented actions taken recently at the federal and state levels to meet this drastically changing financial climate.

In the past month, I've met or spoken with nearly half of the regional depository library directors. They about the future of their concerned institutions given what's taking place at the state and federal level, which raises concern about the future of the depository program as it is currently structured.

Now, Tim, you're writing down. Good for you. He's a great chairman. I'd actually like the next Council meeting to focus on two areas. One, the partnership between GPO and the regional libraries and how we will thrive in this time of economic turmoil.

And two, examining the service relationships between the regional

depositories and the selective depositories they serve. I believe that with the release of our final report and discussions with Congress and the beginning of a new administration and the beginning of a new Congress, the timing is right.

Now, this concludes my formal prepared remarks, and I understand if there's time for questions later, we'll be doing that.

And I m going to turn over to acting superintendent of documents, Ric Davis. Ric?

MR. DAVIS: Good morning. In keeping with tradition, let me give my name again. Ric Davis. I'm the Acting Superintendent of Documents and I'm also the director of the Library Business Unit at GPO.

Before we start talking about really important stuff, let me ask if there are any baseball fans in the audience besides Dan Barkley and I guess a lot of people like myself stayed up last night. I think our goal for this conference, and it will start today with strategic planning for the future of the

FDLP and with the FDLP desktop, we want to make it as exciting as a seven game series. So you can tell me in your comment forms if we lived up to that.

I want to welcome all of you and say how happy I am to be here with you. It's always good to be back amongst the FDLP family. I encourage you while you're here to connect with myself, your colleagues, amongst yourselves in the audience, and also our family here at the Government Printing Office.

I'm joined on stage today by three of my senior managers, Laurie Hall, Robin Haun-Mohamed, and Ted Priebe. And we'll be with you throughout the conference. I also encourage you, after the conference if you ever have questions or comments or you feel like you're not getting the service you need, to contact me directly. My e-mail address is rdavis@gpo.gov. And please feel free to contact me.

I want to begin this morning by thanking our esteemed Council members who

ended their tenures this fall. Peter Hemphill, Marian Parker, Mark Sandler, and our former chair, Geoff Swindells. Are you guys in the audience, by chance? If you could stand up --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Your dedication and service is enormously appreciated. I also want to join Bob in recognizing our new Council members, David, Carlene, Sally, Justin, and Suzanne. From all of us here at GPO, we welcome you.

I also want to take a moment to welcome Professor Nobuhiro Igawa who goes by "Nobu" to our GPO family. Nobu, are you in the audience? Не is doing really some exciting stuff. Let me tell you about this. Nobu is an associate professor from the International University of Kagoshima in Japan.

In conjunction with our partner, the Library of Congress, we at GPO are sponsoring him in studying how the United States distributes government information to it's citizenry. He's researching the models

associated with the federal depository library program and also what's in place at the Library of Congress, and he's looking to go back and set up a similar model in Japan. I'd like to -- Thank you.

Gil has already had his aerobics this morning, so I'm not going to ask him stand again, but I also want to thank Gil for his dedication and service to the Government Printing Office. I've been at GPO now sixteen years and in the beginning of that, I worked for Gil, and then I worked with Gil, and I thoroughly enjoyed it. Gil, if you ever get bored, you know my number. We could always use help. Please give me a call.

Before I update you on some of the exciting initiatives in the library unit, I want to mention a couple of items of note. First, substitutions. At the regional library meeting in Kansas City I attended, it was brought to our attention that the substitution list, official FDLP permanent full-text databases, was causing some confusion and

certain interpretations were in conflict with other FDLP guidance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

To remedy the situation, the FDLP substitution quidelines on were recently revised, and the substitution list as existed was eliminated. With GPO's harvesting archiving activities, the substitution list was never meant to be a comprehensive list of all titles that could be substituted. The revised guidelines permit selectives to substitute when the online version is complete, official, permanently accessible, and the regional has been consulted. information on these guidelines can be found on the FDLP desktop and we'll take questions during the conference if you have questions about it.

I also want to join Bob in commending the team that's developing our federal digital system. Selene Dalecky, Mike Wash, and Kirk Knoll -- I believe Kirk is in the audience back there -- have been doing a fantastic job. We're really looking forward to

their presentation tomorrow, and for all of you to see what is going to change under FDSys in the future, and how it will benefit us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I'd like to briefly talk about the budget. We are operating under a continuing resolution at GPO that goes until March 6. We've asked for, for the S&E appropriation, \$43 million dollars in funding for FY '09, which is about an \$8 million dollar increase for new projects and initiatives, particularly for more data storage that we know we're going to need under FDSys, more automation for cataloging and indexing.

The continuing resolution is not going to affect how deliver existing we services. I've been through this before with all of you and we're making no cut-backs, no scale-backs. We are going to continue doing what we're doing in terms of providing services to the library community.

Bob mentioned a little bit about the value of the FDLP in the meetings that he and I have been having with library directors.

I'm very pleased to tell you that just last week, we launched a new web page on the FDLP desktop on the value of the FDLP.

This was a comment that we received a lot in recent meetings, particularly where people would stand up and they would say, "I'm trying to have discussions with my library director about what it means to be a depository library now and in the future, and I need some help." And I think we've given that help.

I encourage all of you to look at it, but it's not a one-sided communication. I'm also looking for you to provide feedback, share your stories, share information about the value that you have in the FDLP, and we're going to make that information available through the FDLP desktop.

In the past months, I sent a letter to all of your library directors and I asked them the same question. I received a tremendous amount of feedback, and it's been very helpful in terms of our strategic

planning for the future of this program. You're going to hear a lot about that in terms of outcomes on the session that we're doing this afternoon on the future of the FDLP that Cindy Etkin will be leading.

As Bob mentioned, the regional study -- I think he spoke about what I was going to mention on that -- But in terms of the report, we had about 30 days to write the initial draft. It turned out to be 135 pages.

For those of you who, like myself, wrote a masters thesis, getting that done in a month was quite a monumental undertaking. GPO is currently completing the internal review of all of the comments and all of the information received back on the initial report. And we're preparing findings to submit to our oversight committee, the Joint Committee on Printing, right after this meeting, and talk about what steps can be taken next.

I don't think you're going to see any real surprises from the initial report.

There are things that require JCP approval and

there are things that we can do working with you at GPO. The one thing that I heard loud and clear was that we need to make some changes to the disposition process between selectives and regionals, and we're going to be forging ahead on that with all of you along with other things.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The key point that I want to make here about what we heard from the community, the Library Associations, the library, and Council, and others about the report is that we are moving from a collection-based program to a service-based program, and we all need models for more flexibility and collaboration in the future.

Somebody asked me recently if we're still in an electronic transition. I would say we're heavily in an electronic transition. We're at the point now where I'm seeing 97 percent of all new titles that come into the Government Printing Office born digital. We need to look together as to how to serve the public without geographic boundaries, and we

also need to make sure that that content is authenticated, that it has chain of custody, and that it is considered "official" by our content originating agencies.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Speaking of authentication, we've been doing a lot of work this year. GPO now automated technology in place that enables us technologically to digitally sign every file we make available. The way we're going about that is we're working content-originating agencies, federal our agency partners, to educate them on what we're doing on digital signatures to get them on board with it.

The first application that signed this year was the budget of the United States government from OMB. We've also digitally signed the public and private laws of the United States made available by the Office of the Federal Register. approval from both the House and Senate to begin signing congressional bills that we make available.

Right after this conference, we're going to do what I call a "soft launch" or a "beta," similar to what we did with the public and private laws, and we're going to start making these digitally signed congressional bills available.

We're going to do a more formal launch or rollout with the new Congress in January, but between now and then, just like we've done in the past, I'm going to put this out there and I want to get feedback from all of you about how it's working before we engage in a formal launch activity.

You're going to be hearing a lot at the conference about our integrated library system that's been developed under the leadership of Laurie Hall, Linda Resler, and their staff. I want to touch upon some of the good activities that have been taking place with the ILS and there's also going to be a session on that at the conference.

The overall goal of the ILS is the provision of access to depositories in the

public to bibliographic records of federal government publications. We've had a lot of activity recently, and I want to mention a couple of finer points. The new federal depository library directory administrative module was released.

This enables depositories to go in and edit their own directory information. The public interface for the library directory was recently launched. Libraries have access to the CGP via Z39.50 protocol to go in and search, retrieve, and download bibliographic records. We also have a web interface change that was made to improve enhancements to how you view the ILS.

Coming later this year, we're going to have several additional enhancements. We're going to implement a log-in page specifically for depository libraries to take advantage of authenticated services in the CGP. This is going to include configuration of the circulation module and the creation of depositories as patrons.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

An example of authenticated service will be the ability of libraries to set up their search criteria for e-mail own notification from the CGP when records meeting their criteria are added. As some of you may have noticed, I served this past summer as the blogger-of-the-month on Free Government Information. That was very, very exciting.

One of the things -- thank you. One of the things that I mentioned is that those authenticated services are being done initially for the library community and then we're going to expand out to the general public as well for notification, so I want to thank Jim Jacobs for his comment about that while I was serving as the blogger. For more information on ILS, we're having an update session tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. and I encourage all of you to attend.

I'd like to speak next about digitization. We've been talking about digitization for quite a while at library conferences. I want to talk to you about

we've been doing recently.

We have a project underway -- for first-time attendees I want to re-state what many of you have already heard. We have a project underway to digitize the entire federal legacy collection of government documents, authenticate it, and make it available free of charge. Thanks.

We have a lot of challenges to do this. The first challenge is, we've asked for money from Congress. We're under a continuing resolution and we have no money. So I decided to take a leap of faith.

I put out a request in Federal Business Opportunities, FedBizOpps for the public private sector others to respond, recognizing that there would be no exchange of funds, and to seek help in digitizing this collection.

Some might say, "Why in the world would anyone want to do that if they're not going to get paid for it?" What the partner or partners get to keep as part of the process

сору of the files, but under is circumstances access to depository libraries or the general public going to be limited. The trade-off is that a copy of the level files preservation master must provided to the Government Printing Office, and then we intend to make them available, free of charge, without restriction through GPO's federal digital system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I wanted to give you an update on where that is. We put out this proposal. Comments, or actually, "solicitations" were accepted through the end of September and we've received those. The way the procurement process works in government -- I can't give incredible detail on this, but I will tell you we've received proposals. We're going through the evaluation stage of those right now and we're planning to recommend an award to our Joint Committee on Printing to get approval to begin this process.

In the meantime, we're not waiting on contracts to do digitization. This past

year, GPO worked with other federal agencies from the National Digital Standards Advisory Board to re-affirm our standards for both preservation level copy and access level copy for information content.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A website was recently launched that we partnered with the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and other leaders in this area. And I don't like to give out a lot of URLs, but I want to give you this one. It's www.digitizationguidelines.gov.

This is a collaborative effort, and I'm very proud of our staff at GPO, particularly Robin Haun-Mohamed, James Mauldin who led the effort to partner with our other agencies to establish the site, and I think it's going to be very important in terms of making sure adhere t.o standards we on digitization as we go forward.

I'd also like you to encourage you to visit our web-page on GPO access so you can follow along on what we're doing on digitization. We're going to be looking for

partners in the library community in terms of collections of digitization.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As of know, you in many administering the federal depository library does have a collection program, GPO not itself. We're going to be looking partners on this digitization effort, and we already have a couple who have expressed interest to us.

Finally, I want to mention that we re-launched the digital registry. The registry lists digitization projects that all of you are working on. The enhanced registry allows you to go in and search. You can filter results by category. You can contact fellow digitization partners. I encourage all of you to continue submitting information to this very valuable tool.

What it does is, it helps us look at the standards that are being used for digitization. It also helps us examine where we're not going to have to duplicate the effort as part of our priorities for

digitization.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

many of you have heard of How "Ben's Guide to US Government?" Okay. "Ben's launched the Guide" was as educational component of GPO access back in 1999. I think it's time for a refresh, and this has been a very valuable tool that we made available. We originally put it out there for parents and teachers and educators. What I was really fascinated by over the years was comments from professors who were teaching introductory political science in saying, "Don't tell anybody, but I'm making use of this."

We're going to be going through a refresh of "Ben's Guide." I think it's time for an update. We're going to be putting out a brief survey for comment and I encourage all of you to comment on it. And we're going to be looking to do an update on that very soon.

The other thing I want to mention today is our FDLP marketing plan. I've mentioned to Tim and Barbie Selby in the past

and others who developed the "Knowledge Will Forever Govern" document, which I use on my desk as a reference guide all the time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A vision for the FDLP that was put together a couple of years ago -- I felt like one of the gaps that we had, as a call to action by the Government Printing Office was how to help all of you market your libraries. We have this tremendous wealth of information out there. We have all of you as wonderful service professionals waiting to serve the community, and how do we help them find out about us.

recently launched We an FDLP marketing plan. launched We а marketing campaign called "Easy as FDL." Our main goal is to assist you in promoting your libraries. I encourage all of you to visit the FDLP desktop, review the plan, and order the promotional products, and also look at the tips and strategies that we're putting Additionally, we are debuting first ever FDLP promotional video here at the meeting. It's also going to be put up on our FDLP desktop and available for you to download.

I want to thank Barbie Selby, Mary Alice Baish, and Bill Sleeman who were real stars in this video. I think if the Academy Awards come knocking, you might want to be recognized. You guys did a fantastic job.

I'd like to talk next about our federal depository library handbook. As many of you remember, the handbook replaced the instructions and the manual not too long ago. We consider this handbook to be a ready source of reference, but also a living document. I don't want it to gather dust.

The handbook provides the latest legal and program requirements, guidance, and best practices for how to operate as a depository library. We've recently made some revisions to the handbook, including adding a chapter on public access assessments and how we're going about instituting that program, and it's been updated and released off the

desktop. For historical research, the previous version is archived and still made available.

Speaking of the FDLP desktop, I'm extremely excited about some of the things that you're going to see at this meeting. I think we're having a session today that Karen Sieger is leading. What we're doing on the desktop right now is we're breaking it up into two parts.

We're working on the final redesign of the FDLP.gov information that provides program-related content and services. But as I mentioned, in terms of doing blogging, I'm very interested in social networking. I'm very interested in how, after all of us leave this room and for our colleagues who are not with us today, how we can network together.

We're launching this website called community.FDLP.gov to provide the social networking tools in this electronic environment we're in that enables individual members to communicate and network with the

depository community.

Also, to have sort of a registry of experts to find out, you know, if you're not the expert on something at your library, who is, and how do you connect your patrons with them?

To learn more about this, I encourage you to come to the session this afternoon at 3:30 in this room.

Next, I'd like to talk a little bit about automated metadata extraction. That's a very fancy word, and what it basically means is, the use of technology to try to create the automation process for cataloguing records. GPO as a national authority, is never ever going to take away people from doing cataloguing.

But what I do envision is in the future, particularly with the launch of GPO's federal digital system, is that we're really going to be up to our arms in the need to do more cataloguing and given constraints that we have on adding resources, I'm looking at how

automation can help us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I've been very pleased with a project that we launched in conjunction with the Defense Technical Information Center and Old Dominion University, and we're looking at how we can apply automation to go in and look at content and come back and create brief bibliographic records that GPO can then turn into full mark records.

I recently attended a demonstration by the group working on this and we're going to have them in Tampa so that they can give a live demonstration of how this works. But I've been very pleased with what we're seeing.

I'd like to speak next about our shelf list conversion project. This past year, contracted with progressive technology GPO federal systems to acquire bibliographic metadata transcription for the estimated 600,000 non-OCLC cataloguing records that are historic shelf list. These our contain bibliographic metadata captured part of cataloguing activities, and they go

back to the 1870's.

GPO is working right now with this contractor to convert the bibliographic metadata into MARC 21 format, and we're planning to load it into GPO's integrated library system, and make it available to the public.

Additionally, we are digitizing all of these historic shelf list cards for preservation purposes. Many of you recently saw an announcement we put out on FDLPL about CD-ROM assessments. CD-ROMS and dealing with them, is something else we've asked for funding for this year, but again, we're not going to wait on funding.

This is a very important project. I think when GPO and other federal agencies began distributing information in CD-ROM format, including diskette format in the late 1980's, early 1990's, the danger that all of us foresaw at the time was, will the medium -- will the platter -- still be around in 30 years. And we have this commitment to

permanent public access. Is that what we're going to have to worry about?

I think what I'm worried about is the fact that a lot of the technology that was associated with the content no longer exists.

A lot of the companies that developed the search technologies, the retrieval software, to be able to access content, no longer exist.

And we've got to do something about this.

The approach that we've taken at GPO so far, is we've gone through and we've taken a look at our cataloguing records, and we've determined that about 30 percent of the content that we distributed on CD-ROM is already available on the web. But I'm worried about the other 70 percent.

We put out a call for volunteers to work with the Government Printing Office to examine this issue and particularly to take a look at the most serious at-risk CD data so that I can coordinate back with federal agencies and so that we can come to a solution on how we're going to continue to make this

information available. We have a lot of information that has the potential to disappear, and this is one that I don't want to disappear.

I want to provide you with a brief update on PACER. We put out some information on the PACER pilot recently, and I want to give some more details on what's going on with that.

As many of you know, in 2007, GPO with the approval of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts undertook a pilot to provide free public access to federal court records at seventeen depository libraries on a pilot basis. We received word a few weeks back from the Administrative Office that they needed to temporarily suspend the pilot. We couldn't give out a lot of details at the time, and I'll explain why -- I want to give out those details now.

What happened was, the Administrative Office believes that there was a security breach in terms of the PACER

information. They've turned this over to the FBI and the FBI is currently evaluating what to do about it. What I do feel that I have is a commitment from the Administrative Office of the importance of the pilot.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It was working very well until someone did something really bad. I have a commitment that as soon as this investigation is completed, that we're going to re-start the pilot, and then we're going to look expand the pilot. And I want to thank all of the pilot libraries for their patience in this process.

Т want to conclude today with something that is important as as social networking on the web, and that is in-person meetings like this. Community outreach. in tough budget times, GPO is able to travel. What we look to do is to try to combine events. If you want us to come to one of your libraries for something like an anniversary meeting, we try to go whenever we can. We also combine it with state association meetings and other types of library meetings

going on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I encourage you to contact me to let me know of things that are upcoming that we can participate in. Recently we've been from Phoenix, Arizona to Rapid City, South Dakota back to Boston, so we are on the road traveling. We also try to make this continuing part of our public access assessments program so that we can partner with you and give you help when and where you need it.

Speaking of partnerships, GPO has been doing a lot of work to continue in this regard as well. We have content partnerships, service partnerships, and hybrid partnerships that are kind of somewhere in-between.

In FY '08, we launched a partnership with the Naval Postgraduate School that allows depository libraries to gain access to homeland security digital information.

We also partnered with my colleague up here, John Shuler at the University of

Illinois at Chicago, and others participating in GIO, Government Information Online, and I want to thank all of you for that tremendous service and thank John as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Last but not least, I want to mention OPAL, Online Programming for All Libraries. When staff came to me and told me about OPAL, it's one of those things where I thought it was too good to be true.

They said, "You have the capability to offer presentations to the library community online to enable chat modes to have presentations where you can go out to the web, and you can do it for under \$1,000. And I kept thinking, "What's the catch?" And I'm still waiting, but I haven't found a catch yet.

We've been very successful making OPAL presentations available on handbook, authentication, other things we're doing at GPO, but equally importantly, we opened up OPAL this year to the community and we started making OPAL presentations that you're doing available, and most importantly, archiving this information as well.

I encourage all of you to visit the desktop and look at opportunities to use OPAL for outreach and education. It's very easy to use and we'll help you any way we can in doing that.

Last but not least, it's never too important -- never too early, I should say, to start thinking about the importance of the next meeting. This spring, we're going to be in Tampa, Florida April 20th through the 22nd at the Hyatt Regency. Registration and hotel information will be made available through the desktop, and we'll also start the events countdown right after this conference.

I want to join Bob in commending Lance Cummins and his group for putting this together. There's no way we could do this without them, and if at any time you guys have questions about logistical information, please see them.

Finally, I want to conclude by thanking all of you for the work that you do each and every day, your commitment to government documents, your commitment to this program, and your commitment to the American public.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to Bob to announce our library of the year, and thank all of you.

MR. TAPELLA: You know, when I introduced Suzanne earlier, I talked about the fact that the Tulsa City County Library was the first library to receive the Federal Depository Library of the Year Award back in 2003. Today I have the privilege of announcing the 2008 winner.

Now many times, organizations give out awards based on something really unique such as a new program or a new project. And this time the selection committee took a slightly different approach, and in fact, they are focusing back on the basics -- serving the patron and serving the broad group of the

patron. And today's winner serves the largest county geographically in the United States.

Now what they're doing, and it's particularly interesting at this time of budget cutbacks and everything else that's going on, is they've extended their hours of operation and they are conducting extensive outreach to make certain that their patrons have the opportunity to get in and see them both in person and through their web presence.

And so, while some might say that it was selected simply because it comes from my home state, I would like to welcome up library board president Keith Davis and library director, Larry Meyer of the Law Library of San Bernardino County, California.

How are we going to do this, Ric?
Well, first of all, here is the beautiful
award that now has my fingerprints all over
it. And I think we're going to do a photo
shoot after, at the end of the session anyway.
But this is your award. And who's who?

MR. MEYER: That's Davis.

1 MR. TAPELLA: That's Davis. How are you? 2 MR. MEYER: Fine thank you. 3 MR. TAPELLA: Keith. Yes, Larry. 4 This is your award, and it reads, "Federal 5 Depository Library Program, Federal Depository 6 Library of the Year, 2008, Law Library for San 7 Bernardino County from the Government Printing 8 Office." 9 10 Congratulations, and now Ι understand I'm turning over the microphone to 11 you all for some remarks. 12 13 Larry, you get to hang onto it. Just don't drop it. 14 15 JUDGE DAVIS: Ladies and gentlemen, 16 good morning. My name is Keith Davis and I do have the privilege of being the president of 17 the Board of Trustees for the San Bernardino 18 19 County Law Library where I sit in that county as a superior court judge. 20 just heard the wonderful You've 21 comments about some challenges that our county 22

faces because of its size. It is difficult to

comprehend, as I return to the northern Virginia area where I spent many years while attending college -- It's difficult to comprehend the size of the county in which our library has the responsibility of trying to serve so many patrons.

Suffice it to say, our county is larger than over a half dozen eastern states. It is enormous. And we are presented with some unique geographic and population challenges that have presented over the years some difficulties for us.

As we approach our 25th year of being a federal depository library, it's important to let everyone know that we do not feel we could provide the excellent level of service to our patrons throughout our county were we not a federal depository library. We consider it a privilege to be one, and we are grateful for the opportunities that it affords us to extend those services to all of our patrons.

I also want to take a moment and

publicly acknowledge our wonderful executive director, Larry Meyer, who is behind me. His skill and vision have gone a long way -- And that may be him answering the phone, I'm not sure. I'm afraid to look. His skill and vision have gone a long way toward helping us navigate some very difficult and financially troubling times, and we've been able to do so successfully. That is, in no small measure due to his skill and his leadership, and I feel that incumbent upon me to publicly recognize all of those attributes that he brings.

On behalf of my colleagues on the Board of Trustees, on behalf of Mr. Meyer, I want to thank all of you for bestowing this honor and this award on all of us. It means a great deal to us. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen.

MR. MEYER: Again, I just want to add to what Judge Davis just said, and thank GPO. We're extremely honored. We're very appreciative of the award, not just for ourselves, but also for law libraries in

general, and especially those seven or so county law libraries around the country that have the honor of being federal depository libraries as well as the many county law libraries that have also shared housing agreements.

What I would ask you to do -- Not every state has a county law library, but I would really ask for those of you that do have county law libraries in your state, take some time. Call the law library. Go visit. Let them know what you do, but also let them tell you what they do. It's a great opportunity to do a lot of cross-training, cross-knowledge, to the benefit of the patrons, and that's really why we're all in it, is to help our patrons.

So again, thank you very much for this wonderful award.

MR. DAVIS: Gentlemen, again congratulations. Ric Davis, acting superintendent of documents.

I have one letter that I'd like to

read, and then I'm actually going to hand this letter to you guys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It says, "Dear Friends, I am pleased to learn that the Law Library for San Bernardino has been named recipient of the 2008 Federal Depository Library of the Year. I commend the library for its outstanding service to the residents of San Bernardino County.

"Thank you for your commitment to superior customer service and for your enthusiastic utilization of techniques technologies that have served your patrons and significant earned this merit. you Congratulations and best wishes as you fulfill your mission."

And it's signed by Senator Barbara Boxer from California.

I'm now going to turn it over to Tim, who is going to moderate any questions and answers.

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: Tim Byrne,
Department of Energy. Our procedure here will

be, we'll first open up the floor for questions from Council, and then we'll go to the floor. So do we have anything from Council?

One comment I would like to make about "Ben's Guide --" I'm extremely pleased to hear about the refresh. I taught a course in government information sources at the University of Tennessee last spring and actually gave an assignment that involved "Ben's Guide."

And I've always had very affectionate feelings for "Ben's Guide" and the students in my class had already had classes on assessing websites, so they came back and had a lot to say that was very nice about the content, but they really tore it to pieces. I mean, it was painful for me. So I'm really glad that it's going to be refreshed.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing Office. Thank you, Tim, for those kind words. The one thing that I think you're going to see as well is the difference between

1999 and 2008, is that the people who are using it expect more movement. They want Ben to do something, so you know, the content itself will be refreshed and updated as well, but most importantly, we're looking at better use of animation, you know, to draw in people who are more computer savvy than perhaps they were during that time period.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. SHULER: I just want to follow up very kind comment that superintendent mentioned about the Government Information Online Project. And I'd like the folks that are here involved in that project please stand and the deserved to get recognition that they have, please. Please?

This is a small section of the folks that, as of -- I checked this morning before I came to the meeting -- We have passed the 5,000th question e-mail chat session we've had with the public since February 11th. That's 5,000, and I got to say that is one sign of the success that this kind of cooperation, I think, that we've been talking about around

this table for a long time, and what we could 1 2 do with the technology as a community and in collaboration, so these good folks have put in 3 their time and their resources to do this, and 4 we're always looking for new members in the 5 team. 6 7 Ιf you're interested, contact myself of anybody else involved 8 in 9 on

myself of anybody else involved in the project, and let's keep building on that success. And I want to again thank everybody who has participated.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: I should have known John would be the first one to break the rules. If you don't start identifying yourself, I won't call on you.

MR. SHULER: Oh! John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: Anyone from the floor?

MR. TAPELLA: You're going to let us off that easy?

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University Libraries. And for the first time

in fifteen years, I will finally ask a question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This is for Ric. The project to digitize the legacy collections -- Do you anticipate any problems in competition with the commercial products that are already out there, and by that, the kind of problems I'm thinking about is the government not being allowed to be in competition with businesses in their projects.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing Office. I don't anticipate problems because from the standpoint that the information that we're looking to digitize is information that we've already freely made available through distribution to depository libraries.

So I'm not worried about that. What worried about when we put out this proposal was that we would get folks bidding on it who would want exclusivity in terms of I mentioned in my speech, access. And as that's one thing that is a deal-breaker

because as soon as we get digitized content back, I think that a partner or partners is certainly going to want to make use of it themselves, add value to it, potentially repurpose it for profit.

But, in keeping with the mission of the federal depository library program, we need to make free copy available, both for permanent public access and access-level copy.

MR. TAPELLA: You know -- Bob Tapella, Public Printer. There is one other piece that Ric didn't mention specifically on the digitization, and that which will be offered by GPO.

And that is the fact that we will be authenticating by digital signature our copies, which is something that a private vendor can't do, and it's not something that the government would ever give away in that sense. And so, that's going to be a significant difference between our version and a version that might be used by a private sector vendor in some other way.

MR. GOOCH: Mark Gooch from the
College of Wooster in Ohio. Kind of follow-up

question to Mary Jane's.

Has there been any thought in terms of how you might be able to piggy-back on projects like the University of Michigan's Google Books Project, in which those documents would be freely available to some degree because they're not under copyright?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: He said I wouldn't have to talk. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Almost broke the rule.

The Google Book Project and the University of Michigan -- Those might not be in conflict. It's part of what we're trying to do is work cooperatively with libraries to do this mass digitization project.

We see that not just one vendor or one recipient responder to the RFP is likely to take on everything, and so working together, we can make a quilt, so to speak. What we're looking for though, are preservation level tip images at this point,

and also access derivatives, and that's not exactly what's coming out of the Google Project and some of the other projects.

What it does do is move a priority for that material however. If it's available in an access derivative format, it goes from maybe a higher priority to a medium priority because there is something out there. But it's still our aim to do preservation level for the complete collection materials in a cooperative arrangement.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. About two, two and a half years ago, the community developed a priority list for digitization. Is that still going to be operative here or are we going to some other method of prioritizing? What gets digitized first?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. It's our opinion internally, that the list is still valid. What I do want to do after this meeting though is put it out there one more time, examine it again.

And part of the reason I want to do that is because the way we work, looking at it was a prioritization in terms of collections going back in ten year increments. I think that's a wise approach, but I'm also concerned about not waiting too long to get to materials

that are rapidly deteriorating.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State University. follow-up Ι have а digitization priority question. And that is, in terms of the legacy digitizing project, are the people who are bidding on the project deciding which part of the legacy collection, or is it all or nothing or -- Can you give us any more information about how that's shaking up?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I can't give too much in the way of specifics about the bidding process, but I will say the prioritization is being decided by GPO.

MS. WRIGHT: Connie Wright, Tufts University. With that legacy collection, how about looking to digitize what was originally

the public documents library that's now in the archives.

Is it able -- is that all one collection? I think it is. It's a record group, but that would get to some stuff that's not even out there anymore. Had you thought -- Were you going to do that?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. No, we can't really get to that material. We have opened discussions, and we believe that we can get in there and fill in gaps from that collection.

A lot of this material -- The fastest, most effective way of dealing with it is to disk-bind it, and that's not going to happen with material in National Archives. We have, like I said, opened conversations, as long ago as three years, where we would talk about digitizing materials. If we found a gap, we'd be working with NARA and our other partners such as the Library of Congress who often help us at this time and we've been helping them with some material too.

2

1

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington Libraries. Mr. Tapella brought up the "Future of Regional Libraries" document that was released this spring, and I understand that you were under a tremendous time-crunch to get out this document. And I want to commend you on the work that GPO did bringing that together. It really is a very rich document.

And so, the timing was difficult for everyone. The timing was certainly -- the time constraints that you all were given were pretty rough. The timing on the end of the library community -- As you know, we're pretty tough too because it was almost to the point of the comical. We were physically, many of Anaheim, at the American us, in Library Association meeting and didn't feel like we could respond as fully and with as reflection as we wanted to at that time, so it feels like we're opening a dialogue on that topic that's going to be going on for awhile because you called for, you know, the theme of

the next Council to continue to focus on these issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

conclusions to that In your one of the bullet points was the document, the Kansas-Nebraska potential approval of Regional and the need for Title 44, Chapter 19 of the US Code to be updated. Those were some of many conclusions. It's kind of curious because the beginning part of the document tells why there are all these legal reasons why these things cannot happen as of right now.

What I'm interested in is this notion of the revision of Title 44 and how it is that an agency begins to address the fact that it's enabling legislation it's or enabling law needs to be changed. Long story short is, I'm asking you, how much of a time -- What time period do you think it would take to really enact some change in Title 44? I know it's a loaded question.

MR. TAPELLA: I guess what I'd say is I wish I had a crystal ball in front of me.

We will be briefing our oversight committee,

I guess as soon as they come back with the

lame duck session with some of the findings

and with an executive summary.

And we don't really have an answer on the timing. What we can do is we can make recommendations, but it's Congress that has to act and I think as we move forward and look at some of the other findings that we have seen, we might -- we're going to do everything in our power to see if we can compel Congress to take some action.

And I think based on what we've been hearing recently from library more directors and some folks that are talking about maybe giving up their regional depository status, that may help us move the case forward.

But it is purely up to Congress and it's going to require both the House and the Senate, and then of course, the next President of the United States to sign off on it.

MR. DAVIS: That was a very good

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

question. Ric Davis, Government Printing Office. I think as you saw in reading that report, this is a journey. And if you look back at Title 44, there was a major change in 1962 with the creation of the regionals.

There was this little thing called Public Law 103-40 in 1993 that created GPO Access. And then about a year and a half -- or maybe even two years ago now -- through an exchange of memos, we were able to get a waiver on the printing of the monthly catalog.

That type of change was critical to the community, and much like any changes that we're looking at for the future in creating more flexible model, we're going to do it with an air of transparency, just like we did in releasing that report.

The one thing I don't want to do is to have us operate in any way in a vacuum, and before we start looking to make any type of change in the future, it will be communicated well with the library community, the library associations, and we'll gather feedback.

Mary Alice 1 MS. BAISH: American Association of Law Libraries. 2 points. The first is to commend GPO. As you 3 know, AALL has been working for a decade to 4 interest government entities to authenticate 5 their online legal information in particular, 6 online information needs 7 all authenticated. GPO is the only government 8 entity in this country who has down anything 9 10 on this issue. I applaud you. We're delighted that we're going to be seeing the bills, beta 11 test, as you mentioned, Ric, and beginning 12 with the 111^{th} , digitally signed -- That is 13

excellent.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Your standards for authentication are the kind of unofficial standards for our nation, and AALL is trying to get them out to the states as well, so I wanted to just thank you on behalf of, I'm sure everybody in the room, for your wonderful leadership in this most important endeavor.

And the second point just gets to "Ben's Guide," perhaps with a question. But I've been doing a lot of work with EPA and others to improve the quality of regulations.gov, and I remember when Judy Russell was SuDocs and regulations.gov was initiated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

that time, she was going to Αt perhaps put some information up on Guide" to help the American public, who has not been involved in any part of commenting on draft regulations, understand the process. The usage of regulations.gov is sky-high right don't think that the but I American public is aware of it, and I'm wondering --

So the question is, do you have a component already on "Ben's Guide" explaining the regulatory process and perhaps linking to regulations.gov and if not, I really urge you to include that with the re-launch. Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis from GPO.

Mary Alice, thank you for your kind comments

first and foremost about authentication and

you know, as part of an on-going educational

process, if there's anything we can do at GPO to help communicate that message, we're happy to do so.

"Ben's Guide" right now, you know, it's broken up by age group, and then there's a section for parents, teachers and educators, and I don't know so much at the level of the lower grades, but at the upper grades and for parents, teachers, and educators, we have links to regulatory information.

But I think what we really need to improve upon -- And I think this also ties back into some of the information you're going to hear about with the launch of GPO's federal digital system, I think there's a lot of confusion amongst the American public. I know you guys experience this every day in helping patrons with how the regulatory process works in government, how the law-making process works in government.

We get a lot of questions that now John and the folks at GIO help with about, you know, how a bill becomes a law, basic

information and being able to tie it all together. I think that's another improvement that you're going to see through the federal digital system about how you tie it all together -- you know, how can you go and search for a bill and follow it, track the legislation through the entire process until and if it becomes a law?

And likewise, we need to interlink that to the new "Ben's Guide" so that for those who are not at that more advanced level, to jump right in and start tracking legislation or regulatory information that is more of an explanatory process up front so they better understand it. That's a good thought.

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: I guess I would close with just one comment about the boot camp that the new Council members and the chair went through. Just so you dot think this was fun and games for us, it was really hard work. We had to double-time between meetings in full depository gear.

I also want to point out that the GPO web content folks are in the vendor area and they will show the desktop and answer questions all through these meetings. So let's adjourn this meeting and head out to lunch.

(Whereupon, the meeting broke for lunch and resumed at 12 p.m.)

PLENARY SESSION: FUTURE OF THE FDLP

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: Welcome back. Are we all ready for the Future of the FDLP, Strategic Planning, the sequel? With that, I will turn it over to Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Oh, man. I can't see over this. We're dealing with a short problem here. Just a minute. Now I can see you.

I guess, continuing with baseball analogy, what is this -- the second inning or is the bottom of the first? Welcome back. We've had a little inning break and we are here now to talk about the future of the FDLP and this is part 2 of Strategic Planning, and part 1 took place last spring in Kansas City. So I want to do a brief catch-up for those of

you who weren't able to be in Kansas City and then tell you how we've moved forward thus far, and then we will have some discussion with Council on the goals and the strategic direction, as well as input from you all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Previously at Council, we had a Fall 2007 recommendation to start the strategic planning process to move depository library program into a servicebased program rather than a collection-based started our session in program. So, as we Kansas City, this was our background.

And we talked about the vision. We talked about the mission of the program, some assumptions, and we began the SWOT analysis, looking at strengths, weaknesses, our opportunities, and threats. Unfortunately, didn't ran out of time and get completed, but there were an awful lot of good comments, and I went back and looked at the So there was an awful lot there transcripts. even though it may not have looked like it to begin with.

We've put up a strategic planning desktop. We the FDLP put the page on transcripts there. We put the presentation from the spring meeting, as well as subsequent discussions that we've had or presentations that we had had about the strategic planning process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And as Ric mentioned earlier this morning, the letter he sent out to depository library directors asking their thoughts on the value of being designated a depository library program -- the results that have come in have been looked at and viewed as part of this process as well.

Can you all see those? Are they clear in the book? I can read them on my monitor when I had this up, so I apologize if you all can't read them. Do you want me to read all of them to you? Yes, no. Since I don't need glasses now --

Okay, let me go through what has been added since. We came up with some very good strengths of the program and some outside

threats and some internal weaknesses. From looking at those, from looking at comments from the regional study, from looking at the value letters, we've come up with some opportunities. And this part is new, so let me run through the opportunities for you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Let's see if Т can sideways. More opportunities for partnerships -- and we've been doing this for some time now as you all know, but there have different kinds opportunities to of partnerships.

Opportunity for increasing access to government information. Opportunities to exploit emerging technologies. and new Opportunities to increase awareness of government information, not only to our community but beyond. Work with federal agencies to include new content into depository program. Expand continuing education and professional development. This including remote possibilities. Re-shape fits the FDLPso that it into the

footprint of libraries. Increase citizen involvement in the democratic process.

Some global opportunities are there, as well as potential cost-savings for depository libraries. Did I hear a "wow" on that one?

Okay, one of the -- maybe "controversy" is too strong of a word, but one of the points of discussion that was very strong in Kansas City was that we were making an incorrect assumption about moving to a service-based and away from collection-based.

And we went back to GPO. We heard you all loud and clear, and we did a lot of thinking about this, and we've decided that what we have in the online environment, that new technologies have allowed us is an environment that is described as "the blur."

It's described by Davis and Meyer as "the convergence of speak and activity and intangibles that creates indistinguishable lines between products and services and buyers and sellers."

So we think that this really sort of describes very well where we are now, and putting this in context of the FDLP -- If you look at "the blur" -- Is this a service or this is something for a collection, using the National Atlas of the US, you have a tangible product that is huge, and people go and they flip through the book to look at the maps and get what the need.

In the online environment, you have the National Atlas, and while there are some maps there for people to view online, you also have the opportunity for your users to create their own maps, and to determine what points they want on their map and what features they want on their map, and then they can download.

They can download information into GIS programs, and so in this case, it is more than something for collection. You're providing a service and then also the user becomes the information creator.

And we can see it with our own monthly catalog as well. No longer having the

print product for our collections, we now have the online catalog of government publications, which has far more features and far more flexibility and far more usability and findability than the monthly catalog in the print product.

And you heard this morning also that you'll be having more services available to you through this product. So service or communication -- there are lots of examples from the libraries that you all are in that are using RSS feeds in all kinds of ways to provide a current awareness service, for example, to those you serve. But it's also a means of communication.

We also have the example of John's GIO, Government Information Online, which indeed is a service, but you also have a lot of communication skills, new communication skills, that we need when we're talking with people who are not in front of us.

And our own desktop -- Also, another example of this, and you'll hear more about this from

Karen later and the community.FDLP.gov.

Collection or communication -- With the mixed media that you have on the Internet sites, the websites of the agencies, the radio transcripts from the White House, the policy pod-casts from the State Department, all these other examples that you have out there. The agencies are communicating to the public and informing them, but these are also things that we would find in a library collection.

So this is what we've come up with for our new shape. We have a triangular pyramid, and at the base of the pyramid is access to depository materials. That's the foundation of the pyramid. It's the foundation of our program, and that's what we're all about.

So we have a face of the pyramid for services. A face of the pyramid for collections and one for communication, and all of those are represented equally in this triangle because they support and work together as a means to provide the access. So

we're about collections. We're about services. It's both, and communicating amongst us with agencies and with our users. And at the foundation of all that is the access and being user-centric to provide the access to the way the users need the information.

This triangle also represents, as you climb up it into а more electronic environment where "the blur" starts to happen at the top of the pyramid. And you have the base of our more than 100 year history, our legacy collections All those years ___ experience where have created the we traditions and the strength of the program.

And working around all of this is this environment of collaboration and flexibility that we need for the future. And we think that this model fits and meets the needs of all the varieties of libraries, all the varieties, all the types of libraries that we have in the program, as well as the users that they serve and their diverse needs.

So as we went further into the

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

strategic planning process, we have these words of wisdom. Organizations that adapt to change while at the same time retaining their core ideology are the most successful and lasting. And that's what we want to be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So at the core, we have our Principles of Government Information, and you all have seen these before. "The public has the right of access to government information. Government has the obligation to disseminate provide broad pubic to it's and access information. Government has an obligation to guarantee the authenticity and integrity of its information, and government has an obligation preserve its information. to Government information created or compiled by government employees or at government expense should remain in the public domain."

So from the core ideology, looking at the letters that Ric received about the value of the depository program, looking at the strengths that we identified in our SWOT analysis, we've come up with the values of

access collections, collaborationcommunication expertise and professionalism,
services and stewardship. And the next couple
slides describe each of those values.

So after discussion in Kansas City, we went back to the drawing board, and if you recall, our vision in the spring was to -- The vision of the FDLP was to have government information at your fingertips. There was a lot of discussion about that. I went back to Washington and took the Metro into work the next day and all these saw signs posted through the Metro system that the Library of Congress had posted, "Integrity at Your Fingertips, Ingenuity at Your Fingertips."

And I thought, "Oh, boy. It's a blessing they didn't write that "at your fingertips," because it was clearly everywhere in the DC area, so we came up with something new -- Not only for the reasons that you all had in the spring, but because it was also being used in other ways.

So the vision that we have now is

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

"The Federal Depository Library Program will provide government information when and where it is needed in order to create an informed citizenry and an improved quality of life."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The mission of t.he Federal Depository Library Program is to provide, for no fee, ready and permanent public access to federal government information now and for future generation Achieved through organizing process that enabled desired information to be identified and located, assistance rendered trained expert bу professionals in а network of libraries. Collections of publications at a network of libraries, an archived online information dissemination products from GPO access, federal agency websites, and partner websites.

We presented assumptions at Kansas City and there was not any disagreement with the assumptions that we had made, but I've included them in the presentation just as a refresher for you all. There were quite a few assumptions.

So the vision and mission that we've identified has been driving us all along in what we've been doing -- A smattering of what GPO has been working on representing the direction of this vision, trying to get information out there wherever and whenever users need it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So we've come up with four goals and we would like Council's thoughts on these goals and any thoughts about additional goals that you think need to be included. And at this point, I'm going to turn the program over to Gwen.

SINCLAIR: Good afternoon. I'm MS. Gwen Sinclair of the University of Hawaii at Manoa. What we'd like to do now is go through each one of these goals individually, first we'll take comments from Council and then after Council has had an opportunity to will take comment, we comments from And I'd like audience. just to please give everyone to your name ans affiliation when it's your turn the

microphone.

So, the first goal is develop a model for the FDLP that allows more flexibility for partner libraries. And I'd like to ask Council, is this a goal that we have consensus on or does the wording need to be altered in order for it to be acceptable to us?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer from the National Coordination Office. I wonder about the choice of the word "flexibility." Does that mean that GPO is more flexible? Does that mean the network is more flexible? Does that mean the system is more adaptable to the user? And is it really flexibility or capability that you're trying to enable?

I mean, what's the purpose of flexibility for the partner libraries? My guess is the purpose is to allow them to build capability, to provide services to their users to meet their own mission, that kind of thing, so I have -- That's -- Let me stop there. Is "flexibility" the right word?

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes, I think I -when I read "flexibility" -- This is Gwen
Sinclair at the University of Hawaii.

When I read that word "flexibility," I guess I, like many of you, probably think about all of the rules and regulations that bind us, and if I'm not mistaken, that's where the original concept comes from -- is the idea that we need to have guidelines and our other governing documents that are not so specific that they require us to operate in a particular way that doesn't make sense any longer.

Ken?

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I guess, part of my comment are the first and last goal -- kind of tie together. Rather than the word "flexibility," I just think we should be looking at more partner libraries, if that's what you want to call them.

If we're going to be phase access, do we stick to the same model we have now

which are the quote/unquote depository libraries, or do we foster greater ability for all types of libraries to provide access to federal information?

MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from Council? David?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I think there has always been a great deal of tension between the rules which flesh out the basic laws behind the FDLP, instructions to depository libraries, and now the new handbook -- A tension between that and the fact that there have always been in this program multi-type libraries with vastly different missions, vastly different clientele, and policies.

And so how do you reconcile the realities of those different missions to a standard set of procedures? And I think it has always been messy. There's never been 100 percent compliance in this program ever.

And so, I don't have a particular problem with the word "flexibility," although

yo could certainly come up with synonyms for that, but I think the problem is always going to be there. You know, we have to adhere to certain standards, but on the other hand, we're dealing with democracy in the raw out there, in this system. But I don't know how you would state that succinctly as a goal, per se, and get that idea in there.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Other comments from Council?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. The vision and mission speak to this issue of "anytime, anywhere" access for the user to government information, and yet this goal to me, doesn't speak to either that vision or the mission.

It speaks about how partner libraries will participate, presumably as an indirect result or a second order result of this effort -- Which is goal number 1 towards flexibility is to increase that "anytime, anywhere" access, but it's not clear to me from the goal how that happens.

And it's

1 MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State University Law School. It's hard for me 2 to think of these goals in the order that 3 4 they're listed. And so to me, when I think about this, job 1 of the government 5 actually do develop and manage a comprehensive 6 7 collection and increase access to

usefulness of federal information.

to develop a model for FDLP.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It seems to me that the two most important goals here are the last two that are listed, and that if there's consensus on those -- And whenever you have to make strategic choices with resources, that, I think the case we're only going to really move that forward in а different way if formalizing, especially the bottom two goals, and the other two actually flow out of that.

only when those systems are in place that you

can then go to really, the process, which is

So for me, it's just hard to talk about these first two that are listed because to me, the core ones are three and four. And

part of strategic planning is setting priorities among all of them. And I would also -- My last comment for the moment is that goals three and four are the prime -- In my view, the primary job of the government and goals -- The top two really speak to federal depository library program and libraries, and to me, we need help in these, but the responsibility and the mind-set has to come from the community.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay, I do need to mention that these goals are not in any sequence. They're not intended to be in a 1,2,3,4, which is why they're not -- They're just bullets, not numbers.

Other comments from Council? -- On bullet point -- The first bullet point? -- Okay, then I'd like to open it up to the audience for comments.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

MS. SINCLAIR: I don't think the mike is on.

1 MS. SMITH: Alright, I'll talk loud. Lori Smith, southeastern Louisiana University. 2 It seems to me that it's all about incentives, 3 should minimize 4 maybe it be SO disincentives for libraries to partner with 5 the FDLP or maximize the incentives, rather 6 7 just saying "flexibility." It's rewards and benefits that seems to be the core 8 effect to me. 9

MS. SINCLAIR: Any other comments about the first goal?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake Forest Law. I look at the first listed goal as really an issue of statutory interpretation allowing us as participants in this program, to interpret the statute that enables us to be here in a way that evolves with the evolving environment in which we're all working and the evolving technology that allows us to do things in a different way than we did 40 years ago and 10 years ago.

So I don't look at is as an incentive or a disincentive, but an ability to

continue to have Title 44 relevant by interpreting it in today's world.

DR. GREER: Ma'am, can I go out of order?

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I'd kind of like to know from the audience what the word "flexibility" means to you when you read this. Can a few of you who have an interpretation of that help us with -- Now that you've read it, what does it mean to you?

MR. IVERSON: David Iverson from Minot State University in Minot, North Dakota.

I'm a first-time attendee so I beg your indulgence.

We had to -- I became responsible for government documents a year ago, and right after I was given that responsibility we were told to drastically cut our collection. And we were told to do it within the space of a three-month period this past summer to make way for an information commons. And we were

confronted with the rules for listing documents to be identified for weeding, and we to work with our regional depository had library, which consists of both the University North Dakota North Dakota of and State University.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And this created quite a bit of stress for myself and my full-time assistant, well public service librarian as my as colleagues as we try to plan for information commons. So to me, the statement would pertain directly to finding a way to where could preserve we government information, but in a way where if we're faced with a drastic need to reduce our collections, that we could find a way to do that without violating the rules or being penalized.

And I think there's a session scheduled later this week that talks about that where one library went ahead and did that to you know, downsize their collection so that they could get a grant. And I'm planning on attending that session so maybe if one of

those people are here today they could speak
to that as well. But that's how I would
interpret that particular statement. Thank

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

you.

MR. KOBULNICKY: Michael Kobulnicky from the Kent State Tuscarawas campus, also a first time attendee, and as my colleague said, I beg your indulgence.

We are a regional campus of a major university, and of course, we're fighting space and staff problems, so we decided to do everything electronically. The flexibility indicates assessing the need, approaching the way to best satisfy our customer's needs and be responsive in a timely manner.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Are we -- Did we --

MR. DAVIS: One more from this end.

Sorry. Ric Davis, Government Printing Office.

This has sort have been insinuated in the conversation, but it's something I want to add. I think when we were looking at this

GPO, we were looking at it also in terms of the one-size-does-not-fit-all model. Ιf look at how we operated the program in the past, I think a lot of the guidance that we -- whether it be of in terms put out instructions that are manual, how we ran the inspection program Ιt was prescriptive. And from my perspective, I think a lot of the best ideas have bubbled up from the depository community, rather than GPO. So looking top-down from we're engaging in that type of dialogue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SINCLAIR: Chris, did that help?

DR. GREER: I think what I heard
from -- Chris Greer, National Coordination
Office -- I think what I heard from those who
responded in the audience was this was an
opportunity for you to set some of your own
rules and standards to meet your users' needs
and so on.

But I think what I'm hearing from GPO is a little bit of that, but also more of a partnership model. One in which this sort of

shared decisions about these processes, procedures, standards, all of those kinds of things -- an opportunity for more network input -- Is that --? A mixed nodding, so I think to the degree this speaks to that, it makes sense to me.

MS. SINCLAIR: So we might be looking at re-wording this to say "Develop a model for the FDLP that allows for more partnerships between GPO and partner libraries in developing the guidelines."

David?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California Library. Chris, State to you partnership and partnerships and flexibility are not really the same thing. And I'm wondering if we might be able to put the word "partnership" or imply the word "partnership" in the second bulleted point since to me, the is depository libraries network of the partnership in the whole mix here, and so retain "flexibility" in the first bullet and put "partnership" explicitly in

second bullet.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay, does -- We've had a little proposal for re-wording on the first bullet point. I'm not sure that we have a consensus on the right way to re-word it.

Ken?

WIGGIN: Well, I hate to get into words with these meetings, but you know, it's also the word "model" begins to bother me too. I mean, what I'm hearing is you want a flexible program. You know, а "model" implies, "Well, here's how you do it. It's got some flexibility." I mean, I think what I'm hearing is people just want flexible а program.

MS. SINCLAIR: "Develop a flexible program." Well, we'll come back to the tweaking of the wording, but we do have to move on the second goal, which to "Strengthen the network of depository libraries." And we've already touched on that a little bit, but what further comments do you folks on Council have? Chris?

DR. GREER: I'm not being shy. Chris Greer from the National Coordination Office.

This actually seems to me a very important point -- Network of depository libraries, and what the goal is there.

I don't think you mean incremental. The way it's written, it seems incremental, but I think you mean something more. So for example, by analogy to the Internet, when you as a user go to use the Internet, how many Internets do you, you know, expect to interact with? With one.

There are 200,000 independent networks making up the Internet today, but you don't see that as a user. You just have one Internet. Each of those 200,000 has their own business model, their own laws and regulations because they're distributed around the globe, their own user base, etcetera, etcetera.

But they works as if they were one, so you know, I'd ask the same question about the depository libraries. If you're a user, how many libraries do you want? I would say

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the answer is one where I could get everything that I need. So does this goal speak to that notion of a user having, you know, a simple experience with the FDLP system and being able to find everything you need in sort of one-stop shopping. Is that implied here?

MS. SINCLAIR: Katrina?

STIERHOLZ: Katrina Stierholz MS. from the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Chris, I think you could look at it that way, where you see it as a single entity, that I think librarians But see users as a unique set of people, and so the network would be these libraries that have their own user group, just like you talk about Internets and you see users as a single group, and I think librarians see their own users as a unique set of people, and they design -hopefully -- something from the FDLP or from GPO. That is, they pull just what their users want and make a unique set of information for them that meets their needs. And that's how I feel.

1 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. to respond to that, I agree with that model in 2 the sense that user community envisioned by a 3 library is sort of like an application where a 4 group that's using a specific value-added 5 service on top of the Internet -- The Internet 6 7 itself is, you know, an inter-operable network on which you build those value-added services, 8 as a foundation of this 9 the GPO acts 10 pyramid as kind of the single piece build 11 allows each library their to own application services, value-added components 12 13 on top of that to serve our community. But

MS. STIERHOLZ: I think we agree on that. Yes.

MS. SINCLAIR: Kathy?

it's still underlying that one source.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public. When Ι that, I saw was thinking what we've been doing with the regionals. We're trying to get the network of, you know, between two states, or maybe we'd do it between a public and an academic, somehow strengthening the ties between other depositories in a different way, and that also goes back to the flexibility of if we gather things in the census and somebody else does agriculture, how can we get those together and strengthen that network so our users can really know that these networks exist and they can get the same information from different sources?

MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from Council? Tory?

MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State University. I look back over the assumptions and I didn't see one that really spoke to the idea that the new notion that one-size-does-not-fit-all. And it might be a strategy to add an assumption that speaks on that because it seems to me if you have that in the assumptions, then these other ones go a little better.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay, I think we're ready to move to comments from the audience.

And those of you who are thinking about saying

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

something but are a little bit afraid of getting up at the microphone, please do come up and speak because we on Council obviously cannot visit everybody and we kind of live in our own little worlds, and we really are interested in hearing what people have to say.

MS. ORMES: Dorothy Ormes. I'm a new person here, and I'm from New Mexico State University Library. I feel that that second -- Although they're not in apparently -- implies some kind of scaffolding which I think is really important. You've got this basic scaffolding, and it goes back to the first one. I would take out that word "more." mean, how could you be I flexible than what, you know? You want scaffolding that's flexible. That, I think, is really what you're trying to say.

MS. BIRKAM: I'm Anne Birkam from the Public Libraries of Saginow in Saginow, Michigan. I see that we have a core group of users in my city, but we have also served people from other arts of the country just

because -- there's something called WorldCat.

We put all our recrds for all our books and materials on WorldCat so people can go and see, Oh, they have this particular collection of family papers in our geneology collectin which has some Civil War letters that people wrote home to people in Saginow.

And we had a patron -- I don't remember what state it was from -- But he was so excited about this collection of Civil War letters. He said, "Oh, you have the best collection of Civil War letters of anybody I've found here," so you can see that you have your users at home, but you have users across the country. And I think that fits in really well with the federal depository library system because we're supposed to be serving everybody.

MS. SINCLAIR: Geoff?

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells,
Northwestern University Library. Couple points
on bullet number two. I noticed there's a
change in language from bullet number 1 where

in bullet number 1, we have "flexibility for partner libraries," and in bullet number 2, we have "strengthening the network of depository libraries."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I really like the language of "partner libraries" because I see it as being sort of "depository libraries plus," increasingly we're trying to reach out beyond our base of depository libraries. And that's not abandoning the base, but to reach out to a broader community that now has access to this material, might like so I to see discussion of whether "partner" belongs there.

The other thing is, I think one of the -- This really talks about strengthening of base, and that's great. But one of the things that's really going to strengthen depository libraries and other partner libraries is for the program to encourage innovation and excellence. And I don't see that in there, and I'd really like to see that, and I think that's in fact part of the whole flexibility notion. We would like to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

build capacities and capabilities in unique ways and bring folks to our portals in a variety of unique ways, so I'd like to see that added as well.

MS. SINCLAIR: I think a lot of the points that we're making underscore the difficulty of strategic planning where you have to decide what goes in your goals and then what goes into the strategies that you engage in to meet those qoals and sometimes difficult to determine what where.

But in a moment -- Once we get through it, these goals -- We will be talking about strategies and some of what the people are saying might fit into that.

Any additional comment on bullet -- The second bullet point. John?

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Following on Geoff's comments, is my sense that the authors of these goals equate partner libraries with depository libraries or one and the same?

MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy says "yes."

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay, let's go on to the third -- Oh, my Dan-detector wasn't working.

MR. BARKLEY: First, I've met my new selective down in New Mexico State. Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico.

If that's the case -- if we're changing the definition and that changes the complexion of the first two bullet points then -- Because I like what Geoff said about the fact that we need -- If we're going to increase partnerships, it's got to be not only within the parameters of whatever scope it is, whatever model we're trying to develop here, but also, we spend a hell of a lot of time trying to reach out to a lot of different parties, and now it almost seems that we're either going to include them again or we're going to exclude them.

So maybe I'm just having a thinhaired blonde moment -- I don't know. But I have to wonder, you know, with bullet point number 2, in order to provide strength, you provide flexibility. And like a former chief justice once said, or to paraphrase him -- I don't know what -- "I can't define flexibility, but I know what it is when I see it."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And I'm kind of wondering if maybe we're not going about swimming upstream here and maybe we need to look at results-oriented before we develop the goals first.

What are the results we're trying to achieve here? What is it exactly we're trying to do with this program? Are we trying to increase flexibility among ourselves? Are actually looking at maybe ignoring or we possibly providing flexibility to a certain part of Title 44 that we've had discussions on, and going outside those parameters a little bit, while saying we're staying inside. I'm not encouraging anyone to break laws here, of course. But at the same time, I'm kind of wondering what we're trying to achieve here.

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: Tim Byrne,
Department of Energy. Council has struggled
with the use of the word "partner" in the
past, and I think it's used in a number of
different ways in the FDLP. I think we need to
be cautious about how we use it there.

MS. HANN: Christine Hann, Kalamazoo
Public Library. I just would like to comment
that I haven't clearly formed my opinion
regarding -- Yes, I have.

I do think it's important to reach out to try to incorporate other libraries that are not designated as depository libraries in partnership with the goal of making government information accessible to as many people as possible.

And then the other think I want to say is if you mean depository libraries, then you need to say depository libraries specifically. Or if we mean partner libraries, then we need to say that specifically.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Let's move on

to the third bullet point. "Develop and manage a comprehensive collection of online federal publications within the scop of the FDLP."

Council?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I think with this particular statement, you would have to tell us who is managing and who is developing this collection because in the Internet model, it isn't a matter of possession at one level.

It's a matter of access, yet this goal implies a great deal of possession by somebody, somewhere. And if the heart of the traditional depository relationship with GPO is based on possession of collections -- if, through the magic of the Internet, the comprehensive legacy-based collection of federal publications suddenly comes into our life by January 1, 2010, a lot of directors thinking will be complete -- That would have completed the the algebraic equation in their mind which views their collections

occupying space that they have other desires for.

And if we have a digital collection that exists elsewhere outside our physical space, then what is a depository library? What do we have left? Which I suppose is answered by the other two bullet points, but that is not here nor there.

So I think this opens up a huge existential issue about the relationship between the GPO as the mother-ship and the smaller planets that orbit it, if I could mix my metaphors.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valparaiso University Law Library. I'm just
curious trying to parse out this wording. It's
comprehensive but within the scope, so that
limits that it's not really comprehensive. I
mean, I'm not sure what is outside the scope
that wouldn't be part of comprehensive. I'm
confused.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. There are lots of government

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

works that are not within the scope of the FDLP, and what we're talking about in the comprehensive collection -- It's a comprehensive FDLP collection.

Does that make sense?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes. I think so. It just seems those words -- The wording is sort of contradictory, but maybe not. I've got to get used to ambiguity here, I guess.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. Would "complete" be a better word to use their instead of "comprehensive?" "Develop and manage a complete collection of online publications under the scope of FDLP."

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I guess I'm just wondering why we're singling out online and ignoring rest of the tangible objects in our collection. When I think, in fact, a goal should be to ensure that have these we collections, whether they be online tangible or whatever may come along, to ensure

that there's continued access.

I mean, to me, if the goal is to make sure the government information is there long-term, what form it takes, I think, becomes part of the strategic element.

MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from Council? Okay, let's see --

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University. Thank you for that wonderful leadin. The whole issue of things that are within the scope -- I'd like to use as an example the FBIS program.

FBIS was within the scope of the Federal Depository Program when it was microfiche. It moved to unusable CD-ROMS. It has existed for many years as a list item, but it meets that last -- I'm going to mix up my I think it was the last bulleted point in the mission statement about government information is that which is compiled and collected by a federal agency, blah, blah, blah.

We have been asking for years to

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

get access to the online database, the FBIS. And a few years ago, we heard at this meeting that online databases are not within the scope, so US depository librarians or partner librarians or whatever you want to call us, need to know what that scope is, and what is realistic and what is not realistic.

But that's a great example of a government information product that some of us are now spending a large amount of money to access through a commercial vendor that we would have just as soon not have to spend, but cannot get to the current information because it's outside the scope.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida. I apologize. I'm going to be going back to the first two bullets, but out of Dan's comments and some others -- This idea of he flexibility and what's a "partner" and what's a "depository."

I think -- Maybe it's a different goal, but it has increased the number of libraries that have a relationship with the

depository materials and government information. We're talking about trying to -in addition to depository libraries in the traditional sense -- those other libraries that could increase their direct involvement and access to the information without managing a collection when it actually becomes a little bit more formalized relationship than just "They know where things are on the web."

MS. MEISTER: Marcia Meister,
University of California at Davis. The term
"scope" also brought to mind another issue for
me, and that's -- It clearly begs the
definition of the term within "scope of the
program," but I hope that the scope of the
program materials is not just limited to those
things published in Washington, DC.

My concern is the continuing and growing concern about regional federal government agency publications. And I just want to hope that they are included in whatever "scope" we come to. Thanks.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay, I'm going to go

to Ric next.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I want to still go back to John's good point about the role of the GPO mother-ship.

I think the way I see it is, it's sort of been an administrative aspect. In accordance with Title 44, we have bring requirement to content bibliographic control, to acquire it, make it available, etcetera. I see the role of GPO not as one of possession long-term, but again, one of partnership.

And I give as an example what we're doing right now with the digital registry. We opened that up and we're looking at what other partners are doing, but it's sort of like, you know, hurting cats and finding out what each other are doing. And we're playing that administrative role to create awareness so we're not duplicating effort.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. Bullet point number 3 seems to me an apt place that we should get

the phrase "permanent public access" into a goal somewhere, so maybe develop and provide permanent public access to whatever you decide

to say with the rest of that sentence.

And maybe one of our goals -- It's sounding to me anyway, should be to re-define or re-name what the libraries in the program are called because it could be "federal data library partnership" or something if we want to keep the initials, but I think "depository" is a word we need to re-consider perhaps.

MS. SINCLAIR: I'm going to go to Steve next.

MR. HAYES: I would go back to number three, and again, it goes toward the scope. I think these should be aspirational in what you're trying to do with goals, yet we put a phrase in there, "within the scope of." And then going to point number 1, we're searching for a replacement for "flexibility."

Again, I think, many of the guidelines are looked at as -- Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame. Sorry. It will never

happen again. Do you want me to start over? I didn't think so.

The flexibility is the search for flexibility. When I left Government Documents 15 years ago, and the first thing that happened was the new person took over was going to be inspected.

Robin tried to emphasize that, you know, the rules and regulations are really guidelines to help you meet the goals of the program, not to bind you with, "Oh. What do the rules say I can and cannot do?"

And your point number 1, I think you're trying to move it away from something that restricts and instead you're trying to identify those that can enhance the contribution, "moving the program forward," to quote my director -- moving the program forward to the goals.

The scope of number 3, again, is a limiter. It's limited because we're still thinking in terms of an old model of paper.

Much of what was out-of-scope was because we

couldn't afford to print it, write it, and pay
for it, so therefore it's out-of-scope.

Unless you're going to go with the Title 44,

which means, you know, that internal use only,

if I remember things correctly. That's out of

scope. Well, you know, we knew that there were

certain things that would say it's internal

use only.

So I think you want to move these to aspirational, put as few limitations on it as you can, and move it toward -- develop and manage a comprehensive collection without the limiter of "except," you know, it has to be within the scope kind of thing. At least within your goal, it can be aspirational.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Since the question of scope came up, I'm going to read you "scope."

"In accordance with Superintendent of Documents Policy, the scope for tangible materials for the Federal Depository Library Program includes all published information, products regardless of format or medium, which

are of public interest or educational value, or produced using federal funds. Exceptions are those products for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes that are not of public interest or do not have educational value, classified for reasons of national security, the use of which is constrained by privacy considerations or that that must be sold by the publishing

cooperative publications.

"All federal information dissemination products published on an agency's or an agency's official partners publicly accessible website and originating from or funded by the agency are intended for public use and are to be considered within the scope of the FDLP."

agency in order to be self-sustaining, that is

MR. KOBULNICKY: Michael Kobulnicky,
Kent State Tuscarawas. I was trying to
remember, but you just read, and thank you for
reading that in full.

The other thing on "comprehensive"

-- And as I was listening to the discussion,

perhaps there is a very good parallel already

in place, the Library of Congress cataloguing

guidelines. Those are not claiming to be

complete, but they are certainly comprehensive

we have.

MS. FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley College. I wonder, in bullet 3, where the needs of our users are. I thought that we were supposed to provide our users with government information in the format in which they could best use it. So it feels like in number 3, we're assuming that the best format for all our users is online.

to give guidance to a wide range of materials

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: Tim Byrne,
Department of Energy. Now, I do agree in that
we want to have a complete collection of
online federal publications. I've given a
collective discussion at the last Council
session on the concern people had about the
lack of attention to collection. And with
John's comment about what the goals of some of

1 our library directors are in terms of space wanting replace 2 and to the depository collections as soon as they can -- I really 3 think we need to have a goal that addresses 4 the desire to maintain access to more tangible 5 documents until we digitize them. 6 7 MS. SINCLAIR: Anybody else on this third bullet point? -- Then we'll leap ahead 8

to this last bullet point.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

"Increase access and the of federal information." usefulness Council?

MR. SHULER: Absolutely not.

MS. SINCLAIR: It's perfect in every way?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. The word "usefulness" --I'm having a little trouble with, obviously. Really, I think what you're trying to say is "usability," the impact of that information that -- You're not saying that federal agencies, you know, should write in a more clear way. Certainly they should, but

that's not here in this goal.

So, it is the sense of the Council that this is, you know, usability and impact and all of those things that go with it?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valparaiso University Law Library. Besides
increasing access to -- And I agree with
"usability." I like that, but I would also
like to see us have in there something about
the "permanent public access."

It seems like that's -- because we don't just want the access now, but the continuing, you know, into the indefinite future access.

And I think probably the usability or usefulness or whatever, is also talking about the authentication and protection with the digital signature so maybe it was just trying to use the general word to cover those points.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Just going off of what Sally was saying, I do think that we do

need to put somewhere in one of the four goals 1 2 "the permanent public access" because me with the flexibility if we're concerns 3 going to make those rules and guidelines more

flexible. 5

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

You've already, historically, have seen that we have increased the number of depository libraries to make access geographically for everybody in the United States to be able to have access within their congressional district. And if start we letting people be flexible, and they start saying, "Oh, well that means that I don't have to let people into my library, you know, then we're going to start having access issues.

So I would really like to make sure we have something that says "permanent public access," because that is the main goal of the FDLP, and we want to make sure that that's carried over into these goals.

Anybody MS. SINCLAIR: else on Council? David?

> David MR. CISMOWSKI: Cismowski,

23

1 California State Library. It's become little obvious to me there are really more 2 than four goals. And I've participated in 3 4 strategic planning and Ι have never anywhere a rule that says that you're limited 5 to four goals. 6 So perhaps we ought to expand the 7 goals that we have here and re-visit this 8 either at a future meeting or throw this out 9 10 to the community for comments, and do word-smithing battling. 11 MS. SINCLAIR: Well, certainly this 12 13 is just one step in the strategic planning. CISMOWSKI: Yes, I understand 14 MR. 15 that. 16 MS. SWEET: Ellen Sweet, Department of Justice. I speak on my own behalf today, 17 and I'm an ex-depository librarian. 18 19 really points to possibilities for the mothership looking at things in a different way. 20

21

22

23

to the mike? Thanks.

MS. SWEET: I see a lot of

MS. SINCLAIR: Can you stand closer

opportunity for the mother-ship to do things in a different way. There are a lot of statutory impediments, but I think that there's a lot of opportunity there for really widening the scope of what GPO can or really ought to be doing, particularly in terms of usefulness of federal information.

When I was in depository library land, the issue was really service and access, and not just to provide the documents and themselves, but the indexes, the tools, wherever they came from. And I just heard people talk about things that they can't get, except commercially, but it would really be nice if GPO could, you know, go back to the drawing board in terms of it's statutory authority and could try and get some contacts for folks to create indexes to do certain things, etcetera, etcetera.

And the other thing that I would like to say is that there are a lot of federal government collections that are not depository libraries, that are under siege. But when

they close down, if the Library of Congress doesn't want their documents, they can be discarded.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

terrible, terrible And it's а waste, and there isn't an easy way or even a statutory requirement that that material be fed back into the loop. I deal with it every A lot of it is a secret. You have to day. know somebody. It's very unfortunate, but it's something for folks to be aware there's all that stuff out there and as they get shut down or un-staffed, nothing happens with the documents unless somebody wants it and then they just sit in a box for 10 years until somebody comes along and throws it away.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is going to have to be the last comment because we're running out of time.

MR. KOBULNICKY: Michael Kobulnicky,
Kent State Tuscarawas. Two other people who
have spoke earlier spoke of a very important
part regarding to access privatization. That
has to be addressed, I think.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Thank you all very much for your comments. Obviously, we still have a lot of work to do on defining exactly what the goals are and how they're stated.

But what we wanted to do next was go on and talk about some strategies that could be used to implement these goals once they've been finalized, so I'd like to turn it over to Sally.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I would -Obviously, we have 15 minutes -- Sally
Holterhoff, of Valparaiso University Law
Library.

Council, we don't really have time.

We have 15 minutes maybe, to do all four of these. Do you have a preference on which one we should talk about the strategies for first?

We can just go in the order that they are in currently or we could move another one ahead.

Does anyone have a preference?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer from National Coordination Office. Based on the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

discussion that I heard of the goals, it sounded like the inverse order was of greater interest --at least to me.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Start with 4 then?

DR. GREER: Yes.

MS. **HOLTERHOFF:** Okay. Alright, looking at the fourth goal, which I don't know if we've changed the working or not, but "increase the access and usefulness to federal information" is what's currently there. And the strategies that are listed if you can take a look up there -- The first one -- I'll just read the main four strategies.

"Develop and improve discovery and navigation tools. Create bibliographic and metadata records. Expand authentication activities for online government information dissemination products. Explore using innovative technologies such virtual as worlds, MySpace. Work to initiate use of a mark to identify government public domain noncopyrighted resources."

So these are five possible

strategies to work toward this goal. Any comments from Council about these? Or suggestions for other ones?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. Can I get one clarification? Are these strategies intended to apply to GPO or to the partnership of libraries including GPO?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Cindy, could you answer that?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. It could apply to GPO or the libraries. Either one, or together.

DR. GREER: So that -- Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I think this gets out to this basic issue that Ric is speaking to earlier about a notion of true partnerships -- Not just flexibility, but true partnership, and so navigation tools, metadata records, all of those things -- If put off in a unilateral way, sort of the mother-ship, I guess it the language we've adopted now. Thanks, John.

Whereas, doing this in partnership creates the flexibility that not one-size-fits-all and so on. So it seems to me it's essential that this be viewed as a shared effort across the partners of the community.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Okay, thank you, Chris. Any other comments from Council to follow up on that or anything else? Alright then, anyone from the audience want to comment on any of these strategies?

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, southeastern Louisiana University. I'm actually cheating and going back a little. I think that "increased access" to that goal should include "increased awareness of," specifically "public awareness of."

And maybe there should be a marketing strategy that would tie in with, you know, creating a MySpace page. You would then include the URL for the MySpace page in the marketing materials. Since that's a new venture of GPO, a new push, we should have a goal that supports that.

1 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Thank you. Yes? MS. SCRUGGS: Hi. Sarah Scruggs from 2 the GPO. I think this is a helpful goal. I'm 3 not sure why we haven't included the use of 4 the information. If we do all of these things, 5 don't we want people to actually use the 6 7 materials? HOLTERHOFF: So would that be 8 another goal or would that be a strategy? 9 10 MS. SCRUGGS: Well, I think you could include it with "increasing access." If 11 you're going to increase the access, the point 12 13 also want people to is you the information. 14 15 if we have these strategies, 16 don't we need the end -- the user to use the information? 17 HOLTERHOFF: Okay, thank you. MS. 18 19 Thanks for clarifying. Yes? Bill 20 MR. SUDDUTH: Sudduth, University of South Carolina. I think this is 21 pretty much on the same point. It also goes 22 discussion about 23 back to the the

"usefulness." I think what we were heading toward was "usability." You get toward "usability," that becomes a partnership activity because the users are where we are at, and we can help the usability as these things become developed. I think that's what we're trying to go at at this point. So I think "usability" and then that becomes a partnership activity.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Okay, thank you.
Yes?

MS. SIELAFF: McKinley Sielaff, Colorado College. And I've been struggling where to put this in, and I think it dovetails a lot of the comments that I've been hearing.

I was a part if the GI-21 grant. That was a two year grant. The first year was all about developing modules. In the second year, we trained close to 1,000 non-depository librarians to use information. That's like, an average of 2.5 new librarians experiencing this information every day, which to me, I don't see under strategies anything about

training and getting back to that partnership of who the partners are.

And I think we really need to expand our vision of who is using this information and how they're using it and how they're finding out about it, and so in one of these strategies, I think we need to put something in about training.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, Katrina?

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yes, and building -I'm sorry -- Katrina Stierholz, Federal
Reserve Bank of St. Louis. Yes, that really
struck me that anything we do in this goal
really has nothing to do with the depository
program per se.

This is just about providing librarians and users with more access to information. And I seem to remember that when we talked about this originally, one of our -- Kind of stepping back a little -- One of our questions was, you know, in the old days the balance was, that the deal was you got stuff, and you provided service.

1

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And the idea was that GPO would go back and re-think the new deal. And I'm just wondering, know, if that's you really addressed in all of these goals and strategies -- what the new deal is? And I hate to, like, bring that up because that's kind of fundamental, but I don't see it here.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, I think someone mentioned about incentives earlier and trying to get that into the first goal, but I don't know if we -- I'm not sure if we wrote it down to do that, but that's a good point.

Anyone else?

MS. MONGEAU: Deborah Mongeau from the University of Rhode Island. I'm going to go out on a limb here. I think you need -- The goals -- You've only got one goal.

I have an education background and spent lot of time on goals and we а We've really got one goal objectives. there, "Increase access to and usefulness of information." federal That's the ultimate. That's the ultimate -- where you want to go.

The other three goals are actions to get you to that fourth goal.

I would say, "Increase access to usefulness of federal information and developing a model for the FDLP, strengthening the network of depository libraries, developing and managing a comprehensive collection."

And I would take out the word "online" because ten years ago, "online" meant one thing. 10 years from now, "online" will mean something else.

So, that's just -- Like I said, I'm going out on a limb here, and I know you've invested a lot of time and done a lot of work.

But what I see here is only one goal and three different ways of arriving at that goal.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Okay. Thank you for going out on that limb. I think people like that one.

Alright. I've got someone else coming to the mike.

MS. KLAIR: Well, I dare say there

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

aren't too many cataloguers in the room, so -I think that -- Oh, I'm sorry -- Arlene Klair,
University of Maryland.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I do appreciate having the "create bibliographic and metadata records" there. It serves a user goal because what we see at University of Maryland as we have begun our retrospective conversion of our regional depository collection, that it does help bring hidden collections to the attention of users everywhere, and it does drive resources.

see this when we catalog special collections. We -- I am sure, going this continue to see as we to retrospectively regional convert our depository collection. So while that looks kind of esoteric perhaps, I think it's very important to provide more access and it may also have a role in helping our directors see that one of the reasons why these tangible materials are taking up space on our shelves and maybe don't have the access to them is because there aren't cataloguing records for

them for years and years of the collection.

So if all we can get those resources diverted toward making all of that collection visible, and our users start hammering their way into that collection so that it doesn't have to be а government documents librarian driving the traffic to them. Any user anywhere who is coming at it from WorldCat Local, who is coming at it from Google Scholar ___ Maybe the directors' pressure will ease up. They will see the value of that collection and will stop wanting to turn them into -- Take the collections off the shelf and turn it into information commons and all of the other ideas that we have heard here.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes. I think, one more comment.

MS. SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of Michigan, and I'm also -- I'm going to second the comment that the fourth goal is really the ultimate goal.

But I would also offer that on the

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

for first goal, where you're talking about
developing a model for an FDLP, I would ask
why you're not just simply developing an FDLP
that is flexible, rather than developing a
model for one that is more flexible. It just
seems like you're not taking the stuff all the
way to where you want to be.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Okay. Thank you. Thank you all for you all your comments and participating in this discussion.

I've taken copious notes. We'll have the transcripts and we do have more work to do just like we did when we left Kansas City. Look for this stuff up on the FDLP desktop, as well as a printed format of the slides that looks like a more fleshed-out -- Not fleshed-out -- More in a planned format that has some introductory and concluding kind of comments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: See you all at 3:30.

(Whereupon, this session concluded and the next resumed at 3:30 p.m.)

COUNCIL SESSION: FDLP DESKTOP:

METHOD BEHIND THE MADNESS

MS. SIEGER: Good afternoon. My name is Karen Sieger. I am the manager of Web Content and Library Services. I will warn you right now. I talk fast and we have a screen all the way in the front that you may or not be able to see, so I'd encourage you all to move up. Come foward. I don't bite -- much. - Nobody is moving. Okay. Don't I have a lot of space? I guess not.

Allright, nobody is moving. Okay.

If at anytime, if I go too fast, please, you know, start waving and I will attempt to slow down. I can't guarantee it's going to last very long, but I'll try.

I want to thank everybody for coming here this afternoon. I want to be able to go ahead and give you a demonstration of the FDLP desktop and a number of the changes that we are going to be making in the hopefully next couple of weeks to the site.

So everybody is familiar? Before I

start, is Katie Davis in here? She's out, okay.

So I have a lovely laser pointer, but then I realized I'd be laser-ing the members of Council in the face. So what I'll do is I'll ask a member of my staff for -- Actually, Ted can lend a hand for right now.

Alright, so, everybody is familiar with the existing FDLP desktop. Everything that I'm talking about today is in your handbook, so the concepts that I bring up are covered in here. So at any time you can go ahead and follow along with the information that's in here.

I don't typically prepare speeches. If I don't know what I'm talking about, I really don't deserve to be the web-manager, so -- Anytime, if you have any questions, let me know and I'll, you know, cover any of the library services, web services in this presentation.

So, okay, so we have the existing FDLP desktop. What we have been doing for over

a year now is actually looking at the old FDLP desktop, seeing how people use the actual material on there, and comparing that to today's web standards, technologies, dissemination practices.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And as you can see -- This, we've been pitching for awhile now as the beta desktop. We're finally ready to come out of beta. This, however, will not be the final version of the desktop. They're actually making a transition of the site based on what we have learned. And I want to thank all of you for putting up with this while we went through this learning experience. We have learned a great deal during this time.

One of the things that we'll be doing with the desktop is actually dividing the site into two sites. So, as Ric mentioned earlier in his speech, one of the things that we're very interested in is actually the social networking tools that are very popular today.

The FDLP is a great program. It

its job in getting information to American public. However, that geographic separation that we have with the libraries the country don't exactly make network with inviting to your fellow colleagues. So we're trying to use the social networking tools and the expertise that GPO to electronic with regard has and dissemination to be able to provide a venue for you to be able to go ahead and do that interaction in safe social а and environment.

So with that, let me go ahead and pop over to the new FDLP desktop. Right now, this is on a development domain and we're still copying content from the live site to this site. You'll see that we've made a number of changes in here.

I don't have the laser pointer, so Katie will be following along trying to point things out with the laser pointer. We have not rehearsed this, so anything could go wrong.

One of the things that we're trying

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to do with desktop is to streamline our content dissemination. On our present site, whenever a listserv announcement goes up, we try to put the information off of the FDLP desktop. And we're also re-publishing it to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the listserv.

In the new FDLP desktop, we're trying to make it so that the information is disseminated once and outputted in various formats. So those would be HTML, e-mail, RSS, and hopefully -- We're working on this, SMS alerts.

So for example, if you looked at our homepage -- As you scroll down, you'll see a number of categories on our lefthand side. you'll see that "general So says one announcements," another one that says, "cataloguing." Third that one says "distribution," and fourth that says "partnerships."

What we're currently doing is going through the archive of FDLPL. We are porting all that information over to FDLP.gov and

categorizing it into these various categories.

As we continue to do it through, more categories may emerge. Right now, we have these four.

So if you happen to be interested in cataloguing -- that's your main job -- You can actually go ahead and re-order these by clicking on the box on the right-hand side and dragging this to this top. So if you're interested in cataloguing, here's the latest cataloguing news that has come out of the FDLP desktop. You can go ahead and change that to say, "I want to see 15 stories, the latest 15 stories that have come out." We can go ahead and expand this box.

If you turn around and say, "Well, I'm not interested in general announcements at all," I can change that to zero and hide that section altogether. So this is based off of the cookies that are set on your side to customize your experience. The cookie does nothing more than save these personal settings. It does not capture any personally

identifying information about you. But you can go ahead and make that information -- You can cater the homepage to what you want.

So I'm sure the next question will be, "What happens if it falls off the homepage?" That's one of the things we've learned off the existing FDLP desktop. We've posted something -- Once it's no longer the new thing, where does it go?

In this particular site, off of home, we're using a split menu. So you'll see that our main menu so far consists of "home," "depository administration," "collection management," "outreach," and a link to the community site. Under each one of these, you're going to find a specific sub-menu.

So off of home, we have "about the FDLP," "news directory," "browse the site," "news alerts," "file repository," "tutorials," "askGPO," "contact us," and "the site map."

So when something falls off the homepage, and it falls into that "news alert" category, if we go to our "news directory," we

can get to all the news that was traditionally put out on FDLPL right here. So we can go through -- We can view all of them. We can browse page to page. Click on any one of the titles. You're going to get to the full article. If you're interested in finding out which news was specific to the "cataloguing" category, we can click on "cataloguing." From here, you can see we have a link to an RSS feed. We also have a browsable list of all the articles.

We can go a step further in here. We can go ahead and say, "I want to see all the articles that were published in the cataloguing category that start with the letter "c." And I can further go down there from there.

I also have a full-text search in each of these sections so I can go ahead and put my search term in. Let's say -- Let's put the word "spring" in. And I can choose -- I want to search only the title. Search in the introduction, search both of those, search

within the contents, or search with the keywords.

So if I say I want to search within the content, from there I have one article that started with the letter "c" that was in the cataloguing directory that has the spring in it. So if I now click on that article, I'll be able to go ahead and pull up that full-text article.

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

Was that only searching your three results that were under "c," or was searching all of "cataloguing."

MS. SIEGER: That was searching within "cataloguing" under letter "c."

Are there any questions about the "browse news?"

Related to that, we have "browse the site," which allows you to browse everything on the entire website. So if you're lost, here's one spot that you can come and get to anything. So for example, if you

want to go in and -- One of the things that we're looking to do is -- well, Janet Scheitle will talk about this more tomorrow is -- We're looking at the possibility of taking the FDLP handbook and turning that into a HTML webbased living document. So, Janet will be there. We'll be discussing it tomorrow. I'll be at the session as well to answer questions on that.

But for this example, if you go to "browse the site," and you go to the handbook, you can go ahead and search within the handbook. You can get an RSS feed for the handbook as well.

I only have the first two chapters in here so far, so we can take a look at that, but --

If I type in the words "depository staff," and choose "content," we'll see that chapter 1 contains the words "depository staff." If I then click on that, I can get to the full text article, which happens to be chapter 1 of the handbook. I'll get more into

this aspect of the handbook a little bit later on.

But going back to "browse the site," you can still get to the "FDLP news."

You can search the "frequently asked questions," the various web links we have in there, anything from any of the categories and sections on the site.

If we choose a story, once we go into one of our articles, on the right-hand column at the top, what you'll see are three icons. The first one is to make a PDF version of the file of the document that you're on. The second one is to print that page, the third one is to e-mail the link to somebody.

So for example, if I click on the last one to e-mail it, I can e-mail this link to anybody. So if you want to be able to refer this article to a friend or a colleague, you can do that from here.

So in our contents -- The streamlining of the content dissemination that we have -- We're trying to make it so that you

come to FDLP.gov for any FDLP news and information. So when you're in here, you can go ahead and view the information in HTML. If you use RSS readers -- You can subscribe to the various RSS feeds on the site.

But there are those who want to be e-mailed whenever something comes out. We have a number of people right now who subscribe to FDLPL, and the rely on that as one of their main means of keeping informed of the information on the site. So here, we're taking a little bit of a step further. If we go to "news alerts," we can go ahead and actually subscribe to the various categories.

So if you're interested only in cataloguing, you don't have to receive every news alert that GPO puts out. You can say, "I'm just interested in cataloguing," and you an out in your e-mail address and your name, and anything that's saved within that content category will be e-mailed to you.

And it runs every hour. So as soon as something comes out -- Every hour it's

checking to see who are the subscribers.

Here's a new piece of content that came out,

so now let's trigger this mass mail. You can

choose to subscribe to any or all.

The question is "where is unsubscribe?" When you actually receive the e-mail alerts, it's in your e-mail alert. So at the bottom of the page it says, "If you don't want to see this anymore, click this box," and it takes you to the "unsubscribe."

But, yes, you can unsubscribe. We're not going to force you into it for life.

One of the other big changes that you're going to be seeing with the FDLP desktop is the beta desktop combines some social networking aspects with the actual contents of the Federal Depository Library Program.

What we have learned is that that really needs to be two separate sites. So one of the things that I'm proposing and working to implement at this point, is that every library in the FDLP receive an e-mail account.

So it would be your-library-number@fdlp.gov.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

That e-mail account would be a web-based account that you could also set up to come to your Outlook or whatever you want. But it would be a direct communication line between GPO and the federal depository libraries.

So one of the things right now that consumes a lot of time at GPO is trying to keep track of who the coordinator is of each institution. What this would allow people to do is, the coordinator would go ahead and check that box, and if the coordinator changes, they just turn that information over to the next coordinator. And that will be a running record of all the correspondents from So that's something that we're working GPO. on implementing and hope to have in the near future.

What the FDLP desktop will do in turn, is make it so that -- Right now we have about 1,500 registered users of the FDLP desktop. The new desktop would allow for one

account per library. So you'd log in with your library number and your internal password. So we're trying to consolidate down to single password.

You don't have to remember -- You know, we got a lot of requests for "What's my password" I can't remember my password."

Well, this would be one account per library and that will be your internal password to get in. So if you need to share it with your institution, saying there's one person who does "needs and offers." Another one that does the "bi-annual service." Another one that -- whatever it needs to be. You can all log in with that one piece of information.

Let me go ahead and log in.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Karen, Can I interrupt you?

MS. SIEGER: Sure.

MS. STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. You said the depository libraries could log in. Do you have plans to let non-depository librarians log in? I'm not

1	a depository.
2	You're not going to leave me out, are you?
3	MS. SIEGER: No, never. Never. We
4	have had requests for non-depositories to come
5	in, and we evaluate those on a case-by-case
6	basis. So if there's something specific that
7	you need to do that is contained behind that
8	password, we will give access to that.
9	MS. STIERHOLZ: Why not just let a
10	blanket agreement to allow libraries in?
11	MS. SIEGER: I'm sorry, I don't
12	think
13	MS. STIERHOLZ: Why not? Why not let
14	librarians, any librarian, no matter if he or
15	she is at a depository. Blanket, you know?
16	Allow anybody.
17	MS. SIEGER: Well, a number of the
18	tools that are locked on the desktop are only
19	for depositories. So for example, if you want

Why wouldn't you MS. STIERHOLZ: want non-depositories to promote government

to order promotional materials, that's only

for federal depositories.

20

21

22

23

documents?

MS. SIEGER: That's a requirement of the program, that we cannot issue those to --

MS. STIERHOLZ: I'm not trying to torture you about it. I'm sort of thinking it through.

MS. SIEGER: Yes. I'd love to talk to you more about it. There are other things that specifically about depositories would like access that is locked down on the site, because I certainly want to make sure that it's accessible to the broadest possible audience within the confines of the Federal Depository Library Program. So if there are other things that I'm not considering --

There was somebody who sent in an askGPO request in the other day saying, "I'm not a depository, but I'm from this institution -- I'd like an account." When I wrote back, I said, "Well, what specific things are you looking to do that's locked behind that user name and password?" If I know what this is, then I can say, "Okay, yes.

There's an exception that needs on be made, and this is the reason why." But that person unfortunately did not write back yet.

But, I'd love to talk to you more about it. I certainly don't want to exclude anybody from the service. I just want to make sure that -- I don't want to leave it open for anybody. Then we get a lot of spammers that come in. We have had incidents in the past where home-schooling institutions or parents have come in and said, "Well, I want to order 50 pens."

Well, that's not what is was designed for. It was designed to make sure that we spread the information about the program to the public. And so that's best coordinated through depositories.

Does that answer your question, I hope?

Other things that you could do on the new desktop once you've logged in -- Actually, I've not logged in. Now I'm logged in.

You'll notice on the right-hand

column, the first item that comes up -- It is now un-locked as I log in. It's called "my bookmarks," so if this is a shared account at your library, you can actually go to a particular content item -- This is something that's very useful. I don't want to have to go and have to dig around the desktop later on to go find this again. Or I want to be able to share this with other members of my staff that log into the desktop. You can actually go ahead, and if you hit the star, you can actually add this to your bookmarks.

So if I say, "converting shelf-list," I can give it any title that I want, I can hit "okay," and now it's added to my list.

So later on if I say, "Okay, I want to go back to the SuDocs classification practice change for JCP hearings," I can click on that link and go back to it any time. But this is only accessible if you log into the site.

Our event countdown is staying where it is. Is this a useful feature for people? I know it's useful in our library

services. We looked at that and said, "Gosh, we only have 18 days left until the conference, We better get moving."

One thing I'd like your feedback on is the shipping list. We put up the shipping list this week on the FDLP desktop. On the current desktop, you'll see that's it on the right-hand side.

The one thing I don't know in our research behind the beta site is how many people actually use that module and how many people just bookmark the page beneath it. So if that's something that you could let us know -- My staff is out in the vendor area. They're going to be here for the next two days and they're there to answer any questions you have, but also take any feedback that you have that we could use to approve the website. So one of the things that, while you're thinking of it, if you could let us know how useful that is, we'll figure out of we're going to put it up on the new site.

So right now, we've got it down at

the bottom at the page. We can move it back over to that right-hand column. It just depends on how much you use that. One of the things we're also trying to do on the desktop is make it so that the menus are easier to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

navigate.

In the existing site, there are very -- They are somewhat long and they are a little hard to get to. Right now, the FDLP.gov site is using a suckerfish menu. And that can be a little hard to mouse over and get down to the child levels. This version, because it uses a split menu, so you can get to a set set of menu options at any time. And we're trying to build it so that other things that you're going to be using that are related to the main content item that you're on are all accessible on one page.

I can show you an example of that if "partnerships." qo to So that's "outreach," and if underneath we "partnerships," you'll see we have introductory paragraph about what partnerships are and underneath we have three articles that explain the three types of partnerships. So we have "content," "service," and "hybrid" partnerships. If you click on any one of those. Click on the "read more" or the title, you actually see -- You're be able to read the full article and see the list of all the

content partnership websites.

You'll notice that on the righthand side however this menu stays static
throughout any of the partnership pages. so
here you can go ahead and see from the menu,
you can get to "contents," "service," and
"hybrid" partnerships from any one of these
pages.

Under "partnership news," you get the last ten articles that were posted in the partnership news category. Underneath there, you have -- These are the FAQs related to partnerships, and finally, you have a link to the inquiry form if you would like to propose a partnership with GPO.

So everything that you could want

to know about partnerships is available on this one page. And we're trying to do the same thing with the other content. So what child underneath the used to be a so for example, if we go back to desktop, "education outreach" and go to "partnerships," all of those items were children. So "partnership news," "about partnerships," the "content," "service," and "hybrid" partner lists, the FAQs, and the inquiry form -- You had to go and choose each one of those, and it was very difficult to navigate back to all the others. But now you have one page that ditched all that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So what we're trying to do on this is focus less the one on names and applications and more on the broad usage of the material. So for example, "partnerships" is one example. If we go to "Collection management" -- Underneath there, instead of saying "item list" or "lostdocs", PURLS, rambling off those lists of applications --Talk about them in terms of how you would use

them. Which ones are used for managing your collection? Which ones are for modifying your selection profile? Another one for "how is the content being distributed on the libraries?" Get it down to those concepts and from there, you'll be able to see all the tools that relate to that particular subject area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Unfortunately, that's still being worked out right now, so you can't see too much of that, but we'll take any input you have on what you'd like to see on these pages.

A11 the old material is still available here. We weren't too far off in our assessment of how people use the website. was just more about how we were going to categorize that information. So we're trying to be slow and deliberate as we finish this because really, what it comes down to is how you categorize the information. The better categorized it is, the less trouble you're going to have finding the material, the less trouble we're going to have actually disseminating it out to you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So you'll find that the file repository is still there. So for example, if you were to choose "events," you'd still be able to go ahead and say, "Do I want Council meetings or inter-agency?" "Inter-agency" isn't in here yet, but if you went to "Council meetings," you can say, "Okay, I want the documents from 2008," and then you could say, "Do I want fall or do I want spring?"

If I say that I want the fall, here all the files for this conference. are They're now available off the dev site here. So you can see when the file was uploaded, when it was modified, the file size, how many downloads it has. And you can get a quick synopsis of what that file is or you can go to "details" and you can get a longer description if there is one. This one doesn't happen to have one.

But if you look on the last page of your hand-out, what we tried to do is delineate what the difference between the two

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

websites are, so we have the FDLP desktop versus the community site. So a lot of what I talked about here is laid out in this chart.

example, on for the desktop, the FDLP desktop is going to become the information storehouse for any news and information regarding the FDLP. information is created and maintained by GPO staff. One account will be granted per library instead of the individual accounts that we've had in the past. And log-in is based off of library number your and your password.

So with that, I'll talk about the differences and the launch of the FDLP community website. Has anybody created an account here yet? How many people have actually posted a blog?

One in the back. Anybody else?

At this point, we have over 70 beta users of the site. We haven't removed the word "beta" yet. We're still looking for feedback to improve this and make sure that we

provide the most robust social networking tool available.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Part of what we're trying to do here is unite the community, regardless of geography, and provide one site where people can go and exchange ideas, exchange stories, pictures, whatever they want. Not every institution has the ability to get to things like Facebook or MySpace, but you can get to a .gov account.

So let GPO worry about the security and the updates and making sure that this thing is up to date. We're not going to be posting to the site. We'll just make sure that the venue is available for you. But at that point, you can go ahead and interact with your colleagues, share your expertise, share your stories, ask questions, pick the brain of other members in the community, and really strengthen not only your knowledge of but program, also what you guys can communicate exchange and can amongst yourselves.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So everything is web-based. Hopefully, it's intuitive and easy to use. The site offers a number of features. So you can go ahead and blog about things that you're passionate about. You can go ahead and read other peoples' blogs and comment on those blogs. You can submit photos, share photos of events going on in your library.

You can go ahead and once you have an account, you can actually log in and search for other members. You know, if you look and see who from the state of Kansas from academic library who is also a member of see GODORT. You can also who is а selfproclaimed subject specialist in various areas.

Other things that you could do are you could submit web links, so if there are resources that you use at your institution all the time and you think that this would be a great thing to share with other people, you could add those links to the site. You could also go ahead and write and review those

sites.

One other thing that you can also do is -- There's forum attached to the site where you can actually have more in-depth conversations with other members of the community. So if somebody posts a question about --

There's one question in here about "needs and offers." It was very good, rather enlightening -- Something I took back and I'm still pondering at this point -- Not everybody has time to search through the "needs and offers." One of the things I've been looking at is trying to make "needs and offers" where there's a bulk upload.

But one thing I hadn't considered, which was brought up in the forum was, could you go ahead and since we don't have time to look through all these massive lists, go ahead and have the system match the need for a particular SuDoc number with somebody who has that to offer, and just shoot an e-mail alert to somebody and say, "Hey, this is something

1 that you need, this is something somebody has. 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There's a match. Maybe you want to go ahead and investigate it."

that was something I hadn't considered and I've already learned from the forum. I wold go ahead and log-in here real quick so you can take a look at some of the features that are available once you have an account.

Now remember, this is based off of individual log-ins, so you as an individual are making an account on here. So when you're in here, you can go ahead and see the various blogs. If you want to read the entire blog, you can choose to click on one of the titles. You can see how many hits it has. You can email it to somebody else. You can bookmark it. You can also set it as a favorite. You can do a TrackBack.

You could also provide a comment. So if you want to comment, this comment form is only available once you've logged in. you can go ahead and you can put in a title

22

23

for your comment, enter your comment, and then submit it. So all the submissions are dynamic. They're done on the fly. There is no GPO review of the material.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

GPO However, is there as а moderator of the material, so if it's flagged somebody else to say, "Hey, this inappropriate, "GPO will go ahead, take a look at that content, and will take the necessary steps. So if it's something that either needs to be pulled or reach out to the submitter and say, "this is why this is inappropriate, can you go back and fix it?" We can go ahead and And then further violations could do that. result in a suspension of somebody's account or a termination of somebody's account.

So, like I said, we had about 70 people so far who are registered for the site, and what we found so far is they're very excited about coming in and adding to their profile. You'll see that of the people we have so far, we have a number of avatars that have been uploaded.

So let's choose one. Let's take

"Bookslave." So if we take Bookslave here,

we'll see this is Robin Chan. He is from the

University of Central Florida Libraries. We

can see he's from an academic institution. We

can see his various contact info, and from

there, we can find out that he has an interest

in national monuments, serial sets, and the

"Guide to US Publications." He is a senior

library technical specialist or assistant,

sorry.

Other people -- For example, gcart001 is a member of AALL and ALA and is a subject specialist in philosophy and religion and library science.

So when you're creating an account, you can actually go through and choose these items. There is a defined list of member organizations and a defined list of subject specialists. There's a biography section where you can write anything about yourself. So if you happen to be a member of a state library organization that doesn't happen to be in our

list, you can go ahead and expand upon that in your bio.

And if you go through here, you'll find people who have written great lengths about their bio, and other people who have written just a sentence or two, and some people have chosen not to write anything at all.

So it's totally up to you. It's a community site. This is all locked down so nobody from the public can get to this information so your contact information is secure. But it's up to you ultimately to decide how much information you want to share. And this site is driven by the community and what you get out of it is really what you put into it.

So, let's talk about some of the blogs. We have our -- If you want to go ahead and -- Once you're in the blogs, you can view all the blogs, you can view a list of all the other blogger. But if you want to go ahead and write your own blog, we have a blog dashboard.

And so, the dashboards in the site let you do the various functions of the site. So if we click on "blog dashboard," we'll see there's a button for "write a new entry, and you'll see you'll eventually have a Microsoft Word type of interface that comes up. So if you can use Microsoft Word, you should be able to go ahead and use this tool to be able to write a blog. You can bring in pictures. You can import, or you could embed video. You can import, you can embed them. You can embed video, and you can out anything you want here, so if you want to make something bold, you want to something, you want to make it a bulleted list, add a picture -- all that's capable through here. When you're done, go ahead an hit "save," and it auto-publishes to the site.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Another one is the gallery. In here, what happens is each member can create one folder. So in that folder, you can put up however many images you want. So for example, our seeder posts in here, Adelaide Hasse. Adelaide happens to have six photos. So in

If I were to go to one of the other

here, we can go ahead and see thumbnails of each of the pictures. So we can click on any one of these and we can get a full or bigger picture of the thumbnail.

From in here, we can go and watch each one of these individually or we can start a slide show and the slide show will go through each one of the pictures. And in here, you can go ahead and you can actually put a description for each photo.

So if you want to describe what's going on in the photo, you can see that. You can't see that description when it's in that slide show menu, but if you were to turn off slide-show and go page to page, you'll see that there is a description at the bottom of each of the pages.

From in here, you can rate the images, you can leave comments on the images, you can view statistics for them, and if you happen to be the owner, you can upload to that section.

categories, I would not be able to upload to anybody else's category. It's locked down to that individual.

So we have a couple people so far who have posted some pictures. Our one most recently is from the UCF Docs Office, titled "my desk." Does this look like somebody's desk?

Kathy Hale recently posted some pictures from a state library parade. It was a State Library of Pennsylvania Precision Book Truck Drill Team -- Say that one five times fast. It says, "In 2006, the State Library of Pennsylvania participated in the Pennsylvania Treasures Parade with their book truck drill team. On the front of each cart lists the name of the services we offer. One of the carts had "US and PA government documents."

And if anybody knows Kathy, you got to have a picture of Big Bob, so if you know the story if Big Bob -- He has made his way into the gallery here. If you don't know the story of Big Bob, I believe Kathy is here. Ask

her all about Big Bob.

In the web links area, we have some pre-defined categories that range from arts to reference to science. They have subcategories. All these categories we've out in here -- They're all seeder categories, but you have the ability to create categories and subcategories as you see fit in here.

Once you're in there, you can go ahead and you can go upload any web links that you'd like. Does anybody use "browse topics" or the registry? Then this site should be easy to use because this uses the exact same software.

So for example, we can go ahead and view all the new links. There are RSS feeds for these as well. We can view the "top-rated," "the most popular," "the most reviewed." We can search them. We can add a link. We can add a category. So if I want to add a link, I can go ahead and choose what category it belongs in. So for example, if I pick "health," I can choose to put it in the

main cat of "health," or I can say, "It's really related to fitness." I can click on "fitness" and whatever link I put in here will end up in "health, in the sub-category of "fitness." I can put in the name of the site, write a description, and provide the URL. I hit "save." It's uploaded on the fly to the website.

If I find a site that's particularly useful -- Let's take "Eye Level" here. Go ahead and click on this. If I find a site particularly useful, I can go ahead and rate the listing. I can say it's very poor, fair, average, good, or excellent. I can also write a review of that site. And each of the listings is owned by whoever updates them or who creates them.

The last feature in here that is currently working is the community forum. And here is where you can have more in-depth discussion. So one of the questions you'll probably ask me is, "What's the difference between a blog and a forum?"

The blog is a very personal thing.

It's something that's really written from one person's point of view, and there are a couple comments that are traded back and forth.

In a forum however, you can have more in-depth discussions. You can attach pictures and links and photos and they can really get in more peoples' opinions and respond back to them. You can give e-mail alerts anytime one of the categories is updated. You can bookmark particular threads. You can search within particular threads.

So for example, under "events and conferences," we have a sub-category called "Fall DLC meeting." In here, we have Adelaide posting that she needed a roommate for the fall conference -- Not really something that you'd blog about. It something more that you'd just want to have a quick discussion, find a roommate, and then the discussion ends.

So here, Dewey writes back and says that he's looking for a roommate. I don't know of Adelaide and Dewey, you know, ended up

sharing a room, but -- that's for them to work out.

But you'll see in here that we could add, we could make things bold. We could indent things, we can add pictures if we want. We can even add little happy smiley faces as you can see here in Adelaide's picture.

In here, you can have your avatar
will be reflected over here. Right now it
doesn't merge from your profile, but it will.

And you can put more information about where
you're from and so forth. You can put your own
custom footer in and so right now, it just
says "Adelaide R. Hasse," but you could post
anything you want down there in your headers.

So if you want to say what institution you're
from with a link to your library site, you
could do those types of things.

You'll see that there are different ranks here. A rank is basically your status on the forum. So the more you post, the greater your status is. So right now, we've put up a

couple tips for the forum. We'll be expanding it more, but we've got some initial ones going up first, but one of them happens to be on forum ranks. So what are forum ranks? have several forum ranks set up. So if you have between 0 and 74 posts on the forum, you're considered a forum newbie. If you have between 75 and 199, you're a forum enthusiast. and 499, you're Between 200 an Between 500 and 999, you're a guru. you get over 1,000, you've become the honorary SuDoc. So the more eagles you have, the greater your status.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, I'll warn you right up front.

Don't go padding your stats because I will go re-set them. So if you approach the, "Oh, I got first post," -- No, no. we will take care of that.

We will be looking for moderators for the site. As I mentioned earlier, the FDLP desktop is a site that GPO creates the content for and maintains, but the community site is totally based off of the community. So one

aspect of that will be to -- We're going to be soliciting for people who are interested in being a global moderator of the community site

4 and the forum.

So there, you're responsible for helping to control some of the decorum that goes on, make sure that the rules are enforced. So if you're interested, please let us know. It's certainly something that you can put in your resume and say, "Hey, I'm a moderator of the government documents forum here." And then you also don't have to worry about eagles. You get stars. You get blue stars.

You'll see on my particular post, I have my signature -- is a quote from "The Little Prince." It says "It is the time you have spent with your rose that makes your rose so important." You can put anything that you want in there. If you've got a nice little quote that you want to put down there, you can do that as well.

And of course, my avatar -- You got

the nice panda in the tree. I don't know how he got up there. I don't know how he's getting down. But if you click on that, you can go ahead and get to somebody's profile in the forum, and from here you can see all the other posts that this person has submitted. You can e-mail that person. You can send them a private message. There are a variety of things that you can do. There's also private messaging on the other side of the site. I'll get to that in a little bit.

But if you're interested in a particular post -- for example, let me go back to the board index. Some of the things that you can do with your profile in here is -- Let's say -- Under "library issues and best practices" -- What I told you about earlier with regard to "needs and offers," that was actually posted underneath here. So if you go to "collections," there's a link for "tips for needs and offers."

So here is a discussion that started that said, "Rob Lopresti said, "I

2

3

5

67

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

don't have time to examine the "needs and offers" lists. What I would like to see is the ability to put up a list of needs and let the computers match it to listed offers like eBay's permanent searches."

Minerva wrote back and said,
"That's a great idea. I'll add it to my
mental wish list."

So if I want to see notified whenever this is updated, actually go ahead and choose -- At the bottom, it says you can subscribe to the topic or you can bookmark the topic. If I bookmark it, it's going to be saved to a bookmark that's saved into my profile. So if I go ahead and log-in on another computer -- Say I'm at home and I bookmark this, and I go home -- Or I'm at work, I bookmark this. When it's time to go home and find it, I log into the site. It's saved in my internal profile, so I don't have to worry about having bookmarks here there.

If you go ahead and subscribe to

the topic, you can get an e-mail alert every time this is updated. So you don't have to watch it every day. You just can get the e-mail alert.

One of the other things you can do in the forum to truly customize this -- We've created some seeder categories and subcategories. So for example, those are "general discussion," "events and conferences," "continuing education and training, "library issues and best practices, "technology and web-solutions," and "value of the federal depository library."

At the bottom though, you'll see two other community groups. And one is here for Council to consider. There's a group specifically for the depository library Council. Within here, you can have several types of groups. Two examples are an open and a closed loop. So in this particular case, there could be an open forum for Council where any member can go ahead and post messages to Council and Council can respond.

There's also another spot that is a closed forum that only Council can respond to. That can even go a step further that that can even be hidden from view altogether, so when you log in, based off of your rights, if you're in that particular group, then you'll be able to see the discussions in there. Right now it's set so that the only members of that group can respond but anybody can read them.

So, that's just something to throw out at Council to see -- Is that something that you'd be interested in and you know, we can cater that or take it away if that's not something that would be useful. But that same opportunity is available for any member of the community.

You can actually create your own user groups, so underneath "library groups," - We actually had a request from the San Antonio Area Documents User Group.

Kathy Amen is currently in England at the moment, and she was looking for a way

to keep in touch with the group while she was away. So this is a place where they can post minutes meetings and have discussions to related to their group, but the group doesn't their necessarily have budget own or technology ortime to the set up infrastructure themselves. But the infrastructure is here, and the web-mail let's you maintain it, but here this group can actually use that as a mechanism to communicate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If you're interested in making a library group, underneath "forum," there's a little form you can fill out. Fill in some Mainly, what we need to basic information. know is the name of the group that you want to set up and who the moderators are going to be. So if GPO is the moderator not and moderators set There qlobal are are moderators, but then are also four particular groups, such as this library groups. You can have moderators for that group.

So for example, Kathy Amen -- She would be the group founder, and she could turn

around and say, "These people have the right to administer this forum." So they would have the ability to edit posts, delete posts, grant rights to that group. So if somebody says, "Hey, I want to go ahead and be a member of that group, they can say, "Well, I'm sorry. You're not a member of the Texas Documents Group or San Antonio Documents Group." Or they could say, "Oh, sure. We'd love to have your input. Let me add you to the group."

So when you're actually in your profile, you're in your user control panel, one of the tabs in here says "user groups."

You can see the various user groups that are available and if it's an open group, you can actually select one of them and say, "I want to join it." And then an e-mail goes to the founder and the moderators and says, "Hey, this person wants to join this group."

Last section I'll talk about and then open it up for questions is more of the member's area. One of the things you can do in here besides just viewing a list of people is

you could actually go ahead and do a search.

The search is a little extravagant at the moment. We are looking to simplify it a little bit. So bear with us. That is on our radar.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But for example, if you want say,
"I want to see everybody who is from an
academic library and from the state of
California," we click on "find users." We have
two people who currently fit that criteria. So
you cab gi ahead and customize your searches
in here.

limited So we're not to the information that's here. If there's something else that you'd like to know about other members of the community, we're certainly open to it, expanding that out. The only required fields at this point are your name, library number, your e-mail address. So that's the basics. Anything else from there is based off of if you want to input that information into the profile. Some of the things we've been adding based off some of the feedbacks we have gotten -- I'll take an

example on my profile -- was the ability to add RSS feeds. So if you look in here, the last item in here is RSS feeds. Each member can add up to five RSS feeds within their profile. So there are sites that if you're particularly interested in and want to share that with others, and they have an RSS feed, you can share them in here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

At this point -- Let's see -- I think I've covered pretty much everything that's in this booklet. Going back to that last page, you'll see that the community site contains all the social networking tools that are related to the FDLP community. We're trying to cater this as much as possible to the community.

The content is created and maintained by members of the federal depository library community, not Registration is open to only the members of the FDLP community, and accounts are based on individuals so user names and passwords are determined by individual members.

_ _

So for example, if you get to the site -- I'm going to log-out here -- And you can't remember your password, you can click on the "forgot log-in." It will say, "Which one did you forget? Did you forget your username or your password?"

And what it will do is it will send you an e-mail with a token. You take that token. You put it on the website and then it says, "Here's your password," or "Here's your opportunity to change your password," or "Here's your user name."

But when you create an account, you're deciding what your user name is and what your password is. So it's a password you're comfortable with, something you'll remember. It's not going to be one of those hexadecimal ones that we've been sending out through the existing FDLP desktop that nobody can remember.

At anytime, like I said, we're here for the rest of the conference. We're out in the main area. We also have an FAQ section

that we're trying to keep up to date, so if there's something that you're confused about, just drop us a note. There's a contact from right off the homepage. Let us know and we'll certainly add it to the FAQ list over here. We welcome any suggestions, any feedback.

One of the things that we've been asked for so far is the ability to share documents. So similar to that file repository you saw, the community site, we're working on the ability to be able to upload files. So once that ability is available, then we can add it into the community site, and then you could share documents back and forth amongst the community.

With that, I'm going to conclude my remarks and open it up to any kind of questions. Fire away. I'm available for anything.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears from the University of North Texas. Going back to -- off of the homepage, the news articles -- When you're searching those and specifically

searching the FDLP handbook, is it going to highlight where it found the words?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

For instance, say somebody calls up and wants to know about how do I become a depository -- That would be in chapter 1 or 2, possibly. When it comes up, is it going to highlight exactly which section of chapter, because some of those chapters are really lengthy and finding that one paragraph or that one sentence that relates to what about it you're talking Is going highlight that for me or am I going to have to dig through that entire chapter to find it?

MS. SIEGER: At this moment, off the top of my head -- You may have to go looking for it. Right now it's under "depository administration." We'll go the handbook real quick. One of the things that is a little bit different with this handbook is when you click on one of the chapters, you get an article index, so you can at any time view one of the sub-sections entire or you can view the article.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

I'll have to look into how that interfaces with the searching in that "browse this site" to how if it would bring up the highlighting key words. I may have that turned "off" at the moment, but I will check.

MS. SEARS: But if we're looking at all of the pages, we could just do the "control F" then, right?

MS. SIEGER: Yes.

MS. SEARS: Because it's in HTML?

MS. SIEGER: Yes.

MS. SEARS: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: So, yes. So one of things we're trying to do is keep this modular, so we'll go ahead and make a single content item for each one of these and from there, we'll just put in triggers say, "This is this section. This is section. So which section do you want to see? Do you want to see the entire thing, or I'm just interested in, for example, how to obtain assistance?" I click on that and the only thing I'm going to see on the screen is how to

obtain assistance.

If I want to read the entire chapter, I can go ahead and click on "all pages." And so from there, I'll still have the ability to go ahead and make a PDF, e-mail the link to somebody, or print the file.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. First of all, nice job.

Minor little thing -- When you do the bookmaking, is there any reason it doesn't grab the title of the article? You had to put in your own title. Is this -- It's nice when it just automatically fills that in.

MS. SIEGER: Thank you. We can look into that. Some of the titles get rather lengthy. The amount of real estate you have in that block is pretty short so --

MR. WIGGIN: It's short.

MS. SIEGER: Something that you can find, you can make memorable. But I can see if we can blow the basics in and you can tweak it from there or -- I'll explore the various flexibility we have with that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I would make the observation that this is a manifestation of the goals we just talked about in the previous session. And that oddly, the gauntlet has been laid down by GPO giving the community a tool, if the community is willing to use it.

And I think the burden now goes audience that back the this to is very powerful and the freedom that is actually being allowed for members to use to participate, I think is excellent an demonstration of this century-long tradition of partnership and cooperation between mother-ship and the rest of us.

I'll be the first to throw out that a few mid-West librarians, primarily in Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, are beginning to from an idea of what we call "The Great River Government Information Initiative, " in which we're going to attempt to use these community tools in OPAL to call together the states that Mississippi touch upon the in а

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

fashion to discuss common government information dissemination issues. And by next spring, come up with a ten point action plan - whatever that will be, of course, and use these tools to meet virtually, just as the San Antonio people tried to do with one of them being in London.

Т think this is powerful а connectivity that we can use in our community, and I'm delighted to see that the difference between what we saw in St. Louis and now -- I think it was St. Louis, wasn't it? City. Kansas City, Sorry. I knew it was one of those two letter states. Anyway, I think it's great, and I think the community deserves to give a hand to GPO for pulling this off. I think this is great.

MS. SIEGER: Well, thank you. We really appreciate that.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. Just two quick things --

On the community site, check with General Council to see whether closed Council

forum would be a violation of the Federal
Advisory Committee Act.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

On the desktop site, I wonder if you considered or perhaps you have -- incoming feeds? In the spirit of partnership, RSS allowing the depository libraries to have information available their through desktop site might be a good thing. So having of pages, perhaps with a set map regional kind of interaction to get the RSS feed, the feeds, from relevant RSS library partners up onto the desktop.

MS. SIEGER: That's an excellent suggestion. The technology is there. Figuring out a mechanism where people can actually submit that -- I'll have to figure that portion of it out.

DR. GREER: Now that NOAA site is a good example of an agency using incoming RSS to populate a community site. Theirs is organized around weather events, but it gathers things even from newspapers and so on and puts them all on a community page.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SIEGER: Thank you. We'll look into that a little bit more. Are there any other questions?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Karen, could you go over again what is going to be freely available to the public on the FDLP.gov site and what will be restricted to password access only.

SIEGER: Right now, there are few things. One of them is only the а promotional item ordering. There's a statement in the intro in that page that says "This only material is available federal to depository libraries." That's why that is locked down.

Another example would be the biannual survey. Bi-annual survey is to be completed by each library, so that would be something that would be locked down.

Another example would be the bookmarking aspect. That's just because there's a profile attached to that. But our

goal is to kind of keep the sites divided between "this is the news section" versus "this is the community input."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If we go ahead and start opening it up to individual accounts, we're going to have the same kind of situation we have now. that's kind of the reason behind that; not that we want to exclude the ability for that feature because it is a useful type of feature. It's just, right now, with the way that the site is being divided, adding those accounts is not exactly feasible at this time. We may find a way around that at some point --Kind of like with that "news alerts" where you can go ahead and still use it, but you have like a mini-account, so to speak.

But on the initial radar, that's one of the things that's going to be excluded. We're still trying to figure out where "needs and offers" goes. Whether or not it goes on the community site or it goes off of the FDLP desktop. That's something that if you have a strong feeling one way or the other, we'd love

to hear from you on that one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But because that's something that actually upload content to, you we're restricting that down to that libraries. So those are the types of things. It's mostly surveys that are only accessible to the depository community, tangible materials that are accessible only to the depositories upon request. But other things like -- If you want GPO to visit your library for an upcoming anniversary or celebration -- that's not going to be locked down.

So basically, 99 percent of the site will not be locked down.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And one other question whether -- the access to the community site -- to set up an account on the community site -- is going to be individual, right?

MS. SIEGER: Yes.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Even though you say that it's only going to be open to members of the depository community, how are you going to

enforce that?

MS. SIEGER: Whenever you create an account, you are not automatically granted access. You have to submit your name, your email address, and your library number. At that point, an e-mail alert comes into GPO. GPO gets that notice and makes sure that yes, you are from that institution.

Of all the people that we've had so far, we've had two that were more like potential spammers that tried to get in, and those accounts were denied. So as long as you have that valid depository number -- and we can check against that -- we'll make sure that you get an account.

MS. SEARS: Karen?

MS. SIEGER: Yes.

MS. SIEGER: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. On that aspect -- So if you're checking, are you just checking a depository coordinator list then for who could have one, or say, you know, I have 11 staff members. GPO doesn't know all the names of my

1 11 staff members, so would they then contact 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

me and say, "Is this person eligible to be on the community?" or -- How are you going to do

that?

SIEGER: If we find somebody MS. that's questionable, we will contact the coordinator of that library and ask for more information, Or we'll write back to person and say, "Can you verify that you're at that institutions?"

MS. SEARS: Because I'm just -- I would really like my support staff to be able to participate in the community blogs as well.

MS. SIEGER: If you have a .edu or something that we're going to be able to easily identify you -- You get the library number and you have a .edu, you have a better chance than if you have a Gmail account, for example.

We'll go through and scrutinize a little bit more if you have a valid library number and a Gmail account, and we're not familiar with who you are.

1 ||

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. On the desktop, is there also metadata? Because things like the PURL referrals -- I always forget what that's called, and I know it's like hot-link usage

statistics of some sort and if I could search

We have, at the mike ?

8 statistics and bring that up, that would be

nice, as opposed to having know those

10 depository-specific key words that it's "PURL

referrals." So is there metadata to help me

find those sorts of things when I have a brain

13 cramp?

MS. SIEGER: We have the ability to add metadata with each content item that is added into the site. So what we're ultimately going toward in "library services" is making it so that the actual subject matter experts can create and maintain the content on the site. When they do, they basically fill out a menu that says, "Okay, what's your title? What's the content?" At the bottom of the page, it says, "What's your metadata?" So your

keyword metadata is your descriptive metadata. So that information can be created and then when you go into that "browse the site" or the "news" features, one of the options you have when it says "title" or "intro content," well, the last one was "key words." So you can actually search within the metadata there.

MS. SMITH: Okay. And also, I tried to sign up for the community website, and it rejected me.

MS. SIEGER: Uh-oh!

MS. SMITH: So I'll probably have to stop by the table and see why that happened.

MS. SIEGER: Okay. My apologies for that. You've been waiting for awhile. I'm sorry about that.

MS. CRALEY: Andrea Craley, Hartford Community College Library. Two questions, just verifications.

One is -- You said we had one library log-in for FDL for the desktop and it cold be shared among staff. Can staff log-on

at the same time?

MS. SIEGER: Yes, that is possible.

MS. CRALEY: Okay. And another question is -- I just want to make sure I'm not confused too much. If I'm with patrons, tell the about the FDLP, what the FDLP is -- need to be on GPO access. I think that now I saw it on the directory site, the desktop. Would it be there? Can they go to it, or because it's log-in only, I'd leave it to the directory or -- I'm just confused.

If someone wanted to know what is the FDLP, there used on be an area that told you what that was and you could direct them to, I guess, the desktop, and I guess the directory. But I'm confused as to where I would send them.

MS. SIEGER: Yes. One of the things we need to do at GPO is sort of combined that message, so we're sending people to one place instead of five different places, and that's some of what we're trying to do.

As we go ahead and we review all

the information to make sure it's up to date and the most current, we'll go ahead and start to consolidate that more.

Most of the content on the desktop,

99 percent of it, is open to everybody. It's

just that small percentage that there is a

very specific reason why that it's locked

down, will be inaccessible. On the

new desktop -- You can see on this version -
Underneath "home," the first menu item is

"about the FDLP." And so from there, there is

a description about what the FDLP is and then

there are various content articles.

One is "How to designate a federal depository library." The next one is "the biannual survey." "the depository Council," or "the Public Printer," "the value of the FDLP," and the "Library of the Year Award." So those are some of the articles we're putting underneath there.

So you have the basics of what the program is and you can dive into more based off of other items that are considered part of

"About the FDLP."

MR. GRIFFITHS: David Griffiths,
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
And my question is about the scope of the
community site.

Many of us who work for a federal government information also are IGO specialists, who are local government specialists, for example. And would those areas be within the scope of FDLP community?

MS. SIEGER: I'd be interested in hearing more from the community on that. From my perspective, I'm not an expert with the program -- I'm not a librarian by trade, so I leave a lot of that open to other people to advise me on.

Right now, I personally think if it's part of who you are in your profession as a government documents librarian, I would personally say it's relevant. But I can be over-ruled at any time. I'm open to other peoples' suggestions on that.

MR. GRIFFITHS: Okay, thanks.

MS. SIEGER: Alright. We're at quarter of -- What do we have?

MR. SWINDELLS: Just real quick. Jeff Swindells, Northwestern University Library. I'd like to urge Council to look at expanding the community side to other non-depository libraries specifically because I think this offers a lot of possibilities for outreach.

I mean, for instance, I do egovernment seminars in public libraries around my area. I could create a group for folks, just sort of discuss issues that came out in those seminars, and things like that. That's probably one.

The second point is are you going to allow users to rate the posts of others or rate expertise of others and sort of really push the social networking things like slashdot allows you to do, which actually helps filter the best information from a large community of users? Or are the rates only rating websites?

1 MS. SIEGER: There is a system in the "comments." 2 MR. SWINDELLS: Right, okay. 3 MS. SIEGER: So if you go to the 4 blogs -- Let me find one that had comments. 5 Here's one that had seven. Next to each one 6 7 there's a "plus" and "minus." MR. SWINDELLS: Oh, okay. Great. 8 MS. SIEGER: So you could say, "Yes, 9 10 this was more relevant." MR. SWINDELLS: Great. Okay, good. 11 MS. SIEGER: We could push that to 12 13 the top. MR. SWINDELLS: And then I'd like to 14 15 second David's point that both professionals 16 work in multiple levels of government, but our users very much do because we're in a global 17 world and there really is no question that's 18 19 just federal, just local, just international, so we need to start thinking how we're going 20 interact with those other levels 21 government. Thanks. 22

MS. SIEGER: Thank you.

23

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I told you this last summer and I'm going to say it in public. Exactly what John said. I think that this -- especially the community website here, is GPO at it's finest.

And I'd love to personally thank you for the energy and drive and creativeness that you've put into this whole process because -- Well, while I know you have a team, I suspect that the direction came from -- Well, I don't know where the direction came from, but anyway -- I'm really excited about this and I think that it's going to enable the community to come together in ways that five years ago, we would never have imagined would even be possible.

MS. SIEGER: I appreciate that. Thank you. And I want to thank Ric Davis and Ted Priebe and the other people that I work with at GPO for allowing us to actually take that vision and develop it -- Take that creativity and really apply it to this to try

and make something that the FDLP community can make use of.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ETKIN: Cynthia Etkin, GPO. Ι also thank John for want to making that community site comment about the being something that was part of the previous discussion. That was actually a very good example of what was in the slides, I think, didn't show of strengthening the that we network of depository libraries.

MS. SIEGER: I will throw one last thing in there. I know a lot of people have been asking about web-tech notes. I've brought with me the -- How many pages was it, Katie? 95 pages? 95 pages of statement of work for re-design of web-tech notes.

We should be close on re-designing that, so -- If you are interested in hearing about some of the bells and whistles, you can stop by the vendor table and we can tell you about some of that.

But rest assured, we have been hearing that web-tech notes needs to get back

up. We see it's one of the hot, popular items
when it comes to the news stories on the
desktop. We are working on it. It's close.

If there are no other questions, we
have -- It's about quarter of five. Let
everybody break early and grab some dinner and

everybody break early and grab some dinner and our folks will be out in the lobby until the traffic dies down to answer any questions that you have.

With that, I'll turn it back over to --

CHAIRMAN BYRNE: I do not think I have anything further to add. Anything that Council wants to bring up?

Anything on this side of the table that you'd like to bring up? If not, we'll go ahead and adjourn this meeting.

(Whereupon, meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE & FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2008

+ + + + +

The Council convened at 8:30 a.m. in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the Doubletree Hotel Crystal City, 300 Army-Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Tim Byrne, Chair, presiding.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

TIM BYRNE, Chair
CHRISTOPHER GREER
KATHRYN S. LAWHUN
JOHN A. SHULER
GWEN SINCLAIR
KATRINA STIERHOLZ
VICTORIA K. TROTTA
KENDALL F. WIGGIN
DAVID CISMOWSKI
SARAH G. HOLTERHOFF
JUSTIN OTTO
SUZANNE SEARS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening by Chair Byrne
Presentation by Deng Wu
Presentation by Paul Nelson
Presentation by Johnny Gee
Presentation by Blake Edwards119
Demo presentation by Lisa LaPlant127
Presentation by Ashley Dahlen and Katrina Stierholz (Scenarios)193
Presentation by Robin Haun-Mohamed266
Presentation by David Cismowski
Discussion led by Cindy Etkin
Adjourn

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

(8:35 a.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: Good morning. Welcome to the second day of meeting here. announcement before we have one get FDsys. Yesterday at our 5:00 to 6:00 working session, council had considerable discussion about the future of the FDLP Strategic Plan, and there was a lot of concern that we really hadn't had enough time yesterday to really get through discussion of the goals and the strategies.

And considering what GPO hopes for the schedule of completing the strategic plan, council really felt that it was important to have continued discussion at this meeting.

So what we decided to do was do a little bit of a schedule change, and so the -- the working session that council has scheduled from 5:00 to 6:00 this evening, we're going to turn into a discussion of the strategic plan, the goals, and everyone is invited to join us at that session.

And then we also have a session

2324

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

from 1:30 to 3:00 on Wednesday that was to be for recommendations, and we want to devote that time to discussion of the strategies and the strategic plan. So hopefully as many of you that can can attend those and participate in the discussion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So now to get into the FDsys, I'm going to turn it over to Selene.

MS. Good morning, DALECKY: welcome to the first of two session on FDsys to clarify today. We just are everybody, this first session is going to be a technical discussion on the Federal Digital System with the actual minds behind the design, the architects of the system.

This came out of several discussions at the last meeting where people were very interested in some of the details itself and the architecture, and why certain design decisions were made, and how the system works together as a whole.

At the 10:30 session, we're be giving more of an overview, an update, on FDsys activity, and we will be doing a

demonstration of FDsys as it exists today in preparation for our launch in December.

So I would like to introduce our speakers. The first speaker will be Deng Wu, who is with the Government Printing Office, and he is the FDsys senior systems architect. The next speaker will be Paul Nelson. He is the FDsys search and data architect from Search Technologies.

Our third speaker will be Johnny Gee. He is the FDsys repository architect, and he is with BeechTree Consulting.

MR. WU: Good morning. I'm Deng Wu, and in the next hour and a half, what we're going to do is give you an overview of the FDsys high level architecture and the high level design.

We cannot cover every detail of the design, but just give you an overview of how the system was constructed, pulled together.

I'm going to cover the high level architecture from the conception model, and also the application architecture, and then Paul is going to be focusing on the data flow

through the system, and they are the search functionalities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FDsys is a large scale content management system, and the repository plays a very critical role in the system, and Johnny Gee is going to cover the high level design of the repository.

very high level, FDsys consists of three major sub systems. The first one is the content management system. that manages a daily daily solution and content metadata, digital and data processing. The repository is dedicated to the archive. This is one of FDsys' major missions: to preserve the content once it gets into the system.

These two systems are backed up by a product we selected, Documentum, to manage these two repositories. The sooner one is an access component, access services system of FDsys. That is backed up by a enterprise search engine, FAST. Johnny is going to cover the -- a little bit of detail design for the repository design for these two repository

systems. And then Paul is going to be focusing on once the data gets into the public access side, how the search works, how the end user accesses that system to get to browse the content and search the content, and to download the content.

Because FDsys is a large content management system, the data plays a very critical role in this system. Now, FDsys manages everything. It manages the content in the form of a package. We follow the open archive information system model to manage the FDsys packages. The SIP, which is Submission Information Package; AIP is Archive Information Package, and the DIP. DIP is the Dissemination Information Package.

The reason we choose -- one of the reasons we choose to implement this to manage the FDsys as a package is because for each identification you have -- let's say you have a text version of the application, and also you have a PDF version. For some applications, you have the XML version.

So those are inside the packages so

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we can manage those all different formats of the same application as one unit. So when you get, for example, the text version of the content, you'll know you can return to the PDF version using that same package.

FDsys adds another package, which is the ACP, the Access Content Package. The reason for that one is ACP is primarily used to manage the access component of the system.

And also another purpose of ACP is to protect the AIP from frequent access to the content files.

In terms of -- okay, so one -- a package consists of three key elements. You have content files, and also you have metadata describing the package. Another element of the package is that a package -- how the packages are bonded together, so to become a unit of -- a management unit inside the system.

Now, in terms of implementation, we took a different approach for each of the packages. It depends on the -- because of the purpose of -- each package is different. For

the SIP, SIP is -- by nature, it's a transitory package. So when the SIP gets in the system, it has -- serves a purpose.

Now, for the AIP, AIP is the long term preservation package. We took a different approach. So for SIP and ACP we leveraged the content management system capability to -- to implement it logically, which means be honest as to where the files are stored, and where the metadata is stored is transparent to the end user.

But on a screen, if you login to the system, you'll see the packages as they were designed. You still see the logical structure, but behind the scenes it's transparent the way the CMS has flexibility to take advantage of the CMS, the capability to store, to manage, to move around the -- around the system.

But for AIP, we took a different approach because the AIP is -- the purpose of AIP is for long term preservation. Metadata, content files, the relationship between the metadata and the content files, and the

relationship between the content files themselves are all described inside of the package itself.

So we use the CMS to manage and to create the AIP, but the AIP is independent of the -- I'm going to talk about this one a little bit more.

The difference is only for when a user requests that they attach the former system. So this form depends on what you requested. If you want just the files, a couple files, if you want the metadata as well. So the data will consist of the content files along with the metadata you requested.

So it depends on what the end user requested. You may -- you may request the whole package, the metadata and the content files, describing each other inside the -- the package.

This is -- this is how -- what -- what the SIP and ACP looks like. So for a package, you have -- we use the concept of a rendition. What a renditions is primarily determined by the format of the publication.

It's that one rendition might be a text version of the publication. Another rendition might be the PDF, and still another rendition might be a XML.

So those -- in general, there -one rendition contains a complete
representation of the same publication. Now,
we have another -- in this diagram, we have
another one called a granule folder. Granule
is the -- for some of the publications, they
are -- the part of the package -- maybe the
end user is like a Federal Register.

Issues of the Federal Register consists of multiple articles. Those articles are not necessarily related to each other. For one particular article, you may not be interested in the whole issue of the Federal Register.

So that's why we use the granule concept to break the files down to a particular article you are interested in. So it makes those searchable as independent and a unit inside the package.

The metadata: Okay, so for SIP and

ACP we take out advantage of this underlying theme as to manage the metadata. That's why you don't see it in this diagram. the So is metadata management is what the CMS So we'll take advantage of designed for. that. So we -- but on the large scale, when we login to the system, you'll see the package structure is like this.

Now, for AIP, we still have renditions and the content files inside the rendition folders. Now, we have three more So the first one is important XML files here. the AIP. I forgot to mention when we thought the earliest model, used metadata up we standards to -- the XMS standards to manage the metadata, and also the association between content files and the metadata themselves.

Now, come back to this AIP now.

Now, the AIP.xml is actually based on METS.

METS is used to bind the packages together so to describe what the packages consist of, what content files, and also the relationships between the files and the metadata.

The MODS: MODS is another metadata

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

standard we use for descriptive metadata. And PREMIS is used inside the AIP for permanent information. We recalled everything, every activity, when anything is done to the content files inside of packaging will be recalled inside a PREMIS file.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So this is the history of what happened starting from the creation, from the birth of the AIP. What has been done A to Z in this package?

Okay, now this is the application architecture. This is a little bit of a detailed version, a view, of the conception model. Now, here we have repository two subsystems supported by Documentum to ACP in one file store, and AIP is located totally different file store. The Documentum is authentication for user authorization, and work flows and the content search, and also we use the Webtop for user interface.

Now FDsys -- for this tool component, we do have some FDsys customized applications. The first one would be -- what

you see here is just an example of them. We manage the package concept. We manage the concept by FDsys packaging applications, which is through the content repository. This is another big component of the system to pass the metadata from the content files in the search, and Paul is going to get into that a little bit in detail, and also into the virus tracking.

When anything gets into the system, we make sure there's no malicious viruses getting into the system. And also, we have set up PDF functionalities. We use Adobe Life Cycle to digitally assign the select publications, and also some other options, for example the PDF granule generation.

For these tool systems, you need a user account to log in to the system. I will touch that one later on.

Now, we also use the GPO integrated library system to FDsys. Between these two systems, we synchronized a subset of metadata FDsys manages, which is the bibliographic information. When anything come to FDsys, we

want to make sure there's a subset of metadata synchronizing the two systems. We use Enterprise Service Bus to facilitate the communication between the two systems.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, the -- on the right side, we have access subsystem. This is basically the current GPO Access. So when FDsys stands out, this component will replace the current GPO Access. It will be subsumed by this component of FDsys.

reaching Now the tool the repository and the access subsystem we have -we pull the content from the repository for the public access. But only subset of packages are getting their -- getting to the public side. Like for example, we have PDF versions, the text versions and HTML and some -- like a poster script version of publication. But a poster -- for example, poster script will not get into the public side.

So on the public side, you will have HTML version of the publication. You will have PDF files as well, and also the

So there will be access for the -metadata. through the Access subsystem, and Paul going to cover this one in detail, and Johnny is going to over the digital design, a little bit of the design, of the repository part.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, as I said for the repository subsystems, you need a login count. Now, how do we manage the user access? We use -- FDsys the rules and enforce groups to application security control. So it depends which group is used for content.

Each content, or each inside the system must belong to one or two -one or more groups. Now, the rules are used to specify function roles a user can perform. So it depends on which group you belong to, and which function of rules you are assigned with.

So when you log in to the system, that determines what you can do to the system, what you can see, and what you can do in the Now, we -- all the rules and the system. users and the groups are managed in the LDAP. Documentum has the built in LDAP integration.

So we use that one to get advantage of that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

FDsys а tool, Oracle supports Internet Directory tool, and Microsoft а Active Directory. So here is an example. example, if you belong to -- when the content comes from the EPA, we assign it to those who belong to the EPA. This is just an example. You can have granule -- for one agency, you can granules of groups of content as an agency desires them.

So now, when content comes into the system, it belongs to one group. Now, if a user logs in, you are not belong -- you are not from EPA; you probably wouldn't -- you will not see the content inside the system at all.

Now, you can see the packages and the content files, but it doesn't mean you can do everything to the system. That's controlled by function rules.

Now, before I turn to Paul and Johnny about the digital design, I want to cover a little bit more about how the content gets into the system. This is the FDsys, just

an approximate model.

So when content comes into the system, it comes in a SIP format. So the first thing the system does it to validate the SIP is right, is correct. You got the right metadata, you got the right association to the metadata and the files.

Then the primary objective of the ingest process is to create the AIP. So with all the original files arranged into the package form, the AIP is created.

Now, after that one, we have another -- a work flow that will process the content. The first thing we're doing is to parse in the content. FDsys is very XML heavy, and a data driven system. Lots of search and management depends on the metadata. We get the metadata by parsing the text version of the content files themselves.

So once the data -- the metadata are extracted from the content files, we're going to activate the AIP with descriptive metadata, and some technical metadata as well, and followed by other processing activities.

That's primarily designed for easy access to the -- to the Access system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And as you can see, we have three main storages. One is for the archive storage, which is totally separate and is in a very secure storage environment. Another one is Access package storage. That is supporting the daily management of the content and the packages. That's internal, so you need to have an account to log into the system to do anything.

is public Another one That's facilitated in the content storage. submission search and so on. So to access this for this reason, you do not need the Access user account login. But for considering like release, we are personalization tool to personalize But still, it's different from the pages. internal subsystem.

With that, I think I'm going to turn over to Paul. Any questions? All right.

DR. GREER: I'm Chris Greer from the National Coordination Office. I assume we

can ask questions at this point. It would be helpful to have questions on each of the stages here. And I have a number, so bear with me for a minute.

You've gone with file structure as

-- it looks like the soil approach. What
about databases? Do you -- have you thought
that through?

MR. WU: Right. Database -- okay, we use Documentum as our content management system. The underlying database is Oracle. We use Oracle.

DR. GREER: And what I'm talking about is a preservation object, which is a database.

MR. WU: Preservation object? In terms of the creation and management, we use Documentum as well, yes. We store the package itself in a file system so that all the metadata and permanent information are XML files themselves. I mean they're XML files. So we have -- METS is going to bind -- to describe the relationship between the content in the file system, and also the metadata

files after the METS and the mods feeding them between each other.

DR. GREER: Okay, let's take that offline. I'd like to hear more about that. The file taxonomy granularity you described down to the article level, is that the furthest you're going? How far will you break down the taxonomy?

MR. WU: We'll talk about this later.

DR. GREER: Okay. I'm somebody at a regional library. I want to draw up an application that mashes up metadata. Could you clarify that? Do I have to get the whole package? Can I get the metadata?

MR. NELSON: We'll cover that, too.

MR. WII: Yes.

DR. GREER: And the application architecture you have a web application server interface. Looks like the only interface. I'm at -- two scenarios. I'm at a regional -- I want to write an application that has its own Documentum workflow, or maybe I'm at a company and I want a value added service, and

I'm going to write -- I want to write my own application interface. How in this architecture do I do that?

MR. WU: This architecture is geared toward this release. This is first to be released. For the later releases, we -- we are considering opening APIs for the external system to connect to our -- to our system, to communicate with our system.

Now, if the -- as you said, if the other party uses Documentum as well, they'll have more options to do that. Yes. This is geared toward the first release, what it's going to look like.

DR. GREER: So the API comes later?

MR. WU: Yes.

DR. GREER: Okay. Authentication, is that a -- I was thinking at the ingest process now. I have two questions. The authentication -- I'm at a regional. I want to do an authentication. Is that against the archival storage?

MR. WU: It's against the repository itself, yes.

DR. GREER: The archival?

MR. WU: The archival storage and the ACP are all managed by the -- with a different set of security 9:02:23, yes, but it is still managed by the repository.

DR. GREER: Okay, so we'll talk about authentication tomorrow. I'd like to know a little bit more about how that's going to work because that's a major service, and is suddenly the one that's going to be taken up in large measure by lots of users out there. I'm looking at the architecture. I don't know how that will scale.

MR. WU: I'm sorry. This one is geared towards -- this first release we have internal users that take advantage of an active directory. We'll already have the users, and just enable them to have the groups and the rules so they can access the system.

Now, there all -- yes, we need to extend how to authorize the -- authenticate the other agencies, for example. Yes.

DR. GREER: Okay, the philosophy in this first release seems to be containment,

and it's hard for me to see how the architecture expands to utility or usability, which was one of those goals.

The ingest process has the preservation information metadata variation annotation there. It looks like it's entirely internal. If I'm not at a regional or selective, and I want to contribute to the annotation metadata, how do I do that? That's not in this release, either?

MR. WU: This release? Not in this release, yes.

DR. GREER: Is there a plan for that?

MR. WU: Okay, so for this release what we're trying to do here is it looks -- it may look like limited functions. What we're trying to do is build the foundation of the system. The framework is there, and so for this release, for the AIP, we're going to create the AIP, store the AIP.

We do not have -- frankly, we do not have much preservation process for this release.

DR. GREER: Okay.

MR. WU: Yes. So we want to get the user structure ready on -- like for later releases we'll be able to work on the AIP, to structure the process first, the preservation process first; what we can do, what needs to be done to the preservation copy.

So that's why we -- we do have a separate version where we do the archival package and the access package. So that's different missions of the FDsys. Yes.

DR. GREER: Yes, I understand, although at the -- the long term goal has to be to provide -- you know, that pyramid model was really a good way to think about this, and then if you want to build the applications through the access applications on top of that, that -- this is that bottom layer. I haven't heard so far a lot of thinking about how that architecture enables the rest of the pyramid.

What I've heard is a lot about how that architecture contains securely the necessary functions of GPO here, and that's

commendable, but I'll be interested in hearing as time goes by with this discussion how that -- that foundation layer then gets opened up to everybody else.

MR. NELSON: That's the next set of slides.

DR. GREER: Okay, good. I'm sorry to occupy so much time.

MR. WU: Okay.

MR. OTTO: Good morning. I'm Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University. With regard to the archival content repository, I'm just wondering how often is it backed up, and what are you guys doing to ensure like long-term integrity of the data in the archival repository?

MR. WU: The backup, the frequency of the backup should be configurable, and they are -- as I said, for this release we'll build archive repository, but I would have not -- frankly, I will have not established the process yet. We'll have to establish this process. How often it needs to be backed up, how often it needs to be refreshed, for

example.

So we're going to periodically check the integrity of the data as well. So how often would we do it? Whose responsibility is it?

Now, for this release what we did is made sure the original files, the things we need for the release, are there. So that's for the archives part. So the architecture is not limited to anything from there. So that's the focus for the archive repository for this release.

So yes, a lot needs to be done, but yes. The security -- as I said, the security for the archives repository is the most restrictive one obviously because they only have -- only very few people can have access to it.

Even if you have access, probably you're just assigned to a very limited functionality to the system -- to the repository. All right, thank you.

MR. NELSON: Thanks. I'm Paul Nelson. I'm with Search Technologies.

Amazing as it may be or may seem, I wrote my first search engine 20 years ago now, and in all that time, I've never had a project which has been as challenging and as fun, and as worthy as this one.

It has been really quite incredible. Most of the databases I get to search over are like resumes, news reports. This is really great data, and it's very rich data with a large history. It's data that means a lot to a lot of people.

It actually affects individual's lives, and we are trying to design a system that takes that richness and that history, and all that individual and unique aspects of every one of those individual collections, and leverage that so that it can be really made available to the public, and make the world a better place.

And when we started writing our search engines 20 years ago, that's what we really thought. And so we thought search could make the world a better place, and now I'm really getting the opportunity to do that,

and I'm really excited by this -- this opportunity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

When we started, I started with GPO Access -- I'm sorry GPO, march around -- and the first thing we realized was that this wasn't a question of scalability. We didn't -- it's not an enormously large number of documents. We're talking about 10 million or so indexable units.

Ιt wasn't an enormously number of queries per second, either, on the scale of, I don't know, Google or something like that. What we discovered right away was that it an amazingly large was amount of detail, and that that detail was important, and that we wanted each one of the documents to preserve as much of the detail, and as much of the richness on each of those individual collections as possible because the agency that's in the Federal Register article is very important.

in The RIN number the Federal Register article is very important. The speaker that unit of business in the in

Congressional Record is very important. Who voted yea or nay on a senate resolution is very important. Those are things that we need to preserve and need to make searchable as much as possible.

When we look at the system, it's just I mean really thousands and thousands of little details that we have to work out. And so the whole architecture from my perspective from starting on was being able to manage the detail, being able to manage the scalability of the detail, and organize the system in such a way that we can manage that detail and incorporate it, and really expose that richness.

And so a lot of our design is really with the intention of allowing for extensibility, allowing for customizability on a per collection basis, and moving those sorts of details out of code and into configuration so that they can be easily changed, and easily adjusted to make the system as flexible on a per collection basis as possible.

Okay, so let's get into it a little

bit about collections, packages and granules. So we talk about these a lot. What is a collection? Now, this has been kind of an issue within FDsys because collections mean different things to different people at different times.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Within FDsys we use the word collection, and we're now calling -- kind of transitioning to call it a processing code. A collection is a group of documents, which are processed the same.

And so we want to process them in terms of applying the same parser, applying the kinds of rendition same management, creating certain kinds of renditions manipulating it. And examples some of different documents, groups of which processed the same are like the Register, the Congressional Bills, the Record, and so on.

Now, to the public, a collection is a group of documents which logically belong together. And so some examples are the Federal Register, the Congressional Bills, the

Congressional Records. So we see in this what case, how process things we internally, and how we present them to the public are the same, but we're making FDsys so that they don't have to be the same. And some examples of where the two are not the same: for example, you might have multiple budgets. Each budget is very different from year-toyear, but you want them all to be searched under the budgets collection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Similarly, if you have a Congressional report that is printed in the Congressional Record, that -- our object can be displayed in two different collections. So if you identify that there's a report that's printed in the Congressional Record, you want that to show up both as a Congressional report in Congressional reports collection, as well as in the Congressional Record because it really belongs in both places.

Then we have the possibility for virtual collections of the future. That is we could create a collection, for example, of all things related to education. So if you're

interested in searching on the education domain, you want to search over the documents from the Department of Education, say, from the Federal Register, the documents from the Department of Education -- is there a -- yes, of course there is the DOE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

these different Sorry. From databases, we could combine them together with a special kind of virtual collection code, and then be able to search only over those areas. if gives us -- by splitting these notions apart, processing in presentation another way, we have a lot more flexibility to organize the system the public, which makes the most sense for public, but still maintain our -- the need to process things because we have to know how to process something, otherwise we can't process anything, which kinds of makes sense, Ι suppose.

Okay, going one level down, packages: For us, a package is roughly equivalent to a bound paper document. And so if you can pick up one page, and a bunch of

pages come with it, that's pretty much a package on the whole.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So examples is one whole issue of the the Federal Register; one issue of the Congressional Record, a single Congressional bill, one issue of the weekly compilation of Presidential documents. And here's where things get a little interesting: one volume of the Code of Federal Regulations, which is an enormous chunk, right?

And so obviously there's not one file that makes up the entire volume. a whole bunch of files that make up a volume of the Code of Federal Regulations. The 9/11 Report, single Congressional committee а report. Now we're talking -- we're still investigating the Congressional committee reports, but we'd like to put all of the parts of a Congressional committee report together into one package so that when you get that package, you get all the parts and all the errata together, rather than individual items that you have to find and then put together.

So it's trying to make packages a useful, combinable unit. And as just a little example, just to kind of prove to you we have packages on our system, on the left hand side you see a list of packages of -- each of these is an issue of the Federal Register.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I opened up one, and you can see within the package we have an HTML rendition, a PDF rendition, a PDF submitted rendition, an SGML rendition, and a text rendition. two PDF renditions reason why we have because the submitted files are the ones we actually found inside of GPO and now we're combining them into a front matter, a reader aid section, and then individual pieces for each of the different articles into the submitted case, and also -- sorry, in the PDF case.

Also, we tend to have two copies of the PDF so that we can digitally sign one copy. We want to leave the original files exactly as they are, and not touch them. So when we digitally sign them, we move them to a separate rendition. And then we have the text rendition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That's the text files we got, and then we add tags and some metadata to it, and eventually in a near term release, we'll be adding lots of additional linking, HTML linking and stuff, and that's where the HTML rendition comes in.

Now, I clicked the on rendition. You'll see a whole slew of files. There's one text file for every individual article. That gets us to the next subject, which is granules. A granule is the most usefully searchable unit. The most usefully within searchable unit individual any document, and some examples are a single Federal Register article, а single Congressional unit of business.

We didn't know what to call them, but it's basically a thing separated by those diamond-shaped horizontal rules, which I think are called the Bodoni dashes. Is that right? I couldn't find it online, so I didn't know if that was right or not.

A CFR section, so like section

57.402 in Title 40, or an entire bill is one granule, entire report or presidential an So these are individually searchable speech. pieces and the implications of this is that search is much more accurate. I mean if you retrieve the entire issue, and if I said find any word with the word education and the word fire in it, you'd get education way over here, And it if was an and fire way over here. entire issue, it'd be just a really awful search result.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So we do this primarily for accuracy. This is nothing new. I mean GPO Access does this as well. We're just kind of hoping to do it better, basically.

Also you retrieve individual granules so that you can view a single granule rather than having to sift through the entire issue or volume, and that works both on the PDF side, as well as the text side. And one thing that's going to be new with FDsys is that you can get a PDF of the entire granule. And so when you find an article, or you find a unit of business, you get the PDF of the

whole thing, and it'll start where it starts, and it'll end where it ends.

You don't have to get just that page, and then page forwards and backwards. You get the PDF, the whole thing. And now you can save the whole thing to your file system, and then email it to people and things like that. We're treating these as -- as transactional units that can be sent around. And so I think they'll be much, much more useful.

Now, when you ask for a certain page of the Federal Register, because we're not doing things on a page by page basis, you'll get the granule that contains that page. So you'll get the whole context of that item, and then you can of course mail that to somebody else. And then with the Adobe Acrobat, it's got that special feature.

We put a link on it, and it'll essentially jump you to the page you asked for but you'll have the whole thing so you can scroll back and forth to look at the whole thing. So I think it'd be lots more useful

than the existing architecture. And one of the other drivers for this architecture is that granules can be digitally signed.

If we're picking out pieces, we can't digitally sign things on the fly because it just takes too much time. So what we're able to do is split it all into pieces ahead of time, and then digitally sign them all so that we can assure the authenticity of the content as it flows through the world, which we of course hope it will do. I mean we want the data to get out into the world because that's the purpose.

Okay, architecture philosophy:

It's a data-driven architecture. Now, a lot of GPO Access was based on editors creating tables of how to browse things. What we're trying to do to the extent possible is replace those statically generated pages with dynamic pages based on the data itself.

And so the -- the basic flow is we get raw content, and these are like on optical drives, and on VAX machines, and all over the GPO system, and we're harvesting all of that

data with a bunch of programs and analysis and stuff, and grouping them into packages where we put all the files related to a bound volume together into renditions.

Then we apply a parser to that where we extract metadata from the file names. We extract file data from the content of the file, and we're pretty -- we don't care where the metadata comes from. We want to get the best metadata possible. So if we can get good metadata from an SGML rendition, we'll go for it.

If we can get it from the CDPT rendition, we'll go for that. If we can get it from the locator rendition, which we are seriously considering in some cases, we'll go for that. So wherever we can get the best metadata, we're going to -- we're kind of format agnostic is kind of what I'm trying to say. Is that the right word? Yes, that's the right word.

Okay, so extracting metadata. And so when we have this package, which contains both content and metadata, the content of

course are the files themselves, which may be signed or processed in a number of different ways, and then the metadata about the -- the descriptive metadata, and then we use that data to drive the rest of the system.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We deliver that. We can create mods from that. We can use that for search of course, and then maybe coolest of all is we use the metadata itself to browse through the entire collection. And so when we're browsing through the entire collection and you see a list of the years, for example, those are the list of years that actually exists within the Then you open up a year and you see system. the list of months. Those are the months that actually exists and there has to be at least one document with that month in order for it to show up.

And so what you're seeing is a view of the data that is actually there. It's not what somebody presumes ought to be there. what's actually there based It's metadata extracted from the system. what it's data driven when а mean

architecture.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So you asked for a technical discussion, right? And so here you go. We're getting really deep. I'll just run through this quickly. Obviously we don't have an enormous amount of time and Johnny is watching his minutes disappear as we talk.

The upper left hand corner we start with the original content. We run parsers, which are written in java. Our team is responsible for parsing of the data, and that's been actually a really fun thing to do, and it's going really well.

The parsers extract metadata from the original documents, create this called the FDsys XML. The FDsys XML is an XML format that is internal FDsys. to It's essentially the holder of the data that gets traveled around FDsys, and it has all the it's essentially FDsys the representation of the data as far system FDsys is concerned, plus content files.

Now, we have Documentum. Once things are inside of Documentum, you can go

into Documentum. You can modify the metadata.

If you saw the parser make a mistake, you can correct the mistake. If you want to add a granule, you can add a granule. You can do other things in Documentum.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Also, it has a bunch of workflows and automatic things built in. It automatically digitally signs things. It'll automatically split PDF files into granules. It'll automatically create HTML renditions. It'll automatically hyperlink the links inside of HTML and so on.

So once Documentum has had its chance to do all of its work, it flags those saying, "I'm ready packages to as published." And then this published program scans through Documentum and finds the things that are ready to be published and pulls them into this place we're calling the ACP It's kind of -- I think cache is kind of like a mirror maybe of the data that's inside the repository.

It is all the publically available portions of the package, plus the FDsys XML,

that is stored on the website essentially, ready to be quickly served up to the end user.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The published program will take the metadata, will transform that into -profile fields using index in its transform, and pump that metadata into the fast search engine. Oh, and look, inside the index XML there's a mod XML, which I think is just really cool because the thing is you can -- the way we're structuring the system, we are actually indexing the entire mods into the indexes so that at some point, you'll be able to search over the mods itself, which opens up fabulous all kinds of really search functionality.

Okay, we also pull the content files. You can do full content search, and that goes into the search engine, and now you can do searches with a search form.

You get the search results, all the search results. That is the search results list, not the content itself but the search results list comes straight out of the search engine for performance reasons, and we also

use the search engine itself to do browsing across the entire collection.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That is to see -- search engine will tell us all the years that have been indexed for a collection. It will tell us within a year all the months that exist for a collection and so on. So we can browse through hierarchies of documents.

On the delivery side, one thing I - there a missing line from the content files,
obviously the content files will be delivered
directly to the user, but this FDsys XML has
all the information that it needs to produce
mods.

One of the metadata files within the ACP cache will deliver the premise, and FDsys will also deliver the XMLcontent detail, which is essentially a user readable summary of the metadata that's about granule or about that package. And look, we do also а little package table So we can show where that granule contents. exists within the package as a whole and it gives the user a little bit more context about

this item that they've retrieved.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

quick Just а introduction into parsing. Basically parsing is a bunch regular expressions that extract metadata. So an example of regular expression is all these versions of a public law, a reference. So we're trying to find references to public law so that you could, for example, search for public law 109-130 and find any document that references that particular public law, which I is pretty cool no matter how think it's specified. If it's specified public law, or Pub. L, or PL, or P.L.

The purpose of parsing is to produce the first FDsys XML with all the metadata extracted from the documents. An example of metadata we're extracting from the Federal Register: the agencies, the title, the action, the summary, the dates, the contact, the FR Doc number, the billing code, plus a whole slew of other things.

An example of extracted metadata, and again this is just to prove that we're actually running parsers and actually

extracting metadata, this is metadata actually extracted by an actual parser from an actual issue of the actual Federal Register.

And so we've got the title. We've got the page range. We have the migrated Doc ID, which is how it was represented in GPO Access so that old programs can continue to fetch out documents from the new FDsys system. Granule class, agencies, effective dates, billing codes, all kinds of really, really useful stuff that would be very useful for searching. Oh, and the CFR information: the title number, the part number of the CFRs that are referenced inside the document.

We also like to parse the table of contents. This is something that is really above and beyond because parsing the table of contents I can tell you is no easy task. It's very hard to do because people -- when the Office of the Federal Register, when they create the table of contents, it's really a subject index, right? So the words don't match up, right?

And so it's tricky. We have to

look for the item in the table of contents, match it up by page number if the page numbers are equal, but there may be multiple granules on the page. So then we have to figure out which granule it's about, and that's like matching up words and stuff.

In the case of the Federal Register, it's a little easier because we can match up by the FR Doc number, but in the case of things like the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, or the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record, it's really tricky.

But what we like to do is to use the table of contents to annotate the granules themselves because the purpose is to get to the content. The purpose is not to get to the table of contents. The purpose is to get to the content.

And so if we can use the table of contents to make the granules more rich, and more easily searchable, we like to do that. So as an example, this same metadata example we see at the bottom, we've extracted the subject level one for this particular granule

from the Federal Register's table of contents is practices and procedures.

And so that -- what we're saying is that this article was put under a subject heading of practice and procedures in the Federal Register table of contents, and that this is the document. That's how the document was described, the top doc in the table of contents, which I think is pretty cool.

Some of the things you can do with this is, for example, find all the articles in the Federal Register, which are listed as meetings in the contents, which is obviously very useful. They don't often -- often times, it'll be listed under the table of contents as a meeting, but the word "meeting" will not be in the article itself.

An editor from the Office of the Federal Register looked at that, determined it was a meeting and stuck it there. And that's the kind of useful information we want to leverage as part of this parsing.

I'll find all the entitles from the body of the Congressional Record that are

listed under measures passed in the Digest, and of course that's extremely so useful. I'll find all the entries from the body of the Congressional Record identified as the Patriot Act in the Daily Digest; find all the presidential documents identified as, "Communications to Congress," from the table contents of the weekly compilation of presidential documents.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, remember when I said it was a data-driven system? What we're looking at is an actual print out of the screen of a table of contents from the Federal Register.

This is generated from the data that we've been able to extract from the table of contents and from the -- from the granules themselves, and then has been generated to look like the table of contents as best as possible that you see in the actual Federal Register with a lot of additional linking, and some additional features.

The formatting has been changed a little bit at the request of the Office of the Federal Register, so we're doing some things

that they've asked for. Also you see it says, "Within the Health and Human Services Department."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So we know for example that in the data, the administration for Children and Families exists within the Health and Human Services Department, and so we can -- you can link around and jump around. This feature is not available. And so we hope to make these even more rich, and more interlinkable, and more useful as we go down -- down the road.

committee Congress member and normalization: We have lists of all Congress members for many, many years. We have lists of all the committees, Congressional committee for many, many years. And we used those lists to look people up.

And so when we see a speaker from the Congressional Record, we look them up in the table, and then we can annotate from those all this additional really useful lists information. So we can add into the document the fact that that person has а authority They are number 308, which ID.

stays with them for their entire history in Congress so that you can search for person number 308, and you'll get that person whether they're a House of Representatives member, or whether they're a senator.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We can also identify that they are a sponsor within the document. We can --we'll know what state they're from, and we also have their official names. The names that they have told us they want to be known by, which was the names that we'll be using in -- when we show navigator displays, and when you want to search for them.

for Similarly Congressional committee codes, Congressional committee names change all the time. It was the Banking Committee. It became the Banking and Currency It then became the Banking and Urban Affairs Committee. It's now the Financial Services Committee.

You can search for that committee no matter what by typing in SSGA00, and searching for that, and you'll get that committee across all time. And also we have

the official names, and we also have the short names so that you can search for it either with their official name, or their short name.

I think I've pretty much said all this already. Oh, and this is great. Find all documents sponsored by a senator from Maryland. This is just the kind of very useful search that a lot of people would like to do.

We can find all the cases where a senator from Maryland is speaking in the Congressional Record, which I think just kid blows my mind in terms of what we're able to do by taking some of these different pots of data, parsing them, merging them together, and fusing that data in an intelligent way.

A bunch of search features I'm just going to kind of run through. This is an example of the search results. Search results are tailored for every different collection, and this is why I talk about the detail and how we're trying to manage the detail.

We can tailor the search results for every individual collection so we present

just the best metadata in exactly the way that makes that collection the most useful. Navigators: a navigator when we talk about navigators, it's really a fast search engine kind of terminology thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's really a way of sub-setting your search results. It's actually called a search filter on the system. Is that right? So you do a search, and in your search you get 1,000 results, and it says, "519 of these are 423 of notices; these rules are and requlations; 375 of these are from the Transportation Department."

So if you find something there that, "Oh, I really wanted the ones in the Transportation Department, you can click on it and it'll do a subset of the results, and only give you the 375 - excuse me - that are from the Transportation Department.

And we can also have hierarchal navigators, which essentially structure the data in a hierarchal way. If I click on 14 CFR, I'll get the 334 documents that mention Title -- is it -- yes, it's Title 14 of the

CFR. If I click on part 39, I will get the 276 documents that are part 39 of Title 14 of the CFR.

And so we can have hierarchies of navigators. You can drill into the navigators and choose only the granularity of the search results that you're interested in. And again, all this is enabled by the ability to extract the data in an accurate way from the documents themselves, and put them into the search engine in a way that the search engine can accumulate this data across your search results.

Collection browsing: Again, this is metadata based, and so we see here when we're browsing the public and private laws. We get a list of the years. Sorry, the Congress'. So the 105th Congress, the 107th Congress, the 108th Congress, and then you can open it up and see that we have both private laws and public laws, and you can open up the private laws and you see the -- the count, ranges of private laws.

There's not may private laws

typically in a Congress. And then once you get to the bottom, you get a list of all the documents that fit into that category, and then you can get the PDF, the text, or you can go to the content detail for those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so it's a way of, without even doing any search, without even clicking -typing in any character, you can just do click, click, click, and get to the document you need, and what we hope is very userfriendly and collection intelligent fashion.

The advanced search form: this is an example of the advanced search form where you can choose individual fields and search over individual fields. Some examples of data mappings that we're doing: the internal data storage, for example, is 110. But we've built in little scripts and templates, which allow to convert that as needed on each us collection from 100 to 110th Congress 2008, to make it the most useful for the users so we can tell them. Because a lot of users don't know what 110 means, and this gives them really -- just teaches them as

through in kind of a non-invasive way.

The internal data storage for part 5 is actually the number 5, the Arabic numeral 5. And so yes, we have programs that convert from Roman numerals to Arabic numerals, and from Arabic numerals to Roman numerals. And so I was like, "Do I really have to do that?" And they said, "Yes, we really have to do that."

Oh, and mapping of codes and things like that. The content detail page is just an example of what you see when you ask for more information. It's essentially a summary of the metadata extracted from the document in a -- in a way that makes the most sense for the collection and for the user.

The query language syntax: We spent a lot of time of this. I'm fortunate in that I worked with librarians, and I worked with large publishers before. So I really have a sense of the kinds of search functionality you really desire.

And so we have built in a lot of the features that you would find in Westlaw,

and a lot of the features that you would find in Meade Data Central. So we can do those kinds of very targeted, very carefully constructed searches while still trying to maintain a search engine that the average user can just walk in and type a bunch of words and get good results.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so some of the things we have, we have all the basic Boolean operators. You can put things in parenthesis. We have proximity operations like doing near/10, which says that the house and action have to be within ten words of each other. We can do data numeric ranges.

These are just some examples of the kinds of queries you can execute today inside of FDsys. These all work. Congressional hearing and double quotes, Congressional adjacent to hearing. Congressional hearing means those words both have to occur in the document for the document to retrieve, which I understand has been quite a concern since it's a default to or in ways. It's obviously a default to and in our search engine.

If you include items in double quotes, the "and" is no longer an operator. It's now the word and. So you can actually search for the word and if you need to search for the word and. Congressional or Congress you can do parenthesis. You can specify a dash or not to exclude certain documents from your search results.

The field operator: Fields can be targeted with the field operator. You can type this right into the search results. So you can say, "Title: Environmental controls," and it'll search for environmental controls just in the title of the document.

That's awesome for things like executive communications, right? There's a granule called executive communications that people need from the Congressional Record. That's what it's called so you can search for it by using the field operator.

You can do very sophisticated searches like congress numbers 110, and the bill number is anywhere in the range 1,000 to 1,500, and it contains the word,

"environment." Or you can do searches like the state of the speaker is Maryland, and it contains the word, "Chesapeake Bay," or things like that.

And finally the search -- search over the mods expected for a near term future release, we are in fact actually indexing the mods into the indexes. All the fielded searches that you see are actually being converted behind the scenes to mod searches, exposing the functionality to give everybody the actual unrestricted search over mods.

We want to work that a little more carefully, but it's really the system is set up so that we can do this, and some of the very sophisticated kinds of things we can do is search for anything where the collection is bills, and the Congress member is a member of the House, and the state is Maryland, and the role is sponsor and that the US Code has been Title 14, and section number 673.

And so varied kinds of very sophisticated, very targeted searches over very richly structured data. I need to go.

Okay, yes.

Relevancy ranking, obviously -- oh, gosh, there's just so much to talk about. I'll just take two more minutes, I promise. Okay, relevancy ranking we're trying to be very careful about finding the documents that the users want the most. If you just walk up and type a citation with no double quotes and no operators or anything that document will come up first, and that's because we've identified those citations and indexed them into a special field, which puts that right up to the top, and it works great.

You type second priority words in the title, names, other summary metadata, other reference documents. So for example, you can type "HR 1042," and A House Bill 1042 comes up, right up at the top. It works great even if HR does not occur in the document because we know what it is. We can expand that item to all the different variations that it occurs, all the common uses that people enter, and so then we get that right up at the top.

1 You can type in, "House Bill 1043." 2 Yes? MR. SHULER: One question on this. 3 it distinguish 4 How does it amongst 5 congresses? MR. NELSON: Oh, you get all the 6 7 congresses. MR. SHULER: So all the congresses 8 where that number appeared? 9 10 MR. NELSON: That's right. MR. SHULER: Okay. 11 MR. NELSON: Okay? 12 Because I mean 13 it can't distinguish of course, and it's -- it has a slight preference for most recent, and 14 15 so it'll prefer the ones that come up from 16 most recent congresses first. You could add of course, "HR 1042 17 from 110th Congress," and then that one will 18 19 come right up. Or you could just say, "1042," and just add the number "110," and then that 20 one would come up first. 21 So all variations are indexed. 22 23 -- well I'll just move on. Other

search features, standard search features that

24

are part of the standard product. Oh, gosh, there's just so much.

Access IDs: This is where we're talking about trying to make the documents as easily downloadable by you as possible. We're trying to make all of the URLs and all the methods for accessing them as predictable as possible, and so you see some of the different ways that we're identifying the documents in the system.

And so these are a variety of things you can download: the PDF, the HTML, the package, the zip files, everything. The package level mods, the granule mods. These are some of the types of URLs that you can use to actually access these items.

So you talk about people wanting to get this data. If they want to get the mods for a particular issue of the Federal Register, they go to that, and then get it, and it includes all the parsed metadata and everything about all the constituent articles and everything. It's an enormous mods. It's very rich and contains a lot of very useful

stuff.

Similarly, we can get all the URLs for the granule items, and again, this is with the intent of making these documents easily accessible by the world. And then finally, just a little example of the kind of the mods that we're producing with some of the kinds of information that we're storing in the mods. Thank you.

DR. GREER: Are we allowed to interrupt with questions, or are we running out of time here? One question, all right. Why did you choose this framework? I think you quite reasonably reproduced the process, the document system as it exists now. You chose that. That the architecture design. That's the search design.

There are many other ways one might have approached this. Why did you choose that?

MR. NELSON: I'm sorry, in what respect? In -- in what respect of the architecture do you mean?

DR. GREER: The search process is

just a choice of granularity, for example, is
based entirely on a documents process model.

That would be one example. For example, if I
want a -- the search I want is -- every quote
in a statement from my senator over the last
five years on healthcare.

MR. NELSON: Right.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. GREER: You go through all the documents with that.

MR. NELSON: Right.

DR. GREER: I got to go through and pull out the quotes.

MR. NELSON: Right.

DR. GREER: another So strategy altogether would be when that's categories of document elements, and you go down to that granularity, that's the fundamental and granulator. So what you've done is you've chosen the standard document management strategy for this particular search. Why did you choose that?

MR. NELSON: I think a lot of the philosophy has to do with essentially being very respectful of the printed page, and that

the printed page and looking at the printed page is the best way to know exactly what's on the document and what's being stated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so our goal is not to replace the printed page. Our goal is to enhance the printed page and make it easier to get to it so that the user can then look at it, and determine for themselves, "Is this exactly what we need."

And so a lot of the philosophy of the system has been along those lines, and the is with second reason because Google essentially, the world is expecting certain things in terms of how to access documents, and we wanted to also leverage that worldwide education that Google has made in terms of how to access content and use all that in -- so that they can step up to the system, access things in a similar way that they know how to do with Google, and get to the content that they -- they know how to weigh and they know how to get to.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I have just one question. Can I --

MR. NELSON: Sure.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: It's a short one. Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. Back to the packages you were talking about. You said one volume of the CFR. Are you talking about one title from one year? I wasn't sure what you meant. I'd also like one volume of the United States Code. Sometimes the volume has two titles in it. I mean I'm thinking how users -- do they know the title?

MR. NELSON: The way -- and I'll preface this to say that those are not in the initial release for January. And so we haven't made all the final architectural decision for those two collections.

But what we're talking about is how things get packaged, which is how they're stored on the system together and that you can actually fetch a zip file of the entire volume to get there.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: But are you talking about 2008 year as a volume, or Title 21 as a volume?

1 MR. NELSON: Yes, it's not whole year, but my understanding 2 is that there's a certain number of volumes that these 3 4 things are split into. Sometimes they're Sometimes a volume correlated to titles. 5 contains multiple titles. 6 7

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Well, that's code. Well, I guess my bottom line is just before you do this, try to think of how the user thinks of it, not how it's packaged in the current print version.

MR. NELSON: Right.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Because people are not going to expect to get -- if they search for Title 21 of the US Code, and they get 21 to 24 or something, that's confusing.

MR. NELSON: Right.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Or if they want one book of the CFR, could be part of the title.

MR. NELSON: Absolutely. And the way the system works is we're splicing it up into sections, right? The smallest -- what we hope for are the most usefully searchable

units within these items. So when you do a search, you're getting the list of sections that match. You're not getting the list of volumes that match.

And really, a volume is kind of a virtual concept that exists for packaging purposes, but has really almost no impact on the search itself, unless you wish to search for all the items within a particular volume you'll be able to do that because every one of these pieces will know the volume that it's in. They'll know the title that it's in. They're know the part that it's in.

And so typically, we expect people to search by those other metadata pieces and the beauty of it is because we're dividing it up into these pieces. We can reorganize it virtually in any of these different organizations.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Just at the end you were talking about downloading a whole package, though. And if that's a huge amount of stuff, I'm just thinking of the user and the user's --

MR. NELSON: Yes, yes. I mean I think that's -- we haven't -- in terms of how much to download, that is a question because we know that that is a huge amount to download, even some of the -- in fact, the one issue of the Federal Register was like 18 megabytes to download, and that was zipped up, right?

And so things can be enormous, and I think that's something we're going to have to look at a little bit more carefully.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Can I ask a quick - this is Katrina Stierholz from Saint Louis
Fed. This is great for accessing things that
are in print, but there are things now that
are online that are no longer being produced
in print, like statistical series. They used
to come out in print. They no longer produce
them. They're only online.

Maps get updated online pretty frequently. I'm wondering how that will be captured in this.

MR. NELSON: Again, these are collections that are down the road that we --

that I wouldn't say that we have looked into in a great deal of detail, but Lisa has something to say about this.

MS. LAPLANT: Hi, I'm Lisa LaPlant. I'm with PMO. So that is something that we have looked at, and I know it's come up a couple times with the question about databases and ingesting databases, and making sure those are available, making sure that we can ingest maps, making sure we can index -- we can index any kind of images in geographical format.

So we do have requirements for those. There's nothing in the system right now that will limit us from being able to do those, but by taking this kind of a collection based approach, we can have all maps or all databases and figure out how to present those and store those, and to best make them available to users.

So it's not in this release, but it's something that we do have the requirements for.

MR. NELSON: Now, one of the other things at least for maps is we do have the

potential of adding latitude and longitude fields to the search indexes in doing some sophisticated geographic searching if you ever -- if you ever get around to doing that. But it's a -- at this point it's a question of walking before we run.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There's nothing in the architecture that prevents us from doing some very sophisticated geographical stuff down the road.

MS. **HOLTERHOFF:** Just one more forgot. forgot. thing I Sorry, I Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. Don't forget the eCFR when you do the CFR. Because now you can get to them together and pair access, and that would be a shame to miss So that kind of falls to Katrina's that. That's an only electronic product, question. so.

MR. NELSON: Yes, I imagine we'll be doing those, certainly architecting those together.

MR. GEE: So with the remaining time I have, a lot of this information has

already been an issue covered by Deng and Paul, and so I think what I'm going to do is just highlight some of the questions that come up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Basically the repository is built to really support the processing as well as preservation with regard to talking about the actual submission of content. Even though for this release we're highlighting collections that -- the Federal Register, there's nothing from a repository perspective that prevents us down the road of ingesting maps or databases, any kind of digital files out there today. I think the real challenge would be how to tag them so that when somebody does a search for them they get the expected results.

The requirements for the talked repository: Again, we preservation. We talked about processing. part of processing, we chose a COTS product, Documentum, really facilitate to the processing from -- of adding files, updating metadata, and so on and so forth.

So the next slide sort of gives you

what any sort of CMS system will allow you to do, and just an example of Documentum. Independent of FDsys, this is the features that Documentum supports. It allows you to ingest any kind of format on HTML pages, pictures. It can actually even be audio files.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

All this information gets stored in a repository. Within the repository, you can use the workflow features to support these files, and then once processing of they've been processed, how you deliver the files again is supported by the COTS product, whether we're delivering on a top from a print, or a website perspective, which is what FDsys is and search interface is going to provide.

But I think there was a question before about can you integrate other applications with Documentum? And the answer is yes. This is the reason why we chose the COTS product. The COTS product provides APIs that allow you to -- as long as you build application that uses the same APIs, you can

talk to -- with Documentum down the road.

It's just a matter of exposing which APIs we want to expose to the community. Obviously for the preservation stuff, we're going to probably keep it a little bit more tight lipped because we don't want people to tamper with it and potentially corrupt it, but just for a general submission perspective, we can see down the road having agencies submit content directly to FDsys.

I think Deng sort of covered what the -- sort of the logical structure patches. What you're seeing here is actually what an authorized user would see within the FDsys application internally.

You have seen some more folder structure, as well as a sort of cabinet entity where we group all the collections, as well as the package, the renditions and the individual files.

Deng highlighted earlier about the use of roles. This is sort of the roles we initially identified and designed for this release. You'll see later on in slides what -

- how these roles are implemented, and from a feature perspective, what one role gets and one role doesn't get.

As for security, one of the strong points of using the COTS product is that all the security is -- the plumbing for the security is already handled for you, and really it's just a matter of configuring what kind of access you want to give to users.

So at the top of the slide, we've sort of defined the security for the SIP packages, as well as the security for packages that have been submitted.

If you look at the bottom, this is sort of the security that's defined for the AIP packages. And if you look, most of these user groups have no privileges, and the reason why is again we're truly isolating the access as well as the ability to update packages that have been preserved already to a very small set of users.

I think Deng sort of covered this already, but from an ingestion of processing, all this just shows is how this interacts from

different submission or ingestion workflow, processing, and preservation.

Going into a little bit more detail of the actual submission process: For this release, we're supporting two ways to submit a package. That's through either an interactive process through the application where a user - an authorized user would select a package that's located under a local file system, and -- and upload it into FDsys.

We're also supporting the notion of a Hot Folder Job, and this really facilitates our current production process where we're getting packages from various agencies, and there's no need for somebody to manually upload them. This is done on a periodic basis nightly, hourly if needed. That's all configurable.

Once the package is uploaded into FDsys, we have an area where we call the work in progress, where they could potentially -- as part of the upload process, some files got dropped off. We have logic built in that will check to make sure that you're not submitting

any packages that have files missing from a rendition.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It will do additional logic to make sure that the files that are identified are associated with a particular format. This is -- I think one of the reasons we do this is because it's critical from both a processing perspective in delivery that when the file says it's a PDF, it actually is a PDF and not a different file format.

talked about sort of the Deng ingestion workflow. I think somebody brought up the point with regards to -- no, backing up as well as validating the data hasn't been tampered with. Well, in the ingestion work flow, we're actually creating a Crypto Time Stamp, and that basically means we create a hash from the content file. We apply several message digests based on the FDsys unique ID that all objects have within it, as well as ingestion date, time.

This creates a time stamp, and will have a separate utility that we can run on a periodic basis once every three or six months

that will actually go on the file system, recalculate the Crypto Time Stamp, and compare that they match up.

How often we run this is still to be determined, but we're anticipating that the amount of storage for FDsys can grow into terabytes. So it's not something we would run on a monthly, but definitely at least on a yearly basis because it's going to take a while to do all the scans.

And I think that's -- we've thought about this when we're processing, when we're making sure that the current architecture and design handles it. And it's just a matter of how often we're going to do this in the future.

I think Deng talked about how the ACP and the AIP are stored separately. Even though we're using Documentum to manage both of them, the actual storage of the content and the metadata files are actually located in different file stores.

When we talk about file store, that really relates to how the files are stored

from hardware perspective. GPO purchased industry standard mechanisms. If you're not familiar, we are using NAS storage, as well as SAN. These really built hardwares are to be highly reliable as well as redundant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So independent of how often we back it up, the storage medium is pretty reliable as it is, and obviously we will be backing up and moving it to an offsite storage. But how often and where that is is I think still being determined at the moment.

I think Deng already covered the METS, mods and premise. The only thing I will add is that we have a separate utility. One of the goals of the AIP package is to have it self describing and independent of the application and/or Documentum.

And to your point about why have we considered using a database, we chose implement the metadata storage as XML only standpoint from the of if you database, you still rely on а particular database vendor. We felt that an XML gives us

that independence from any Statement of Reasons vendors.

What this doesn't preclude us is that if you wanted to reload the preservation package into a separate system, you had the content files. You had the metadata in the METS, mods and premise. All you would have to do is sort of determine how you want this information to be reloaded into a separate application, into a database.

All that information is preserved outside of Documentum in just simple files, and we do have the utility that will allow us to do this, again, as part of verification as well as if there's a need down the road to move off to a different CMS vendor.

From processing workflow I think we touched on there's the parser that actually parses the metadata out of the package. It's part of the metadata extraction in the workflow, we actually checked to see that the data that's coming out of the parser, based on some heuristics, whether the quality of the data looks good or not so good, and for

metadata that's missing or we deemed as potential error we can actually kick the workflow out to a group of users whose role is to check the metadata and/or correct it if necessary.

I think we talked about the creation of PDFs and HTML renditions, and the ability with the integration between Adobe life cycle and Documentum we can actually sign packages as well at the PDF granule level.

The slide just really talks about how we showed examples of the mods file. This is sort of an example, Fdsys.xml. And all this really does is we basically take in all the metadata elements coming out of the parsers and FDsys side of XML, and mapped it to logical objects in the repository.

The reason we did that is that -you'll see in the next slide. Each of these
objects on the right actually has a copies
page that provides a UI that is very simple.
It's something that we are leveraging the COTS
procedure from a metadata management
perspective.

This is sort of a sample UI for the copies that are available, and in this case it would be a FDsys package folder of the Federal Register. Samples you'll see: the name, FDsys unique IDs.

Next slide, and I'll flip back and forth, shows what a person belonging to the submission search role would see. Somebody belonging to a different role actually has access to more metadata elements, and that's sort of the -- how we are utilizing roles in FDsys is that depending on the role you have, you have access to certain actions as well as metadata.

And finally, like on the external side, Documentum also has an advanced system internally, and this will probably be useful for users who are looking to correct metadata prior to either getting published out to the external site. Or if something actually gets published outside, somebody notices an error they can come back into the ACP, make the modifications, and then it will get published back out corrected.

MS. SEARS: Can I ask a question?

MR. GEE: Sure. Suzanne Sears from the University of North Texas. I apologize if I've misunderstood something here, because I'm a librarian and a lot of this technical stuff is over my head. But I hear you say a lot to be determined when we're talking about the preservation and integrity, or -- just I'm curious what a time line is as far as the preservation part of this is.

MR. GEE: From a design and architecture perspective, if really -- from the implementation that's actually to be done, the to be determined is really from a process of how often are we going to run these verification checks that the data hasn't been changed or altered in any way, or if there's a need to export the data external to Documentum and reconstruct the packages.

We have the utility that's going to be available for this release. How often we're going to run this is really driven by what the need is.

We are actually storing all the

packages in a separate AIP file store. If there's a need to say, "Hey, I need an AIP package for this particular ID," we can deliver that to you from an AIP package perspective.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer from the National Coordination Office. Can you go back to slide 54, the repository process or the business process? Yes, right. The bottom right corner, content publishing, public user access and so on, which branches off of the processing workflow and is separate from the preservation process.

I was surprised to see that coming out of the processing component rather than the preservation piece. Does that create custody issues? It's coming from publishing, really coming out of the processing workflow or out of the preservation --

MR. GEE: So from a processing perspective, we are actually --

MR. WU: Yes, the diagram shows that way, but they both come from the SIP. So when the content is submitted to Fdsys, so we

see that as acceptable and verified via the SIP. The SIP is going to get transferred into two. One is the AIP. Another one is to the ACP. Although this diagram is a more processing access like a granule generation and -- that's why it's drawn that way. They come from the same source, exactly same source.

DR. GREER: So the access box shouldn't be connected in that way? In fact, there are things missing here is what you're saying?

MR. GEE: Well, in the processing workflow, that center box there, it's actually creating the ACP from the AIP, but there's additional processing we have to do in order to deliver the additional renditions that a user may want. Because from what is submitted we may only get PDF, and we may -- as part of the processing, we're also extracting images and performing OCR on those images there that are potentially embedded in the PDF.

All that information is used to generate an HTML version and that -- that's

sort of why the content publishing happens from a processing. If it just came directly from a preservation, that means you're not getting all the additional benefits of what we're trying to deliver as value added on top of what's submitted.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. GREER: I guess that is what I'm concerned about. The ACP and AIP are generated not from the archival record, but from the process record. So if I go back to the archive and generate packages, they're not necessarily the same as the package generated in this workflow.

MR. Well, the design WU: philosophy here is that the ACP should be able to be regenerated from the AIP. That's the goal we're trying to achieve. So from this diagram because that's part of ingestion process.

DR. GREER: Right.

MR. WU: Because when the SIP is accepted, it will begin to create AIP. And at the same time, it's the exact same source that creates the ACP for access because they come

from the same -- now, we want to change the ACP. We need to activate ACP. We can't create the ACP from the AIP, from the archival copy.

DR. GREER: All right, so we're getting into detail, but I think there are custody issues in the way you're doing this. So I think that would be worth looking at.

MS. TROTTA: Can I ask one question? Victoria Trotta, Arizona State University. At what point in this whole process can Google get to the documents to index it?

MR. NELSON: Google can go to the collection browsing and browse through the hierarchies to get to every single document that's inside of GPO. We're also talking about making a site map I guess it is, where we list all the documents for Google, and they can just look at our site map and then can get to everything. But that's definitely a requirement of the system.

DR. GREER: Can we clarify that?
Can Google crawl your site?

MR. NELSON: Yes. Of course, we think we make a better search engine for GPO data than Google. And if we didn't, we shouldn't be standing here, but we'll have all

the detailed metadata.

We'll know a lot more about the structure of the documents. We're leveraging that structure for the search. But yes, obviously Google. We want people to be able to get to the data.

MR. GEE: Well, if there's no more questions, you can definitely come speak to us offline. Thank you for your time.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:11 a.m., and resumed at 10:38 a.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: Before we get started for this session, I wanted to repeat the announcement I made earlier that council has decided that we really need to continue the discussions of the future of the FDLP Strategic Plan.

So we're going to devote our working session this evening from 5:00 to 6:00

into a more extensive discussion of the goals, and we'll also spend some time tomorrow afternoon talking about some of the strategies, too. So everyone is pleased -- encouraged to come to these meetings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Earlier we had а very, very informative and very technical discussion of Now we're ready for something at a FDsys. different level; some more of an introduction to those of us that weren't ready for the technical descriptions. So back over Selene.

MS. DALECKY: Hello again to those who are returning from the first session, and hello for the first time for people who are just joining us for the second session.

As Tim said, we did have a good overview, or technical overview, of -- of FDsys and the architecture in the content repository and search and the overall design.

And so thanks to Deng Wu and Paul Nelson and Johnny Gee for conducting that.

If you have any further questions of a technical nature, we'd be more than happy

to follow up with those either after this session, or if you want to contact the PMO directly, we can talk through there as well. But I'm going to back it up a little bit and start talking about FDsys at the higher level: what it is, what it's going to do.

Blake is going to talk a little bit more in depth about what's coming right before launch in of beta testing we terms opportunities for the library community, and also some of the help features that we're expecting to get out there because I know a lot of the -- there's a lot of questions surrounding, "Okay, you're launching this new system, and how am I going to know how to use it?" And so we want to address some of that.

And then Lisa LaPlant is going to actually be demonstrating FDsys it as currently exists today; live code in our development environment. Hopefully nobody is messing with it right now back at GPO, and you can actually get a look at what you'll be seeing once we launch at the end of the year.

Okay, so what is FDsys? FDsys is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the Federal Digital System. It's going to be GPO's system for managing federal government documents and allowing them to be uploaded, accessed by the internet, accessed to the general public, and allows these electronic files to be included in the repository library program.

From a publishing perspective, we're expecting to get three kinds of content coming into FDsys. There will be content submitted directly into FDsys, either by the originating agencies or by Congress, or through the GPO production process.

We'll be taking in converted So I know there was discussion about content. the digitization programs going on in library services and in pulling that content in and making it available through FDsys. And then there's harvested content, so that would be the web crawling, going out finding content on official federal sites and pulling it into FDsys and making it available, and preserving it going forward.

From an authentication perspective,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

we're looking at making sure that the content that comes into FDsys is -- has been approved by, contributed by or harvested from an official source so that we can maintain the integrity of the content to the users.

The content, when it's authenticated, can be proven to be complete and unaltered since it had entered into the system. And we are going to be using a lot of the same, at least from the public side, the digital signature technology that's in use right now on GPO Access, and you can actually go in and download a signed public law, for example. We'll be making those available through FDsys.

A couple of different added features is that we're looking to be able to sign content at the granular level. So instead of getting an entire signed issue of the Federal Register, for example, you'll be able to get an article within the Federal Register, and have that digital signature apply to that as well.

We're also looking at how we're

going to authenticate multiple formats. Right now we're assigning PDF files and we're looking to be able to authenticate beyond just the PDF to ensure that we can maintain the integrity of all the content that comes out of FDsys.

From a search perspective, we talked a lot about that this morning, but the bottom line there is to improve findability. However people need to get to the content, we want to make that easy to do.

So whether you are a novice user coming into your Google box and typing in your key words and in natural language; or you're a power user who is searching mods, elements, and putting in the little at sign, and doing all that crazy stuff, you can do that as well. And if you don't even want to search and you just want to browse, or you want to do a simple search and navigate to much more pinpointed results, you can do that as well.

And then a part that we hope is doesn't get lost in all this because the search is so visible, and it's what people

think about the most at least from the general public side, but from our perspective even more important is the preservation.

We need to make sure that the content that we have today is available 20 years from now, or 50 years from now, or 100 years from now, and that we can not only maintain the files as they exist today, but we can migrate them. We can bring them forward into new file formats, or we can emulate them if necessary, or we can do what we need to do in order to be able to see this content and make sure it's not lost.

Okay, the implementation of FDsys is going to be done through a series of releases. So what we're in right now is Release 1C.2. It's the second phase of the first release. It's very easy to follow.

We have requirements that take us through Release 3, and that requirements document is available on the GPO.gov website. It's available off the FDsys pages. If you're familiar with the GPO.gov site, you just go to the left side and you can find FDsys under the

programs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The staging of these releases allows to release functionality and to us build on that incrementally, and also improve existing functionality as we move forward. instead of kind of putting out 3,000 requirements.

Taking a couple years to build a system and then just saying, "Here you go," we wanted to be able to make logical progression through the releases to set up foundation, to replace existing functionality on the GPO Access site, to bring in all the we'll need to storage that for prepare digitization, things like that.

So this incremental releasing really helps us stage the new functionality and improve existing functionality based upon feedback.

Release 1 contains Okay, so The first phase was release multiple phases. That was our proof of concept that we had 1B. released last summer but have managed the packaging concept help

understand how we're going to be actually parsing the data, and how we're going to be populating the XML file that kind of controls all the data is it runs through the system, and that was available to some beta testers and focus groups trying to get additional feedback as to how we were going to actually present search.

I mean we knew the content that we were going to be able to make available. We knew the metadata we wanted to extract. We knew how we wanted to present it on the screen, and this helped us just kind of prove that that can be done, and then make sure we can validate that with the actual users.

The second phase is going to be our first public release, our first operational release. It's built on the actual infrastructure that we're going to be using. We've been building on a data center at GPO. It's pretty impressive the work that's gone on just to bring in the 70-some odd servers that are needed to power FDsys.

That's going to be our foundational

infrastructure, and also the preservational repository. So we're building the access part, and a repository so that we can store our archival packages from the beginning.

We'll do preservational processes later, but we want to make sure we have the integrity of the archival package so that we can form those processes down the line.

and foremost, we need to First replace the GPO Access functionality that's out there right now, and migrate that content So a lot of what we're doing into FDsys. right now seems to be still document-based, but that's kind of the nature of what we're dealing with right now is we have no -older system that needs to be updated, and so we're going to pull that content in, improve the findability, and then also maintain the scalability and flexibility of the system so that in future releases we can bring in things like dynamic content and maps and those types of other file formats that we're not looking at for 1C.2.

There will be an interface between

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

FDsys and ILS for the exchange of metadata in the first release. There's going to be the --we will be providing the digitally-signed documents, and advanced searches, citation searches, all the great different ways that you'll be able to find the data and you'll be able to view and download both the content and the metadata that we'll be making available to the end users.

Okay, I talked a little bit about the content migration from GPO Access. I wanted to go into that in a little more detail just so that there's a very clear picture of what to expect when we flip the switch, and you can get to the live FDsys site at the end of the year.

The content migration is a pretty difficult process. We're looking at lots of content going back to 1994. In some cases, in one or two collections to 1982. It's stored in different locations within GPO. It's in different file formats, and so the act of actually going through and gathering all this content so that it can be made into packages

and ingested into FDsys, and parsed and all the good stuff can happen to it to make it both preservable and accessible takes some

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

time.

And so we want to make sure we do it right because we've got multiple needs for this content. So we have a very good process for doing this.

We have a very good identification process. We have a very good way to extract the metadata and to make that available in the search index, and to create the packages. But in order to get everything in, we're going to phase in the content and start with a subset of the collections currently available on GPO Access at the launch of FDsys.

So the plan is to contain eight collections at launch, and they're listed here. It's the Federal Register, Congressional Bills, public and private laws, the compilation of Presidential documents, Congressional Record, Congressional Reports, Congressional documents and Congressional hearings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so it's a mix of the regulatory and the Congressional materials. We're going to continue, even though we're launching with these eight, we're going to be continuously preparing content for ingest into FDsys, even after launch.

So the plan is to phase them in as the content is available. We're not going to wait until the release of 1C.3 in summer of 2009 for example, to make the next set of collections available.

do Let's see. As we migrate content into FDsys, GPO Access will available. We don't want to take away any functionality that you currently have today. We just want to offer a new way to get at it through FDsys. And so you'll have parallel systems that you can use.

You can choose either GPO Access if you want to get all the content, or you want to go the familiar route, or you can experiment with FDsys and search the content that's available through FDsys as we move forward.

When I talk about migration, it's going to be all of the historical content. So from for example the Federal Register from 1994 forward will be in FDsys, but also the day forward content. So you'll be able to get to a Federal Register from 1995, and you'll be able to get to one from Tuesday, for example. So we will have that forward approach once we've migrated content in.

The target completion for migration is next summer, probably around the time that 1C.3 would drop. So it's going to be a pretty busy time for us, but again we do have a process for doing it, and we'll be getting the content in throughout the beginning of 2009. So we think that that date is definitely achievable.

I just mentioned 1C.3 that we're looking at for mid-2009 as a release. What we're looking at for phase 3 or 1C.3 is to start introducing content submission beyond GPO. So with 1C.2, we're pulling in content from our plant operations at GPO, stuff that we produce in print and as a byproduct we get

the electronic content.

With Congressional submission, we'll be having Congressional staff submit content directly to FDsys where it can be processed for access electronically, and it also can go to plant for print.

So this is going to be the first time we're actually going to open it up and start bringing in our other partners to bring content into the system. And then some enhancements to search and access.

We know that when we launch at the end of the year, there is going to be a lot of feedback that we get, comments. That's one of the reasons that we want to get out there as soon as possible so we can make sure that all of the different testing that we've done, all the beta testing, the usability testing, all of that makes sense and that people are using it, and they can use it in the way that they want to.

So we anticipate that there will be enhancements to search after launch. Okay, 1C.4 is a continuation of the content

submission functionality. This is when we go to our federal agencies and start opening up the ability for them to submit content directly to FDsys.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

looking forward this We're to because we've had some very interested agencies who want to be the first on board to start working with us this electronic on submission, and the hope is that it will just make it easier for us to get content from they maybe these agencies when wouldn't originally be thinking of sending it.

Maybe they would just put it up on their website. But if the proposition is there that they can submit it to GPO, GPO will be able to then take it as an order and print it as normal, but also make it available through FDsys and preserve it. It would be an incentive for them to work with us to build this content in.

Also, we'll be preparing for the digitized content that's going to be coming into FDsys, and we anticipate a very large amount of content, content that is probably

not within a collection that's already been identified through the migration process.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so this is going to be a very interesting release for us to be able to pull this in and make it available to the public; these large, fully-formed collections in some cases, and in other cases, one offs, two offs that we're going to be dealing with from a management perspective, and also from an access perspective.

also additional And then some from the public side in terms notifications and new content coming in, for example, the ability or to navigate relationships between publications. So within those publications, the metadata going from a bill to a law, to a statute, citation, those types of things. And also, this is where we were looking to open up the interfaces so to create the APIs, allowing other people to come in and start using the content in a different way than we're presenting to the public.

Okay, release 2 is when we start looking at bringing in that third type of

content, the harvested content. And another big feature here is introducing preservation processes. So at this point, probably a yearand-a-half, two years into creating these archival packages, and we might be at point -- I mean two years doesn't seem like a long time, but I guess for a PDF file, that can be a very long time. So we need to be able to -- at this point be able to access that preservation repository, and perform any processes to make sure that that content is still -- still has the integrity that we need from a content perspective, and also if we need to do any kind of file format changes or anything to continue to make it available we can do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This would be where we'd look to interface with the GPO online bookstore so that we can start having that one interface view into all the ways that you can get to the content available from GPO, whether it be electronic or print.

Again, more customization for search. This is where we allow you to tell us

how you want to get to the content. You set your search preferences, or you set your alert preferences, those kinds of personalization or customization that are starting to become very

popular on some sites.

Release 3 is again focusing a lot on the agencies, making their job easier, making it a benefit to come to GPO and submit your jobs, or so that you can submit them through FDsys. You can track them. You can get your estimating tools so that you can figure out how much it's going to cost.

You can maybe even create your documents using some kind of creation tool that allows you to easily create it, submit it, have it published, have it made available in a standardized format.

And also, this is where we're looking at collaborative working environments both from the agency end. So allowing multiple agency authors, for example, to create a document and submit it to FDsys, but also this is where we started talking about how we would bring in the library community

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for metadata collaboration or other types of - I think we talked about comments, commenting
on good publications to look at, those types
of things.

There is a super secret release 4 that we're working on, and I shouldn't say anything. It has to do with time travel, but I'm going to leave it at that. All right, sorry.

So these are milestones that are coming up for the current release 1C.2, and some of them are tech speak, but the key thing to take away here is we've got a lot of big milestones between now and the end of the year.

We're hitting on milestones. We're going confident that we're to make our schedule, but we need to make sure that we stay on track. We have a very good team working on it, and we've got a lot of very good support from the business units, library sales-services, the publication and information sales, and the plant operations. So we're very happy to have that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

One area that's of note here is the beta testing that is going to be external beta testing. We do want volunteers who can come in and do scripted testing, and unscripted testing and give us your feedback so that we can take that in and either maybe apply it to the system prior to launch, or we can feed that into the next round of enhancements that we'll be doing up to the next release.

And I think Blank is going to come up and tell you a little bit more about the beta testing and how you can get involved. thank you.

Thanks, Selene. MR. EDWARDS: I'll do the current status as well. I'm Blake Edwards. I'm a program planner in the program office, of management and one mу responsibilities is the user support side of things for the system, which involves trading and beta testing and user acceptance testing. That's what I'm going to talk to you a little about today.

Tn terms of the current development for 1C.2 is currently on track. Lisa is going to be doing a demo of the current system. You'll be able to see a live snapshot of what the system looks like today.

There's still some work that's going on to include additional collections, but the system if running really smoothly, so that's a good sign.

Like Selene said, beta testing is scheduled to begin in December. I think the date right now for external beta testing is December 11th as our start time. So we'll keep you guys up to date on that as it gets closer. And also, the launch is scheduled for late December, so come late December-early January, you'll be able to log into GPO's website and start using FDsys as another tool to support your constituents in the libraries.

And also, one of the key things that's going on right now as the system is being developed and being finalized, we have some people that are working on help and training materials that will be used to support people inside GPO to make sure that content is processed correctly, and gets

through the system, but also materials that will be available to you as librarians and to your constituents to help them find the documents that they're looking for.

In terms of the help features that are going to be available in FDsys, some of the things that we're working right now:

There's a training manual that's being put together, which is the base of the -- all of the information that you would need to know on how to use the system.

That information will be replicated in an online help tool as well. We're using a tool called RoboHelp that Adobe recently acquired from Macro Media. It's a took that's been around for a long time. LexisNexis, regulations.gov are some of the other people that use the same exact tool.

So you'd be pretty familiar with it. We'll give you a snapshot in a second of what it looks like just so you have a picture to put with it.

But what that allows you to do is it gives you a table of contents so that you

can browse through the help material. It allows you to search within the help material to find -- say you wanted to find something related to bullion operators. You could search for bullion and come up with all the pages and the help files that come up with information about bullion operators.

Some of the other features in FDsys will have what we call contextual of field level help. So at different places on the interface you might have a metadata name or you might have the word collection. In those areas, you'd be able to roll over that and get information that just gives a tidbit more information to give you a sense of what that element means.

And the last thing is that we'll continue using AskGPO, which is currently used to support GPO Access and the online bookstore to receive comments, questions. And so we're working closely with library services and the sales -- and publication information sales to continue using that to support the release.

So this is a snapshot of the

RoboHelp tool. It opens just like any other HTML page within Firefox, Internet Explorer, Safari, whatever browser you're using. And you can see on the left-hand side the first tab is the table of contents.

So this gives a little bit of a snapshot into what the table of contents we currently have intended for this. Also, you can search within it, and there's also a glossary of terms. So if there's terms that are used on the site, or in metadata that you're not familiar with, you can actually go into this tool, search for that element in the glossary and get some more information on that.

I was talking about contextual or field level help before. This is a snapshot of what that looks like. So on the advanced search page, publication date is one of the elements on that screen.

You can roll over it and get information that gives a small amount of information more about that. If we gave too much information, it'd be overwhelming. But

at least a tidbit helps people to put it into context for what they're doing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So in terms of what's next, testing for the talked about beta scheduled for December. release, which was We're also planning some online training webinars for January. We've had a lot of success using a tool called GoToWebinar that we've used in the past for beta testing with the library community, also with agencies.

We're planning on using that again multiple sessions in January once the system is up and running so that you have a chance to get some feedback directly from GPO on how the system works; gives the opportunity to ask questions about how it works to people that are very experienced, and how the new search tool works.

In terms of communication for the first public release, there's a couple of things to mention. There will be a press release going out. Carrie Gibb, who you may be familiar with, is our communications

expert, and she's going to be responsible for a lot of this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There will be a press release. There will be marketing materials for the FDLP posters, brochures and email campaign, which you can share with constituents or other libraries that you know that might not even be a part of FDLP. You can forward it onto them as well.

And design and development for the next release will begin in November. So we're going live with the system in December, but there's a lot of work that's going on planning for release 1C.3. And so a lot of the time spent by the PMO, by the business units, by the developers will start incorporating some of those changes, or some of those things that we need to do for the next release.

So what can you do? A couple of things. Stay up to date on activities. We'll keep the GPO.gov site updated with information. There's the current URL for that.

1

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Also, if you want to participate in beta testing, we are looking for a lot of people to participate. This will help us to get information on if there are any bugs that come up, if there are things that you would like to see done differently, if there is wording on the pages that doesn't make sense, or a suggesting on wording that might make more sense for your constituents.

Those are the types of feedback that we're looking to get back, so go ahead and email us at PMO@qpo.qov and we'll add you to the list. Also, if you have any ideas or feedback result of this conference as а related to FDsys, feel free to email comments on the demo.

Lisa is going to be coming up in a second to do the demo. Feel free to email us and we'll definitely get back to you. In some cases, we may need to go to a developer or an architect that has the more detailed information to answer your question, but use the PMO as your way in to get your questions to us.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Lisa who is going to go ahead and do the demo.

MS. LAPLANT: Good morning. My name is Lisa LaPlant, and I'm in the program management office. I'm on the Access and Delivery Team. So it's been a pleasure over the past couple years to do a couple different demos.

We started out in Saint Louis, and we talked about a day in the life, and we talked about our concept and our vision, and walked through how we really saw the system from an initial launch and all the way out through the end.

We moved on from that, and we did a demonstration on paper, or slides. So you got to see our slide show, the vision actually becoming a user interface, and the requirements for how we wanted to actually present information out to the public.

We moved on from that to a demo of the 1B system. So we did that last year, and showed the initial functionality for search and public access. It didn't really have the

So it builds on the discussion that

fielded search, and it didn't have the browse features, but we wanted to give you a flavor of what was to come in the system.

So now we're up to our 1C.2 demo, and you know we are -- we were told no slides, make sure that it's something that's live. So you want to see FDsys live? Here we go. And this is also a shout out to our infrastructure folks. Kirk Petri is in the audience.

We don't want to forget about infrastructure, and they've done a really, really great job of making sure that the servers and the racks, and filer heads, and all this stuff that most don't really know a whole lot about on the user interface side. But it's all up and running. It's an actual shot of the system.

That's it, okay? No. So onward to the actual demo. So this is really going to be taking a look at the search system and the user interfaces, and how you get to government information from the perspective of a public user.

Paul gave earlier. Paul really gave the foundation and the infrastructure, and the architecture and the mechanics, the -- you know, "how sausage is being made." So now you

actually get to see sausage.

So kind of building on that, our search philosophy. So as we're developing search, we like to keep these things in mind.

Provide a simple search, and provide advanced results.

So with our simple search, we want to make sure that it's easy enough and simple enough, and straightforward enough so that you can have a public user sit down, type something in the search box, and find relevant results.

We also want to make sure that if they get 5,000 results, 10,000 results, we have a way for them to narrow down what they're looking for. So that's our first principle.

We also want to make sure that we can provide advanced search features so users can efficiently retrieve specific documents.

So this really aimed at more of our power users, our users who know exactly what they want to look -- what they're looking for and they want to make sure that they find exactly their target document quickly, and finally,

provide relevant search results fast.

So we know that users have an expectation that search results should be relevant. It should be what they're looking for and they shouldn't -- they don't want to wait for their results. And also, it goes without saying we want to make sure that we're offered the waste engine. So that's kind of our underlying architectural concern.

So before we get into it, some of the questions that we received are how are some things going to be different, or how are things going to change from the current GPO Access site ro FDsys?

So you'll be able to easily search across multiple publications or collections of government publications from a single search box. So we're going to go through the demo, and I'll show you how to do that.

search against the robust metadata about each

We're going to perform an advanced

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

publication from a single advance search page.

So in Paul's discussion earlier, we talked about all the metadata that we're parsing out of documents, and storing in normalized formats, and this is really going to -- we're going to show you how you'll be able to use that for a search.

Going a step beyond that, you'll be able construct complex queries to using bullion proximity and field operators. got a lot of feedback during our requirement process that said there's specific bullions that you'd like to be able to use. There are certain field operators. We know you want to be able to use proximity operators, so we made that -- sure that was something that was part of the search features.

So you'll be able to refine and narrow your search by applying filters, sorting search results and searching within search results. You'll be able to retrieve individual government documents and

publications in seconds from the search results, view more information about a publication, and access multiple file formats from the content detail page.

You can access metadata or information about government publications in mods or premise. You can download content and metadata packaged together so you can download the entire issue of the Federal Register, plus all of it's metadata.

You can browse for publications and you can utilize advanced help features. So I know that's kind of a lot, but we're going to try and go through all those through a series of sample searches.

So in terms of the data that we have available in the system right now, it's a subset of what we're going to have available for the public launch. So we have the Federal Register. We have Congressional Bills. We have public and private laws, and we have the complication of presidential documents.

So as Selene said, this is live code. It is on our development site. We're

connecting in through VPN, and we've asked the developers to not work on anything in the site for a couple hours so there's no -- there's no

weirdness.

And on with the show. So our first search is going to be for fire safety. So for anyone who saw the 1B demo, we -- the search that we used to do for the 1B demo was for railroad retirement because my dad is a retired railroad worker, and so that's what we like to do a search for.

So fire safety is in honor of Blake's dad, who is a retired fire chief, and his name is Larry Edwards so this is his shout out for the 1C demo. So we start with fire safety. Railroad retirement still works, too.

Okay, and search. So we do a search, and we have a search results screen. That search produced 2,906 results. As Paul said earlier, the default operator between two terms is -- is and, so you don't have to use quotation marks. You don't have to use parenthesis. You can if you want to. They work, but you can also just type on a series

of terms.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So getting to our first point on the search philosophy: we have so many search results; how are we going to help the user to narrow down what they're looking for?

So one of the first ways we're going to do this is providing search navigators or search filters. So for all of the content in the system, there will be a set number of search filters. So you can narrow search by collection, by date, your by author by organization, person, government location and key word.

know some of you might be So saying, "These the that's are pretty generic. Α person could be anybody. Organization could be anybody. Location could be anybody." That was intentional.

We know that from talking to our public users that а person knows the difference between a person versus a location organization. So on this first versus an level of navigators, we want to provide something that is very easy to understand.

1 So for this one, let's say we're 2 just interested in search results from the Federal Register. Okay, so I selected Federal 3 Register, and now we're down to a little over 4 1,500 search results. 5 You can see that I clicked on that, and an X appears next to it.

That means that I've selected this one.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I can click on the X here, and that will deselect the search filter, and you'll also notice near the bottom that we have what calling collection specific search we're filters.

So because we chose the Federal Register, we can now narrow down by items that are specific to the Federal Register such as section or agency, or CFR citation. So let's say we're just interested in the final rules and regulations related to fire safety from the Federal Register.

So we'll click on that, and I'm down to a little over 500 search results. Okay, so let's move over and take a look at the actual search results themselves. our first search results, you can see we have

an identifier at the beginning. So that tells me that it's volume 71 of the Federal Register, and the page number.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the title of This one, it is Medicare and Medicaid Programs Fire Safety. The second line of the search results identifies the collection that it comes from, the section within the Federal Register, the action and the Federal Register -- date of the Federal Register issue.

There's also a teaser after the -the description of the content after the
second line, and you'll notice that fire
safety is highlighted in there.

Okay, so from the search results, we can click on the title, and it'll actually bring up the content. To the search results page? That would be -- it is a -- when you mean static URL, do you mean that -- will you be able to put it into a word document and click on it five days from now and it'll work? Yes.

It's not related to a session. One of our primary requirements was to make sure

that the -- just about everything on FDsys is bookmarkable. So you can bookmark your search results. You can bookmark individual documents. You can bookmark the content detail page. You can bookmark individual

FDsys pages.

So from the search result, you can actually go through and find out a little bit more information about the content. So I click on more information, and this is a page where it'll provide a look at the metadata that we've extracted out for the publication.

So we can see that it is regulatory information, the SuDoc class number, the publisher, the section, the summary, and you also can access and download the information in various formats. So the text file and the mods information is available.

I know there was a question earlier about actually being able to get to the mods. So here is mods. You can also get to the entire zip file. And at the end of the Federal Register, it's content detail page is what we're calling the document in context.

So I know that this is a rule that came out from the Department of Health and Human Services, and I click on Health and Human Services below, and it expands out, and shows other rules and regulations, notices and proposed rules that are also from the Department of Health and Human Services in this issue of the Federal Register.

So this is really showing that this is a rule, but it's within a larger context of the entire document if you're looking for additional information. So also from this document and context area, you can get to the PDF. You can get to the text, or you can jump over to the content detail page for this specific rule.

Okay, we'll go back up to the top and there are a couple different actions that can be performed on this page in addition to looking at the metadata and downloading the publication.

You can purchase your own copy, which will take you to a page on the bookstore. You can email or link to this

page, which will launch it in an email program
of your choice, and you can view the record in

the catalogue of US Government Publications.

Okay, we'll also provide a capability for you to browse from the Federal Register from this page, and to view today's issue. Okay, so let me back out of this and go back to our search results.

So I want to drill down through some of the navigators, so -- actually, let's go back to the top. One of the other things we can do is to sort our information by relevancy. We could store it by date; new to old or old to new, alphabetical Z to A, or A to Z.

We can change the number of search results per page, and let's go -- the default is by relevance, or for default for --

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. Just curious about
the dates. It doesn't seem to be -- you'd
think you'd have the most recent date first.

MS. LAPLANT: It's actually based on a relevancy ranking for each one of the

collections. Paul kind of touched on this a little bit during his presentation so there's different -- for each one of the collections we can set, there's different configurations we can have for the relevancies.

So for instance, if there is a -if you type in a citation for -- the document
will come up higher. If you type in a keyword
in the title, that'll make the document come
up higher. Freshness is also part of the
relevancy ranking.

Okay, I'm going to go down and click through some of the navigators on the side. So say for instance you are interested in a specific CFR citation. So let's do 14 CFR 39.

So I clicked on the plus sign, and I expanded out the CFR citation, and I'm going to click on part 39. And so we're down to 165 results. Let's see if we can get down a little bit father. Let's change the number of results per page and go up to 100, and let's do new to old. And we can also narrow down by -- let's do -- let's see, Seattle. We're down

to 38.

Okay, so out of our 38 results, it looks like there are a lot of air worthiness directives that have to do suppression and fire safety. So one of the cool features for this release is the ability to do search within search results.

So I check the box, and our original search drops down here, and we can now type in -- let's do -- so we have a couple different models here of airplanes. So we'll do model 747, and that gets us down to 12 search results.

Let's see if we can get it down a little bit farther. How about we'll do a search for service bulletin. So we have a feature. I misspelled bulletin. Okay, so now we have down to 28 search results, and can show how you go through and you can go through and continue to narrow your search results. You can click on navigators. You could click on the documents to actually open them up, or view more information.

Okay, and actually I think the way

1 | 2 | 3 | 4

-- instead of saving all questions for the end, I'm going to do little chunks of search features like this. So if you have questions related to the simple search and the navigators, let's go ahead and open it up for questions about this if you have any right now.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Are you going to have RSS feeds for search queries?

MS. LAPLANT: Not for this release.

That's in the 1C.4 release.

MR. JACOBS: Cool. Thanks.

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. Under the Weiss interface, one is able to predict a URL to, say, a Congressional report. I'm assuming that in FDsys you're going to do the same thing where we can predict a URL to a House report, Senate report, based on Congress and report number?

MS. LAPLANT: Yes, definitely. One of the requirements that we put forward was that we need to be able to have predictable, persistent URLs, and that really drives us to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

make sure that we have access IDs for each one of the publications, each one of the pieces of metadata, and content detail page, so that we can create those predictable links.

So that's something that we will make available in our help documentation so you know to be able to either update your scripts, or to link into our publications.

MR. BROWN: And I also assume -you don't probably know this one, but I'm sure
you do. You might know it. They'll also be
running parallel. In other words, the Weiss
server will be running for a certain period of
time parallel to FDsys so that we can make all
these changes?

MS. LAPLANT: Yes, definitely.

MR. BROWN: Great.

This is Katrina at MS. STIERHOLZ: the Saint Louis Fed. So you -- it looked like loaded bunch of you went and а those collections back in March. The newest I saw of those didn't seem particularly for some Are you continuing to load everyday, or you sort of testing the world of loading things all the time?

MS. LAPLANT: For this, we actually have information up unto -- I want to say the latest is August 8th for the purpose of testing and putting information through the system. So we are continuing to load information into migrate content in, and make sure that we get everything into the system.

So this is actually not official migrated data. This is data that is test data that we're using for development purposes. So when we actually do begin migration, this information won't be in here. It'll be wiped out and it'll be the official migrated content.

MS. STIERHOLZ: And you guys are comfortable that you'll be able to load constantly with these new collections everyday, all the time?

MS. LAPLANT: We do. We actually do have a migration plan for how we're going to get information into the system. We're going through and benchmarking and testing how long the processing and the flow is, and --

yes.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay.

MS. LAPLANT: Okay, should we move into --

DR. GREER: One question. Chris Greet, National Coordination Office. You decided to develop your own search system as opposed to implementing another product like Google search. Can you tell us what the logic for that was?

MS. LAPLANT: Not exactly. So our search engine is actually the fast search engine from Fast Search, and transfer FAST ESP. We are doing customizations to it, especially on the side of the parsing and getting documents ready for the system. There are a couple custom pipelines to it. There are a — it's a custom query processor.

So you can type in five different versions of a public law citation, or a Congressional Bill, and the information can -- will come up into the search engine. I don't know of Paul wants to --

MR. NELSON: I just wanted to add

that the Fast search engine is now a wholly owned subsidiary of Microsoft.

MS. LAPLANT: Yes.

MR. NELSON: And so it's not going away any time soon, and it's part of Microsoft's strategic direction that they want to have, and enterprise search as part of their suite.

MS. LAPLANT: Okay. With that, should we move into advanced search? Alrighty. So if we can, it looks like my system is not cooperating here. Let's close this stuff out. Okay, EPN is connected.

MR. SHULER: Perhaps while we're waiting for that to come back, I'm curious. Is there a component in the search or display capabilities that will enable us to build a legislative history that would connect all the documents related to a particular law from its inception to it's regulations, to executive documents?

MR. NELSON: We're capturing a lot of that metadata. We are in fact capturing the legislative history that is printed at the

bottom of public and private laws that is actually in the system. Wherever a bill is mentioned in the Congressional Record, we are saving those mentions in the metadata.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the bill itself where Tn it. mentions US Code references and so on, we're have all these citation saving that. We information captured for all these pieces. in terms of the interlinking, one of beautiful things about the database is that -is have all of that GPO has these we interconnected documents that flow from one to the other to the next, and wherever statue at large references are being made, and so on.

Now, in terms of binding them together, one of the things that were -- one of the collections that we're going to be looking at for the -- after the initial release will be the history of bills itself, and identifying in the history of bills all the references to the bill, and how that bill proceeded to the Congress.

Right now, you can, for example, drill down and get to a particular bill from a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

particular congress, and you'll see all versions of the bill sorted by date. So you can see kind of essentially how it progressed through the Congress, and at some point, it find will be able to say, "Now me the reference for that bill anywhere else," identify things that are pointing to it.

MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. So right now in the current world, you have to search THOMAS. You have to search GPO Access, and you might even have to go out and search some other places.

What you're describing is an opportunity or a possibility that we don't have to be siloed in this fashion anymore; that FDsys will enable us to search across those publication moments and put together a legislative narrative that we now have to go - unless we're paying for very expensive services, we would have to go to different plots and places to move together ourselves.

MR. NELSON: I mean that's one of the primary goals of how we've been

architecting the system is to try and capture all of these interconnections between all of the documents, and part of that is in parsing, right? When we see a reference to an item, we parse it out. We save it in metadata. We pick apart the pieces. We know where that reference came from.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So if it just says, "HR 1234," we look and say, "Oh, it's from a public law, which is from the 105th Congress." So we know what congress it is, so we can help make those things explicit as well.

Now, our primary emphasis at this point is capturing the data, putting it in so that you can get it in the mods, so that it's actually in the data there somewhere. In terms of exposing all of that to the end user interface, once we capture the data and the data is in the search engine and searchable, then we have we're set up, Everything is ready to go so we feature, after feature, after feature.

We can start making things interlinkable. We can put links on the

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

content detail page. You can jump from document to document to document. Those -the goal is to get the data first, and to be able to extract it reliably. And then once we have that, then we can -- we have a universe of possibilities to open up as we go through the next series of releases.

MS. DALECKY: And what we talked about in terms of -- of getting feedback and understanding what's going to be most useful, and what's the best way to present it, we have requirements to be able to do this type of relationships following. We have the ability to capture the metadata in order to do this in the future, but those are the types of things we definitely want input on in the community.

MR. SHULER: And Т want. to emphasize that because of my history working on behalf of the public. It isn't so much that they're interested in single documents about fire safety. They there's actually a deeper context that links the regulations to the legislative activity, Congressional hearings the other executive documents.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I, as a documents librarian, are making those connections through other knowledge of my own on behalf of the user as I jump from silo to silo. Very rarely, unless I really want to become a major part of the user's life, will I explain what I'm doing.

And as we go through MR. NELSON: this process, Lisa and I and the other team members have had a lot of these discussions where we're like, "Oh, gosh. We see this thing as it's referencing a CFR citation or it's referencing the US Code." And we're saying, "Gosh, should we extract that?" And we make those kinds of decisions all the time, and almost always we err to doing it because we know that those are kinds of things that we want to get now, and it's actually less expensive to do it now because we have the parser writers that are looking at the documents.

They're doing the testing. To do it now is a lot less expensive than doing it a year from now where we have to go back to that

۷.

MR. LEONE: Sure.

TROTTA:

MS. TROTTA:

MS.

question?

Tori Trotta, Arizona

Can we ask another

So where we can do things now and get them done in like a half a day, we're going to do it now as much as possible. And so a lot of this data that we're extracting may not even be displayed anywhere, but it's there in the metadata so we can leverage it

original code and figure out how we'll

these things into it.

and use it from here on out.

So it's just one of the things we're getting the data -- getting the data solid, and doing the data migration solid is like the most important thing at this point in time. And then adding all of the features that build on that data is -- we're just really trying to set ourselves up for an architecture and a data plan that really moves us to all kinds of wonderful things in terms of interlinking. How are we doing on the --

MS. LAPLANT: We're getting close.

State University College of Law. I was glad to see on that last search that there was a link to today's Federal Register, and so my question is when we see that we can see today's Federal Register, can we assume that the Federal Register that's in FDsys is up to date as of today, or is there another standard for when we could expect information to be loaded, especially of a sensitive time nature such as Federal Register?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. LAPLANT: It would be the same was what's currently on GPO Access. So it's the 6:00 a.m. Okay, I think we're back. So I don't know if you saw what I was doing there. It looked like my Adobe Acrobat was trying to update itself, and it kind of brought the whole thing down. So I have it started now, so hopefully it won't try to do that again.

Alrighty, so we're back up to advanced search, and let's do -- one of differences between -- between FDsys and GPO Access is that on GPO Access now, you need to 50, there are -- I don't know, where you could to perform go

advanced search on a specific publication.

So this is actually consolidating those pages into a single advanced search page, and this is available -- it's available next to the search box. So any time you see a search box next to it, you'll see a link for advanced search.

So I click on that. There are a couple different fields on here. So the first one is publication date. So you can choose to do a search for all dates, or you can narrow it to a specific date, or date is after, date is before, date is between.

So let's do a search for all dates, and we're going to move into -- first let's do a search on just the information in Congressional bills. But before I do that, I want to show you what metadata we have available to search over all publications.

So you can search for SuDoc class number, title, citation, government author branch. So right now, that's what we have on the advanced search screen for all documents that are in FDsys.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So Paul kind of mentioned that we are extracting out a lot of different metadata for each of the publications one and Our initial thought with the collections. advanced search page was not to overwhelm people. So to have a limited number of basic options here, and we're really relying on feedback from you all if you see something that's missing.

So that's definitely the kind of information that we want to make sure that we can get from the beta testing, and the initial testing of the system. So I'm going to add Congressional Bills in as a collection that we're searching, and you'll notice that now we have more information in here.

So once you select a collection to available search, the metadata that's search in in the fields are actually tailored to the specific collection that you're looking So for this one, we can search under number, bill number, session congress congress, report number, action tax committees.

bill

we're actually pulling up into the search field. If I select multiple collections, it'll be the metadata that those collections have in common. So for instance, if I put public and private laws in there, along with Congressional bills, one of the ones you'll see is bill number, because both public laws

and Congressional bill

number in common.

So let's do our collection as bills. Let's search in the title of the document for a nice popular one, Medicare. And in addition to -- so if we want to add additional search fields, we can click on this link down here where it says, "Add more search criteria," and more search boxes appear.

numbers have

Let's do a search in Congress number for 109th Congress, and we'll go ahead and press search. Okay, so we see that it actually populates in the search box with the fields that we're searching over so we know we're searching over in bills. The title is Medicare. We're looking for Medicare in the

title field, and the Congress number. We're looking for the 109th Congress.

Okay, so I'm displaying results 1 through 10 out of 343 search results. And let's go through and narrow that down by just senate bills. So I'm coming down under our Congressional Bills specific navigators, and narrowed that down to just bills from the 109th Congress.

Actually, let me back out of this. I want to show you not only can we narrow it down that way, but we can also click on the plus sign and display out individual senate bills that are from the 109th Congress.

So for this one, let's take a look and let's say we just want to see all of the bill versions for S. 1778. So we'll click on that, and now I'm down to all three bill versions that are available for S. 1778.

You'll notice that the search results are a little bit different from the search results in the Federal Register. So it says we're in Congressional bills from the 109th Congress. This bill version is

introduced in senate, and the date that it was
made available. And Acrobat didn't try to
bring everything down this time, so here is

our senate bill in PDF.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

available from So PDFs are the search results. Ιf Ι click on more information, you can see the full title of the bill. We pull out the sponsors and the coand the committee and US sponsors, references.

So Paul mentioned that there are various references that we pull out from the documents, and this is -- this is one of the ones that we were able to extract. So we already looked at the PDF. We can get to the text from here. You can get to the mods metadata.

So I want to spend just a little bit of time on this one. In the mods metadata, we have all of our information that we've extracted out, or we have our title, various identifiers, and all of the references that we're extracting out from the Congressional bills. So we can see that it is -- we've extracted out various US Codes
citations. We have various members of
Congress and different types of -- how they

4 prefer to have their name displayed.

We know the chamber. We know -here's our US Code citations. So we're
capturing a lot of -- there's our bill version
and bill number. We're capturing a lot of
really cool information, and we're making this
available in the mods files.

This is one of the examples of a file where you would be able to link directly to the mods file. Okay, and we can also download the entire package, and it's in zip format. So you can see we have our XML file. We have the text file, and we also have the PDF file, and this is also something where we'll have a predictable URL so you can get to the package and the metadata and the content.

Okay, all right. Let's try something a little more complex. So advanced search was cool, but one of the things that's even cooler is when we start getting into some of the bullion searches, and the field level

searches. So we're kind of moving up the scale on intensity of search.

So we started out with simple search, and then we went to advanced. Now we're kind of going up a little bit. So this is going to be a search over the weekly compilation of presidential documents.

So we'll do collection and so what I'm saying is that it's in -- the collection is the compilation of presidential documents, and CPD collection of presidential documents category. Okay, so you can see that this is not something -- it's a feature that we make available if you would like to utilize this syntax, and if you would like to learn it, it's there.

It's not something that you have to know to be able to search. You can just type in -- you could type in, "Collection of presidential documents," or "Presidential documents and proclamations and libraries," and you'll get relevant search results. But if you want to have a more targeted search, we're providing what we're calling these field

operators and various query operators and bullion operators to be able to really target specific documents.

So I'm looking into the compilation of presidential documents, the category. I'm looking for proclamations and I'm looking for anything that has libraries. So library, libraries, librarian. So we'll do search, and we have eight search results.

So we'll take a look at the one on literacy, and you can tell from what's highlighted in the teaser that it's pulling up librarians, libraries. It looks like that's all. So click on this. PDF comes up. It's on the first page.

Oh, did I click on the first result? Sorry. That's why we're not finding literacy because I clicked on White Cane Safety Day. So let's actually click on literacy.

Okay, here we have proclamation 8053 Literacy Day 2006. You can see that it pulls up the entire granule, so it's not just a single page. And if we go to our more

information, we can see that it's part of the weekly compilation of presidential documents.

The category is proclamations. The president

is George Bush.

We know the date the event took place. We're pulling out the notes that is included at the end of each one of the Weekly Comp. In our document and context on this one, we have the ability to show various other announcements that came from the White House that are included in that issue of the Weekly Comp.

So we're still through and we're formatting these. So this is an example of where you're looking at it and you're like, "The formatting on here is not that great." That's something that's still in development. So it'll look a lot better when you actually see it in the real site.

So let's take a look at the -- see what else President Bush said at the remarks at the White House conference on global literacy. So from this, I can click on more, and it jumps me over to the content detail

page for that granule so I can find out what he said: that he spoke at the New York Public Library.

We also have the ability to view the entire issue, and view the title page and the table of contents here. So it's really starting to -- it's making sure that not only do we provide access to the granule, but we provide access to the document in its original context.

Okay, so let's do one that's even more fun. All right, it's going to take me a little while to type this one in, but I really want to show what it can do. So let's do our collection. Let's look in bills.

Okay, we're looking in bills. We're looking for Barbara Mikulski, and we want to find out if there are any bills that she was involved with that had to do with the Chesapeake Bay. Let's look for watershed near restoration. So we're working for the word, "watershed," within five words of the word restoration, and we're not looking for the word, "forestry."

I'm actually going to -- after I do

this search, I'll show you -- I'll kind of

back out and show what happens if you take off

some of these search terms. So not forestry.

Paul is laughing because I think I took one of his sample searches.

Let's do congress number -- 109th Congress. All right, so we have our -- as complex of a search as I could come up with for this demo, and we're going to press search. And we have a single search result.

So this is kind of showing that yes we can use bullion operators. You can use quotation marks. I think the one thing I didn't put in here was parenthesis, but those also work too. So if we -- if we take off some of these, let's say we take off Congress number 109.

So we get two results. So we had one from the 108th Congress and one from the 109th Congress. And let's take off the --oops, we can't do that. Let's take off forestry. So let's put those back in.

So now we're up to our four

results. So I was trying to weed out the ones that actually have forestry in the title. And let's take out the ones where we say we wanted watershed within five words of the word restoration.

So as you could see, it was pulling up watershed within five words of restoration. So we'll take these off. So now we're up to 14. So now you kind of get the idea of how we can use the really advanced query operators, and our bullion operators, and really either hone in on exactly the document that we want to find, or we can narrow our search.

So we're providing the ability, everything from starting out with that simple search, going to an advanced search, and then also providing this query syntax and field operators to be able to get to very specific information.

So along the lines of getting to really specific information, next thing I want to show is our retrieved by citation, or citation search. So this is really -- oh, sorry.

1 MS. PARKER: Marion Parker, Wake Forest Law. A quick question about the order 2 of the bullion searching. Is it searching 3 4 left to right in the string, or is certain searching against 5 operators 6 drilling down to the next ones? Like is it 7 doing all the ands, and then all the ors, and then all of the --8 MS. LAPLANT: Paul, do you want to 9 10 take this one? NELSON: It's doing it all at 11 the same time, so in terms of the order that 12

it appears on the string, it doesn't matter the order that you enter it. Even if you entered "watershed," and. "restoration," or restoration and watershed, it'll be the same as far as the search engine is concerned.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's just going to look for documents that have both of those terms.

MS. LAPLANT: But certain operators higher precedence than do а operators.

Right. MS. PARKER: That's what I'm asking. Does it do, for example, all the ands first, then all the ors second, then all of the within fives?

MR. NELSON: In terms of grouping,

it's going to automatically stick in parenthesis as it sees fit, and it'll -you're absolutely right. It'll group all the ands together and parenthesize those. So if you just said A and B, or C and D, you'll get A and B parenthesis, or C and D parenthesis.

The order of precedence is defined in one of our design documents. I don't know if it'll get propagated up to the help file.

MS. LAPLANT: It will.

MR. NELSON: Then there you go.

MS. LAPLANT: It's in there.

Okay, any other questions, or can I jump onto citations search?

MS. SWEET: Ellen Sweet, Department of Justice. Will we be able to sort the results?

MS. LAPLANT: Yes. So our sort is by -- it's by -- you can do a sort by relevancy. You can do a sort by date. So old to new, new to old, and then also a sort

alphabetical by title.

Okay, so I clicked on -- next to each one of the search boxes in addition to the advanced search, we have what's called retrieve by citation. So this is -- it's kind of like our current functionality on GPO Access, which is the retrieve by page functionality, except it's kind of -- it's beefed up a little bit.

So instead of just retrieving a single page, or a single document, you'll be able to retrieve the entire granule, and you won't have to press the next page, next page, next page.

So for retrieve by citation, this is really aimed at the folks who know. They know exactly what they're looking for. They don't want to mess with search results. They don't want to mess with navigators. They want to go directly to the content, directly to the document. Do not pass go. That sort of thing.

Okay, so we're going to select our collection. We'll do Federal Register, and

we'll do volume 71. Now, we'll put in a page number from the Federal Register that we pulled up earlier. So 55326, and retrieve the document, and we have the file.

So one of the enhancements that we're going to make prior to the public launches instead of the text file, this will - this will actually be the PDF file of the document coming directly up. But I just wanted to show the functionality that we have in place so far.

MR. WIGGIN: Question.

MS. LAPLANT: Yes?

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. What if you type
that into the initial search box? What would
you get as a result? Is this the same --

MS. LAPLANT: Same thing. So 71 FR 55326. So 71 FR 55326. So there was no -- there's no parenthesis, or there's no quotation marks on it. If I put quotation marks on it, it'll jump it up to the first result.

Okay, one more on the retrieved by

citation. So we'll go Congressional bills, and let's do 110th Congress, and bill type HR, and bill number 6. And you'll notice it was refreshing the bill versions, so it'll just provide me a pull down of the actual bill versions that we have available for this particular bill in the system.

So we'll do introduced in house, and we have HR 6 introduced in house. Okay, so we're going to -- I know we're kind of running short on time, so just like three more minutes. I definitely want to make sure we show browse.

So real quick, if we click on browse government publications, it brings up our browse page. We have the ability to browse by collection, by Congressional committee, by date. So let's do a browse for public and private laws.

So I clicked on public and private laws. We have a little bit of introductory text about public and private laws, and a list of available public laws in the system. So this is an example where we're actually using

the metadata that we're pulling out, and populating the browse tables and browse information based on what's actually in the system.

So it's not a person going through and building out these tables. So let's do the 109th Congress. We want public laws. Let's do above 362, and we have a list of our public laws that are available that are above public laws 362. And from here, we can go to the text of the PDF, where we can jump to the content detail page with the morph.

So do one more. So that's an example of how you would browse for like a worn off individual publication. So I want to show you how you can browse into the Federal Register and drill down into the table of contents of a publication.

So I'm clicking on Federal Register, and 2008. We'll do January. Let's do 15th. We have the list of all the agencies that are available in the table of contents for January 15th. We'll do environmental protection agency.

We have a list of all of the rules and regulations and proposed rules and notices that are available from this agency. So I can get to the PDF of it. I can get to the text file. And let's click on more information, just find out exactly what's going on with this so we know the summary, we have our

citation.

We can expand out the Environment Protection Agency so that this shows our document in context. We can show the entire issue. So if you want it all just expanded out instead of having to click through each one, this is also an example of what the daily table of contents would look like.

Okay, and one last thing that I want to show is on the advanced search page. So we mentioned -- Blake mentioned that there are numerous help features on here. So one of the ones is providing the roll over -- or the hover-over text.

So any time we see a -- I don't know if this is showing up that well on the screen, but any time you see like a little

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

dotted underline, and the question mark that comes up, it means that there's a definition available for a piece of content.

So for publication date, the date the document was first made available to the public, and for collection the collection to which the document belongs, typically the same as publication or series.

We also have, next to each one of the search buttons a link to a -- our pages in So this is for advanced search, RoboHelp. and I'm going to click on show contents, and this will actually bring up the advanced in RoboHelp search pages so you can see exactly what the steps are to performing a search.

Here's our list of bullion operators and field operators. So I'm just going to kind of expand through these. You can see what's in there. We're still working on populating this. So this kind of gives you an idea of the table of contents.

Another cool thing with this is you can actually search within our help materials.

So we'll do a search for bullion, and it comes up with the bullion search, and it also highlights the term where it is within the help documentation.

So also that kind of gives -- gets me to a point where I want to plug our -- we actually have a focus group tonight on help and training and documentation, and we have five slots still available. So if anybody is interested in our focus group tonight, and would like to provide us feedback on help and training and documentation, then Carrie Gibb is here. She's in blue. Go see Carrie after the demo, and she'll get you all signed up.

So with that, I'll open it up to questions.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I'm imagining a library in the Midwest in a major city where this product arrives, and it strikes me, speaking as an anthropologist, the way that tribe would react to this.

They would treat this as a bender.

They would equate what you just showed me

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So GPO in this sense achieves the

with ScienceDirect JSTOr put it on the alphabetical list of databases to search, and have a nice day. What happens?

MS. LAPLANT: What do you mean what happens? They use it and they're happy?

MR. SHULER: I don't know. I'm just laying it out here. I'm assuming a world without documents librarians. I'm assuming a world without depository libraries. Bear with me. Mother ship has left. They have left the device behind. How does a library integrate this into its culture, into its information ecosystem?

I predict, based on my experience, they're going to treat it like every other bender driven device. They will put it on the list. They will ask, "Is this available federated through for searching capabilities?" And will they be able to link those specific items of things that are in a catalog, as well as what's available directly the article for the text of the or publication?

same transparency as JSTOR ScienceDirect,
Article First, etcetera, etcetera. I'm not
saying that's a bad thing. I'm not saying
it's a good thing. I'm just saying it is. So
you have achieved transparency that you've
been seeking. What does that mean in our
institutions? That's -- I'm just posing it as
a question rather than seeking an answer right
now.

MS. LAPLANT: It's a good question.

MR. SHULER: Let me ask the audience. Would I be wrong in thinking that if we dropped this device into our existing cultures? Is this how they would react to it?

Am I freezing to death up here and getting brain freeze?

I understand there isn't one answer depending upon the institution, but I'm thinking about our generic institutions, how they would react to this kind of device.

MS. DALECKY: John, I think it actually was a discussion that you had started about the legislative histories, and the fact that we've got -- we've got a tool that can be

used to find the documents, but the context just isn't there yet.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. DALECKY: I think there's a lot that needs to be done, and quite frankly, we need the community's help in order to do it to put the context around it. And I think that in putting the context around the content, making it not only searchable and findable, but making it make sense to people how they use it, as we go forward and make that happen, I think the question is how do we integrate that with what already exists through the Depository Library Program in terms of doing self help, or doing it through assisted help.

Do we take what we have and enhance it through adding annotations? Where -- where do we go from here because we've got a -- we've improved the search? We've made what we have easier to get to. How do we improve it? And we're not going to be able to know how to do that. I think that it's going to have to be a joint venture.

MR. SHULER: Okay, thank you.

8

7

10

12

14

15

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS.

Christine Hann,

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I just want to follow up on what John said. I think what you're saying John, is that should there be an anchor to kind of capability integrate this libraries' business systems as opposed to just the stick on. It actually becomes integral to your operating systems, and works in a way your other systems do, and integrates That's a completely different approach than the one we're seeing here.

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington. I just wanted to say, John, you are on track. This is exactly the reaction I was having as I was looking at the product. Our core users is academic librarians in particular. That's the group I speak right because can to now representing academic librarians. They'll understand this immediately in a way that they do not currently understand GPO Access. So thank you.

HANN:

Kalamazoo Public Library. You bring up some

very interesting points, John. I'd like to say let's not imagine a world without depository librarians. And also, from what I've seen, it looks like an amazing tool and it's got a lot of potential. And in order for the end user to be able to tap that potential, they'll need some training, and that's where I see the depository librarians coming in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I also envision that other staff in our systems will -- could use training. I'm not sure how to wrap that all together, but those are the thoughts that come to mind. Thanks.

Ilustre of MS. ILUSTRE: Anita Occupational Safety Health Review and Commission. One research that Ι find difficult has become every regulation is that place which says public comments invited. you have a way of finding where the public comments can be searched?

MS. LAPLANT: Are you asking about public -- the comments or the --

MS. ILUSTRE: The comments of the public. Every regulation has that place.

1

7

6

9

11

13

12

14 15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

MS. LAPLANT: This is a cool one. I like this. So the -- there's actually two things that we're pulling out. We're pulling out the contact information, so it's got the So you could do a search directly contact. over that contact field. You could also -we're pulling out various dates like effective date, and comment date, and there's one more. there's a series of dates that we're trying to parse out of directly in that field. So those are fields that you could search over.

Now, it kind of gets to -- it's not -- those aren't fields that are going to show up on the advanced search screen, on the advanced search on the pull down box, but that is something that you could do where I -- how I did collection, colon, and then you put something in.

You could do it that way, but that's the kind of information, the kind of feedback that we're looking for during beta testing. If you say, "That's something that really should show up on the advanced search

form," put it on the advanced search form. So yes you can. It's not going to show up on the advanced search form. It will be in help documentation. Let us know if you want it to be there.

MS. ILUSTRE: Okay. Thank you so much.

MS. JOBE: Hi, Peggy Jobe, UC Boulder. I'd like to comment on something that John said. I can see this getting added to our -- like we use Integrated ERM to manage our articles on one page. So this is added to get a couple subject headings on it.

So I think that I'm back to the title of the thing means nothing except to the documents community. In particular, I think even using the name GPO it means something to the documents community, but not a whole lot to anybody else. So I know you guys went over and over the name, and came up with FDsys, but — or FDsys, but when it's sitting in a catalog under, "Find articles and more," no matter how many access points, it doesn't say a whole lot.

MS. KNIGHT: Rebecca Knight, University of Delaware. Is this going to be a database or system that can be pulled into WorldCat Local? Club Med is already in WorldCat Local. That's the kind of thing I was thinking about.

MS. DALECKY: I'm actually not familiar with that, and I'm not -- I don't know the answer to that question. Can Dane, who is our architect -- is that -- is it in a -- actually, can we go pull Dane? I guess I'm not familiar with exactly what that means. Can we get back to you on that?

What I meant is there's a couple of different things that I'm thinking, and I want to make sure that I understand what you're saying. So can we talk offline? Okay.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I want to sort of -- I have a comment on what John was saying. It seems like there's an interest in this as a stand alone product. I think what you've done so far as been really great.

I like that there's a metadata

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. LAPLANT: That's the goal for

layer. I still have questions about whether or not the APIs will be -- will have to be authenticated in order to get to a guery full of metadata. I'm not sure about that. will be authentication, or there will not be -- that's good.

I think what my question is is will this bee also not just a stand alone end metadata layer in which product, but а libraries can build their own applications on top of this? I'm thinking something like the UC Santa Barbara's Presidency Project. have a great website pulling in all sorts of president's papers and things like that.

You can query it from here, but you can also pull it apart and make your own product so to speak. And I hope that that will be built in, including such simple things as being able to grab that search box as a widget and sticking it on another HTML page, and being able to add your own local context, know, contact, with your depository you librarian, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

direction, yes. So a lot of that will really be enabled when hit those 1C.4 we requirements, the API requirements. And that's something that we do want to continue to work with the library community, and make sure that we get very detailed and derived

requirements that meet your needs.

MR. NELSON: One thing I want to do at some point is that Barbara Mikulski can have her own page, and then she can do a little search and show the last last five speeches she's given on the floor show the last ten bills that's she's introduced. You know, those sort of things, and you can go to her page and it'll dynamically update as those things get into FDsys, and it'll be totally cool.

MS. LAPLANT: So for this release, we're really setting up and -- setting up that infrastructure and pulling out the citations, and setting up -- making sure we normalize and we store the metadata in a way that we can -- that can enable us to do that.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Coordination Office. We've heard several times now an interesting API layer, and the idea that you would drop it in late 2009. I wonder if you considered having a few pilots to explore what that really means before you get too deep into that process?

MS. DALECKY: Yes, I definitely think we're open to that, and we can have some follow up discussions to see how we could work that in prior to the 1C.4 release. In fact, I think it's a good idea to test it before we try it.

CHAIR BYRNE: With that, I think this has been a very, very informative presentation. I have one announcement that the public libraries will be meeting at the registration table. Let's go to lunch.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:17 p.m., and resumed at 1:37 p.m.)

MS. STIERHOLZ: We're going to refocus on collections and services working in an electronic setting. I'd like to introduce Ashley Dahlen. She's from GPO, and she's

going to walk us through this -- this information, and some scenarios. Ashley?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DAHLEN: Just a real quick overview about why we're doing this session. We are seeing libraries facing very difficult challenges, and we're seeing different solutions being created.

Challenges include anything budget and staffing constraints other to libraries that are simple responding to their user's needs for more electronic information. And our that adequate concerns are collections and services are being provided at libraries they become as race to more electronic both now and in the future.

We all know that we've been transitioning since roughly 1993 with the GPO electronic information access enhancement act, but with that said, we know that there are resources that are only available electronically now, and most libraries have adapted to that dissemination at the -- but other libraries have actually taken much more additional efforts concerted to acquire

1 electronic publications, and to shift the 2 focus of their collections away from tangible formats.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And it is this type of transitioning library that we're discussing here today; what we consider the more active electronic library.

So just to give you an overview how of envisioning kind this: For we starters, in your packet behind PowerPoint presentation, there is a list of key assumptions of transitioning to electronic collections and services.

Those key assumptions have already been discussed at the spring 2006 conference in Seattle with council and GPO. So we're not going to discuss them again here, but they are there for you to refer to.

We also have come up with a list of considerations that we think libraries need to consider before making any massive transition or any changes, and we'll be talking about those briefly. And we've come up with some scenarios that we'd like to share with you all. These are real scenarios, and the advice that we gave the libraries is real, too.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So what we're looking for council to do is to -- we're looking council and audience's input, and suggestions and advice that we are actually giving to these libraries. So Katrina Stierholz is going to be moderating the discussion, and I'll be reading the scenarios and the considerations.

Considerations to take into account -- considerations to take into account prior to moving your electronic. think We library should update Collection Development Policies Public Service Policies and or Guidelines prior to the transition. should include conducting a user need analysis in order to keep in mind the present and future needs, as well as the needs of your primary and non-primary users.

Even if we have limited options because financial staffing, whatever, available to you. You will at least be alert to the possible user needs, and can plan to accommodate those needs when an issue arises.

We think you should anticipate a change in staffing and skill needs of your library staff. More staff will likely be involved in technical services processes for electronic materials so staff are not occupied as much with the processing of tangible resources.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We think you also need to anticipate a continual need for the training of public services staff that all staff are able to use electronic resources and provide services for US Government information resources.

We need to arrange for IT support, often overlooked, and we need to formulate a plan promote electronic depository to and to make them visible within resources, your library, your library catalog, your library web pages, etcetera, and you need to explain the purpose of the transition library staff to get everyone on board with the changes. Subject specialists may have considerable input into the process.

MS. STIERHOLZ: So other

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

considerations to take into account are formulating a plan to promote electronic depository resources, make them visible within your libraries, library catalog. Anticipate changes in staffing and skill needs -- oh, I'm sorry. We need to go one more.

Make them visible within library web pages, and explain the purpose of the transition to library staff to everyone on board with the changes. going to look at these are basic so considerations to take into account before you really get started, but sometimes they are driven by particular instances, and some of these scenarios I think will ring true to a lot of you.

Do you guys -- does the council want to discuss any of the basic considerations? I think those are pretty straightforward.

MS. DAHLEN: All right, scenario one: My director wants me to cut back on the number of items selected because it all seems to be online. How could I do this and prevent

it from happening?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I should mention that these bullet points do not apply to every library situation that we come across, and they are also not in any order, so don't place priority on them.

Ιf you find yourself in the situation, we are advising people to assess what you are actually receiving in print, what content is a value for users that you need to retain in print, and what can be shifted to an format. Develop alternate the effective, efficient method for cataloging or adding online versions into the library catalog; train staff in the transition so they aware of resources that have changed formats.

And do not fight your administration. Work with them. Compile statistics and data to give to your administration fair the а assessment situation.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay, so for this particular scenario, just to remind you what

2 back

3

4

1

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the scenario is, "My director wants me to cut back on the number of items selected because it all seems to be online." How can I do this, or prevent it from happening?

They'd like some comments from the council, GPO, and also from the audience, either on what you think of these recommendations that they've offered, but also in your own experiences, particularly for those of you who are in libraries and may have experienced something similar; any advice you can give to help out. Comments?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii at Manoa. of my selectives is not really an electronic depository, but they've cut back on their item selections just is described as in the scenario. And their library director absolutely refuses to allow them to put electronic only publications in their online catalogs.

So I think we need to -- and I'm sure that's true of other libraries. So I think we need to have a way of addressing the

belief that if it's online, I don't need a cataloging record.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Can I ask a little more detail on that? So if it was an item that they received in print in the past, and it is now electronic, does their catalog record not indicate that it is available electronically for that print item?

MS. SINCLAIR: In this particular selective, the library director refuses to allow them to put URLs in the cataloging record.

MS. DAHLEN: So they're not really transitioning.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay, I don't know what to say. Go ahead, David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I also have some selectives who have that very same problem. And what I had been told is that the reason for it is not because the library director is opposed to people accessing documents or content from a catalog record. The reason is that they don't want the -- any

1 | 1 2 | s

library computers that are devoted to catalog search only to have the capability of going off to the internet for any of those computers.

And so it's just -- and to solve it
-- to deal with it, a specific situation that
could be dealt with by an IT department, I
think, very easily. They just cut out access
to everybody -- the clientele of that
particular library in order to achieve an
internal building problem.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Right.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. To build on what David was saying, there are also -- and I was just talking to a public librarian at lunch about this. There are public libraries that have those catalog only stations locked down so that they will not go to the internet.

So even like at Tulsa City County, where they did put the URLs in the record, you could not get out to those URLs from any of the catalogs in the library. You had to go to one of the internet computers, and look it up

in the catalog to go out, or you had to go to the GovDoc computer and email out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DAHLEN: But you had a work around at least.

MS. SEARS: If you could ever get access to the internet access computer at a public library, especially in these economic times the line up for -- the wait, especially on a weekend to get access to the computer can be substantial.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay. Go ahead, David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Going specifically to this subject, the -- one of the ideas that I tried to emphasize to my selectives is to be prepared for this particular situation to happen. Because even though it's happening right now, it will happen to you And so when your director comes to someday. says this, be prepared to either you and continually defend receive to materials if your particular library situation requires those tangible that you have

materials, or be prepared, or actually be proactive and start transitioning to electronic before your director comes to you

with this.

But in any case, be prepared for this question to happen. And not fighting your administration, I think, is a very, very important thing to emphasize; that this is fruitless and it's just going to end up negating everything that you've tried to do during your whole tenure as a depository coordinator.

But I don't know that you have to necessarily agree with everything that your director says, but fight in a diplomatic way, but be able to prove that if you want it to remain the same that it's necessary for your patrons, or for your library mission.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you, David.

Are there any comments from the audience?

MR. ROHRIG: Tom Rohrig, Texas Tech University. Our library does not add board digital records to our catalog because we feel that we must physically own it. However, we

1	do use all of so with our MetaLib, we
2	include in our documents meta-search, our
3	online catalog, which does somewhat get around
4	that. Thank you.
5	MS. STIERHOLZ: Can you clarify
6	that for me for a second? Are you saying you
7	don't include online documents in your
8	catalog?
9	MR. ROHRIG: They're in digital.
10	Now, if they're hybrid, if they're both in
11	print and online, we will include the records.
12	But if they are born digital, they're only
13	online. We don't add the records to our OPAC.
14	MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay. Go ahead,
15	Denise.
16	MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, American
17	Library Association. Question for the
18	gentleman who was just on the floor and I
19	apologize. Do you catalog your full text
20	searchable databases, like EBSCOhost?
21	MR. ROHRIG: You mean as the
22	individual items?

MS. DAVIS: If I were looking for

content and I searched in your catalog, would

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I be able to find a bibliographic record for WorldCat or EBSCOhost, or a commercially --

MR. ROHRIG: Yes. I believe we do have individual records for those databases.

MS. DAVIS: Well, they're born digital. I mean I'm just saying they're born digital So if you need to go the other way --

MR. ROHRIG: Yes, I'm really not sure of that because I've never had that question. I know we have our print indexes record. I'm not sure actually that we do include records for our online databases.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay, you want to go on the next scenario?

DAHLEN: Okay, scenario two: MS. We don't have the staff to process tangible materials. advising that after We are revising your collection development policy, reevaluate your items selection profile and your user needs. Deselect what you do Outline the available methods need. cataloging online only resources, keeping in mind that cataloging electronic resources continues to be the most effective way

disseminate online materials.

You should investigate the purchase of commercial vendor records, the staff time involved in selecting and copy cataloging individual online resources, and the time and the staff involved in integrating online resources into library web pages, course quides and more.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Council, comments on this?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. When I took over the Tulsa City-County Library, a good portion of the government documents were not in the catalog, and we were a 50 percent depository and our staff had been cut.

We went down to a 30 percent selective by doing the collection development policy, making sure that we were keeping what needed to be for our community, and then getting the records to put online, and our circulation jumped tremendously. Then we were able to get back the staff that we had lost because we were then shown as having usage.

So I agree with your advising.

2

STIERHOLZ: MS.

Comments from the

3

audience?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Arlene Weible, MS. WEIBLE: the Oregon State Library. I guess I believe that а lot of the trouble that documents librarians have had in the past with having staffing to process shipments and that kind of thing is kind of a thing of the past because reality is there isn't that much material coming in anymore in that traditional way.

And I think one of the things gets back to what was said earlier about you really need to reeducate the staff, your cataloging staff, the other places where this kind of activity normally takes place in your library. Because they may be under the impression that the volume of material that used to through the program is still the same, your -- your ideal environment is that you do not separate off documents from the technical processing of other things in your library that you've integrated as much as possible.

And if you can, let the people know

what your technical services folks know: that they're not going to be overwhelmed by government documents. They're probably going to be more likely to want to integrate that into their workflows because honestly there are a number of libraries that cataloging departments have to justify their existence now, just as much as documents departments, and they need this stuff to catalog.

So I think it's -- again, it gets back to making sure everybody in your institution understands the current realities of the program, and not what it used to be in terms of volume of material.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Go ahead, Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. Another thing that you could add to this is that people can evaluate what they are doing in their processing. Because I've learned that some libraries have elaborate processing procedures that aren't really required, and -- you know, because somebody somewhere believes that they have to do it that way.

So a reevaluation of processing could be included.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. STIERHOLZ: Go ahead, Kathy.

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Public Library. Francisco We're talking perhaps a shift of where things happen. You say that lack of processing stack and the documents part, but depending on how your catalog is set up, and who gets the cataloging records, it could fall on your IT department to get the FTP -- whatever the download is, or whoever your web team is where that's located how they want to put things up.

it could shift some workflow So from actually the documents into a whole other unit, and the documents department needs to really work with that unit. So it really just depends on how you set up your library and the work flows and the work units. But it's not particularly, it's in ours not technical services, it's really IT and the web, the whole virtual library part that is growing rapidly, and we're losing the actual processing part.

1	So we have to take that into
2	account.
3	MS. STIERHOLZ: I think one of
4	the points that I thought is interesting and
5	important here is you point out how much time
6	it takes to handle the electronic materials;
7	that it's not just nothing. You have to put
8	it in the catalog and on web pages, and
9	there's staff time involved in that.
10	MS. DAHLEN: Unless you get the
11	entire all of the online pubs.
12	MS. STIERHOLZ: Do you mean like a
13	
14	MS. DAHLEN: I batch from a
15	commercial vendor.
16	MS. STIERHOLZ: Even from a
17	commercial vendor you'd still have to put them
18	on your web pages and course guides and
19	things. I mean it will never be work-free.
20	Any other comments? Okay, let's go onto the
21	next scenario.
22	MS. DAHLEN: Scenario three:
23	Electronic Government Publications need to be

coordinated and/or integrated into general

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

finding aides. Is there a need to differentiate or brand electronic depository resources from other resources?

We are answering. It is a part of the library's public service commitment to be visible federal depository library, а regardless of whether they are a primarily tangible or electronic collection. How you go about doing it is a local decision. For libraries that are primarily electronic, there should be reference to depository some information available at a logical place on the library's website, or the electronic front door.

Some libraries will opt to create a government documents web page, and populate the page with depository resources. This type of set up is easy to "brand" as depository information, however, it may be harder for online users to discover the needed resources if they are unaware that they need federal information.

Other libraries opt to integrate depository resources within existing web

pages, web guides, etcetera. Users need not know that the information they are seeking is depository. This strategy makes it harder to brand the library as an information resources for federal information, but it can be done. If you are faced with this situation, ask yourself, "How can the library teach users that the library is a location where experts can help them find and use federal government information?"

MS. STIERHOLZ: Council comments?

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. We're facing this situation now at my institution, and one of the strategies I'm thinking of is that our online catalog allow us to embed an image on the cataloging record. Usually it's the front cover of the book.

And what I imagine one could do with what I'm going to recommend to the powers that be actually, is that we select an image that is depository like, a star, a flag or something along those lines. And for every government document that pops up, that is

branded with indicating it is an FDLP thing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think that would be a very simple thing to do. It would solve the branding problem. You wouldn't have to go to a separate page. It integrates the material, but gives it a distinctiveness amongst the other material, that if the user cares about it, will notice the distinction or maybe ask, "What does that mean, depository item?"

That would be one simple way instead of trying to sort out two other types of web pages.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I think this points to the fact that many of us complex institutions, and our staff have always tried to have us present ourselves on the web by those institute internal divisions, and yet we should be more user-centric. Quite honestly, I think the question about users need to know that the information they are seeking is depository -- or need not know.

They may not even know that the government has information on that. In fact,

I think it comes irrelevant of where the information comes from. I mean you can still put your logo on your door.

You can put it on your website. You can have a very nice web page that describes what a federal depository does, but when it gets to some of the item information, I think the more integrated it is into your collection -- we're going through this now because we have state documents, and we have archives, and we have all these different things.

Everybody wants their little section of the web, but the public doesn't care. They want the information. I think we need to keep that as the focus.

MS. STIERHOLZ: I thought it was interesting. You can take that sentence, and take out the phrase, "Federal Government," and say, "How can the library teach users that the library is a location where experts can help them find information, whatever it is?"

Yes, to your point, Ken, I think they don't really care. Sorry.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. One of the things that we do at EWU is we don't flag individual items, or make a big deal out of saying, "This is a depository item."

But especially with things like web guides for classes, or general finding needs, we will say this is -- really quickly and simple, "We are a federal depository library, and here's generally what that means. And it means that we are a great place to find these certain types of resources with expertise in what they mean that you might not find elsewhere. Here's some that might be helpful for this class."

And we generally get a really good response from people because by themselves, they may not know what a federal depository library is, but when you kind of explain it in a little elevator talk, or can you -- what can you say between like the second and fourth floors in the time you have to say something to somebody?

Generally, they're pretty impressed

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. STIERHOLZ: Do you mean it as

when they find it, and they take advantage of it without trying to put a flag when you get in the door or items and things and trying to do it that way.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Others on council? Audience, comments about branding online resources as depository?

MS. HANN: Christine Hann, Kalamazoo Public Library. I like the idea. think that when people go looking information, they want the answer to their question and a lot of times they specifically looking for government information, and that's fine. And if the -- a good, valuable source of source their question is government answer to information, then great.

A lot of times our users don't They just want a good answer. But when care. they find it, I think they -- there should be a simple way to recognize that the information came from the federal government. So I like the idea.

kind of an authentic thing that this is authentic, or is it credibility kind of thing?

Or do you mean that as -- you know, that you want them to know that this is government information, government documents?

MS. HANN: Yes and yes.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay.

MS. HANN: If I'm understanding you correctly. I think it's always important for people to understand what the source of their information is. And I'm afraid this microphone is going to fall off.

I'm not sure how to -- I had an idea going through my head. I'm not sure how to quite put it in words? I think at times it's important that people -- many times it's important that people may not have the awareness that they can get information on such a broad variety of topics from their federal government.

So that's one thing. And then the other thing is that they -- every source of information has some particular bend or bias to it, and so when they get the answer, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

_`

19

20

21

22

23

24

think it's important that they know it came from the federal government. And however they choose to evaluate that is up to them, but just that they have that information. I hope that answered your question.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yes, thank you.

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: I think the --

MS. STIERHOLZ: Can you give us your name?

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Oh, I'm sorry. Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas. I think the distinction I would make is that -- and to build on you, is that it's -- not that it's depository government documents, but that it's government documents. I don't think it really matters whether or not we're a depository or not.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay, thank you.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. It strikes me that one critical problems in distributed the information search issues are of quality, authentication and authority, and builds their capability for authentication,

knowing that it's a government document with GPO origin, means that hopefully as people get used to that that authentication is an option that you have as you use that document.

MS. STIERHOLZ: David?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I agree with Ken that initially at least to most users, it doesn't matter to them where they get the information, as long as they perceive it as good information.

However, when I look at branding, I -- branding of course came from the world of marketing. And while the pure informational quality of the document may not be source dependent, the ability to provide this in the future may depend on how we market a number of things to our customers.

Part of branding, and no matter how you do it, is not only telling people who created this information, but tell them how they got it; that is what mechanism delivered it to them. And if it came to them through the FDLP, knowing that may over time get them

allocated into the fact that they do have service at a federal depository library, and this is why they're able to get this quality information.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Ken?

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. I just would make
here -- maybe a point that's trying to be made
here, too, is the distinction between I guess
labeling the information, and much of it
probably does say United States Government
somewhere on it. And if you want to put a
little logo, that's fine.

I think what you may want to be pushing and branding more is your expertise within your library to help people navigate through government information, which is somewhat different than the person coming in and just starting a search for a particular subject.

I mean it's like good referencing review. And I think them knowing that your organization, whether online or offline, has an expertise that they can come to for. So

Ι

there's the person that's always going to fill 1 2 in the search box, and then maybe a person that sends you an email reference question, 3 and they may choose to do that because they 4 see you are a depository library. 5 So Ι think there's different 6 7 branding going on here. It's not just the item, but it's the service. 8 STIERHOLZ: Okay, want to go MS. 10 the next one? MR. DAVIS: Actually --11 MS. STIERHOLZ: Oh, no, we're just 12 13 going to ignore you, Ric. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. 14 MR. 15 wanted to echo a sediment that was sort of 16 expressed in different ways on stage, and a personal experience. 17 From the users that we interact 18 19 with, it comes down to the element of trust. And before we started engaging in digital 20 authentication, we started -- in the source 21

9

22

23

24

And people said, "Why in the world

code of web pages, we started putting in

doubling core tags.

would you do that?" And we actually felt like it was talking to Google, Yahoo, and other internet search engines, it was helping with the relevancy. The byproduct of what I found was we were having a lot of members of the American public, non-librarians, who would write in and say, "I don't know what those tags are that you have on those pages, but those tags provide a wealth of information and it tells me that I can trust you."

And we've migrated from having tags on web pages, to digitally signing documents. So when we're thinking about branding now, the authentication logo, the FDLP logo, it all comes down to that element of trust.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Cindy, are you going to get up?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just also wanted to add that the branding thing you all aren't doing in a vacuum. We're doing a lot of branding as a program, and in the marketing things that we do, and every time we do a referral to a depository library, or when we make a referral to government

information online, we put in our messages that we're sending you here, and here's where you can get your expert users -- librarians with expertise in using and finding government information, and yada, yada, yada.

So you're not doing all that in a vacuum.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Okay, the next scenario.

MS. DAHLEN: We have a historical collection, but it is not used a lot, or we have a collection in closed stacks remote storage that isn't used much. "My director wants this space; what are my options?"

We're advising for the library to reevaluate the present and future needs of your users, what publications in an electronic format will not be an acceptable format to meet future needs, identify if the library needs to mark the collection through cataloging, web page development, outreach to classes, etcetera, rather than disposing of it.

Would increasing the usage of that

tangible collection alter your space issue at all? Work with your regional library to identify if the collection is unique in your

be transferred to another location, or be

region. If it is, the collection may need to

6 retained at yours.

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

if the collection Assess candidate for a digitization project. If the collection is in fact withdrawn, offering the publications to other libraries, dispose the material please of per the guidelines established by your region.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Comments from council? Go ahead, David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. There probably isn't a month that goes by before one of my selectives approaches me with this very same scenario.

By the time the director wants this space, it's almost too late to do anything about the situation. And while -- when one of my selectives tells me they're in this situation, I of course don't say, "You

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

should've dealt with this years ago," because that would not be productive.

And I'm not trying to lecture to the good folks in the audience here, but if you -- if you add collections that are like this, and your director has not yet come to you, be assured that one day your director will, and you have to prepare for this eventuality because it will happen, and there are ways of dealing with this before you are faced with a directive such as, "Within six months, I want everything gone."

whether the actions and So the bullet points here are probably good things to happen once -- once the directive has come out, I would like to see us put some kind of an appeal to proactivity in here because it's sort of a tragic situation where -- where this happens, and there's not a whole lot that you this point. can do at Ιt becomes emergency.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Other comments?

CHAIR BYRNE: In my former life as a regional librarian, I several times

this -- they really didn't encouraged themselves favor keeping any by collections in SuDocs and maintaining it as a separate collection because it just made it a This is a case where integration into target. the library collection where it's not so visible, and not something that a director can say, "If we get rid of that, we save the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. STIERHOLZ: Tim, can I ask you a question? Are there times that people have lost valuable and/or important material in this process, or do you feel like based on your knowledge of those selectives, generally was it at least tolerable?

space, " really saves the collection for you.

CHAIR BYRNE: Well, I had one library that made the mistake of fighting their administration.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay.

CHAIR BYRNE: And as a result, really turned the administration off to the documents collection. So they were told they had to reduce the size of their collection by 80 percent. So yes, they did lose a lot of

things that were pretty valuable.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. STIERHOLZ: All right.

CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, MR. California State Library. Yes, there have been situations with some of my selectives where I feel that their library ended up being the loser in this. Not so much because they lost tangible material. Well, certainly not lost they tangible material because should've been weeded out a long time ago, but because they lost valuable materials that got lumped in with the worthless stuff, and was discarded as well.

And one of the things that I preach to my selectives is exactly what you said, Tim. Integration not only at the collection into the rest of the library's collection, but the program, integrating your program, into the larger mission of your library absolutely essential because you don't want to be seen as a function of the library that is set apart from the other functions of the library, from the mission of the library, from the collection of the library.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the more you can do to integrate your depository activities into the general working of the library, the more you become like а stealth operation in the I tell people sooner or later you're library. going to get a new director and the first thing your director does is tour the library and look at change, because directors -- new directors want to change things.

And when a director sees a bunch of stuff in the basement that nobody ever uses, they're a closed stack collection that nobody uses, the director is going to point out and say, "What the H is that? Does anybody ever use that stuff?" "No." "Well, we're going to use that space for something more productive."

So if you can integrate your operations and your collection into mainstream of a library, then the director has nothing to point at anymore.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Ann Marie?

Ann Sanders from the MS. SANDERS: Library of Michigan. As a regional, I, like David and Tim, have seen this time and time and time again, and 49 times out of 50 it's because the collection involved isn't cataloged, and -- but my -- my point is that we proved it within our own institution in a very unusual way in the last couple years. Because of a building project, we ended up creating a close stack storage US documents location, and it had to do with the physical layout was why we created it. Not for any other reason.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But when we had to choose material to go in there, we chose material we wanted cataloged. We very deliberately put all the WPA and branch defense, and a whole bunch of other things in there, and then we turned around and went to cataloging, and said, "It's closed stacks. Nowit. in has t.o be cataloged." And since it's been cataloged, we are now doing a streaming ILL trade out of that room because we're wanting to be places in the country that has holdings attached to an LCL site.

So even within our own institution, we had a really hard time proving that that

old stuff got used until the cataloging. And I -- there was a library literature probably ten to 15 years ago that said that a cataloged collection went up in the average of 500 percent in circulation after it was cataloged, and I'd love to see somebody update that, because I got to believe this in our own experience that it's very true, and it's the biggest enemy of this exact scenario is the resources to catalog.

MS. STIERHOLZ: So it sounds like the advice from you regionals is not to wait until you get to this point. Okay.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Well, I think that's partly true, but this also raises one of these fundamental things. I mean let's face it, there are historical collections out there that have little value to the -- a particular library's current mission.

One of our assumptions in our strategic plans is development in a larger library world. Our developments are informing the future of the Federal Depository Library

Program, and I think that's very true.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I mean a lot of our public libraries are either ceasing to be a selective of really cutting back. They don't deal in old stuff. I mean they have current readers. They want current material, not just want the public wants.

I'd like to see some more studies of the cataloging. I know when you catalog a collection, it exposes it more and it's called for more, but what nobody does is evaluate that the reader -- that the user really finds it useful.

I worked in a library years ago that had annotated all the Smithsonian reports, and people would find the darndest things in the catalog, and then they'd find out it was a 1908 article, and it wasn't really what they wanted. So we have to be careful about that. But I do think the integration is an important piece, or what in that collection is still relevant to that library's mission?

A lot of these are "just in case

collections," and I don't think we do just in 1 case as much, other than at a larger library, 2 a regional library. We actually have 3 received a lot of really great stuff, not that 4 we wanted it all right away, as some of these 5 libraries are reading or working 6 very 7 carefully with them to make sure that we do see the material, that it goes through the 8

and

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proper process

collection.

Yes, we're a small state. So you can come to us and get it probably as easy as you can at the library that it was at.

it's

added

into

our

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yes?

MS. CAULFIELD: Jane Caulfield, Catholic University in Ponce, Puerto My suggestion on this particular Rico. situation would be if it's a correction that you discover, and it's something you know you really want to keep for whatever reason, if you have potential users out there with whom contact, might find you have who the information useful, call those users and go, "Look, we've got this collection of materials

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that we discovered, and it's something I think you can use in your subject area."

"Why don't you come over to the library before we throw it out? Take a look at it." And then enlist those people in helping you keep that information.

МУ example is we recently discovered in the bottom of an old map cabinet we were about to throw out a complete set of all the US Geological Survey quadrangle maps for Puerto Rico. We got into a very heated discussion in the library of -- half of our staff was, "God, those are awful. Those are You must be able to get them online." old. And the rest of us going, "Wow, these are neat. I want them."

We had an argument going between the reference library and the Puerto Rican collection library as to who was going to get the maps. We all went off to lunch still arguing.

By accident, when we came back, a couple of our student assistants who are history majors had come in, seen them on my

desk, brushed the dust off, were looking at
the maps. They had called a couple of their
professors, and the decision was very easy
because the students and the professors were

6 to keep them."

So by accident, I discovered the possibility. Call your potential users. If you've got somebody you think is going to use these materials, enlist them to help you get your director to say, "Yes, we really do need to keep these."

going, "You can't throw these out. You need

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you.

MS. SITTEL: I'm Robbie Sittel with the Tulsa City-County Library, and I'm going to contradict what this gentleman said because as a public library, and as a documents librarian in our library, I'm the one that gets the requests for those historic materials because the rest of our staff don't know that they're there, and luckily my predecessor was good enough to collect things that pre-dates our inception as a depository.

So it is important for public

submitting

libraries to have those items, too. So that's 1 2 my comment. Thanks. MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Do you 3 4 have an announcement? MR. ELLIS: Yes. Is there a Janet 5 Holly here? 6 7 MS. STIERHOLZ: It's an emergency reference question. Okay, Ann? 8 Ann Sanders, Library 9 MS. SANDERS: 10 of Michigan. I have one other suggestion to throw out that it is important that we not 11 consider all regional collections 12 13 complete and comprehensive because i f individual library disasters not withstanding, 14 15 things have happened over time that we're not 16 really thinking about. In Michigan, we used to have two 17 regionals. The Detroit Public Library was a 18 19 100 percent volunteer. We were 100 selective throughout its entire duration as a member of 20 the Depository Program. 21 When they ceased being regional and 22

selective, they began

disposal lists to me. In the last year, I've

23

24

became

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

taken 10,000 items that we did not own, and I considered that we had a pretty good collection.

Ι asked earlier So when the question that does it -- did it really matter? We don't know if it matters, but my experience is telling me that it probably does more than we think.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Suzanne?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I want to build on what Robbie from Tulsa City-County was saying about that it is important for those historical research materials to be available other than in research libraries because there lot of the general public that are a approaching intimidated at the research library, and would go to the public library to get that information.

They usually don't have time for the inter-library loan. They need it then. They don't need it two weeks from now. Or in some cases when you go to inter-library loan,

it comes back that it's reference only, and you have to come here to use it.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Anyone else? Let's go onto the next scenario. I'm sorry.

MR. POLLASTRO: Mike Pollastro,
University of Idaho Library. We're regional,
but this is our -- this is what's happening
with us right now. My director has come to me
and asked me about space, and taking the space
away; getting rid of our regional library
categorization and reducing out depository
collection, and made remarks about integrating
the collection into what is already there in
the regular collection doesn't really hold
much water in our case.

I mean our print use totally is just minuscule in comparison to the use of electronic resources, and growing more so all the time. So it's -- really, it almost looks like there's no battle. I mean it's well lost already.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Sorry. I don't know what to say.

MS. CRALEY: Andi Craley, Hartford Community College Library. I'm an example of a very small selective, about 15 percent. And unfortunately, we've not had any of these issues. In fact, we're the opposite. We have very supportive library directors who fight with our administration, fight for us.

But a library director that we had, who retired in 2006, always told me that she considers it a very special privilege that we have a library within the library, and that's always stuck with me. So I think that's where she fought with the administration because it wasn't our collection. It was a risk. We're a library. It's prime real estate. We're always getting equity offices inside the library.

So that was always her fight; that we're a library within a library, and that's just the point. That idea came into my head.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Robin?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you.

There's a couple of considerations to be thinking about as you talk with your

colleagues, because usually you still have some time -- not always, but sometimes. If a regional leaves a program, unlike Michigan, most states only have one regional.

That means that you cannot discard materials. So the short answer is you don't gain a lot of space unless you leave the program altogether.

We would love to talk to anyone that is in that situation about options and possibilities. Arlene Weible has stood up, and Oregon had an innovative approach of a shared regional, which has been a couple places in the United States.

This time it's among four large academic institutions, including a shared collection and shared services. There are some options, but if you don't say something, we don't know about it, and we can't help you, and we would love to talk to you and to help you.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you for that information, Robin. Anyone else? Okay, we'll go onto the next scenario.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. DAHLEN: How do I keep up with the copy cataloging of boring digital materials? Are there tools available now or in the future that can help me?

advice is Our to scan your in-scope publications electronic titles for for your collection. You can furthermore tailor your item selection profile to include EL item numbers. You use your library profile more quickly scan the new electronic titles, monthly archive reports.

Are you all familiar with that? There's a new electronic titles link. If you keep scrolling down, at the very bottom, there's a monthly archive report that puts everything out into one big list and makes it easier to compare your profile with what came out that month.

You can consider batch loading of records through a commercial vendor either by getting all online materials, or by tailoring the batch loads to your user names.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Okay, comments from council? Go back to the question.

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, Francisco Public. It still comes back to if your cataloging department isn't doing the electronic things. You're still shifting your workload to someone else. So it's still trying to figure out the best way to handle electronic cataloging; for each library to figure that out, and it's not as simple as we're making it.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Yes, I was wondering because of the integration of FDsys with the ILS if it will be possible for people to choose item numbers and batch load them directly from either FDsys, or from the CGP?

MS. DAHLEN: We've seen various libraries go about identifying. The biggest difference is in who is actually doing the selecting when they're choosing individual record to copy catalog. We've seen it being done by depository library staff. It's being done by technical services staff. We've seen it being done by IT staff. So we've seen about a million different models of doing that.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Cindy?

_ _

-

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to respond to the question you had about ILS or FDsys pushing cataloging records, and that's something that's been on our radar for a long, long time. We looked at that when we were putting together our requirements for the ILS, as well as putting together the requirements for FDsys, and it's one of the things that I had as an action, or a strategic target in our draft plans.

So yes, it's on our radar. We hope to be able to do that. In the meantime, you can still go into the CGP, which is one of those options.

MS. DAHLEN: New electronic titles is part of CGP. Is that what you mean?

MS. ETKIN: What?

MS. DAHLEN: You said CGP is available but new electronic titles is a part of CGP.

MS. ETKIN: Right. I'm talking about going in like the Z39 as a gateway or something like that to -- for the larger

bundles of records.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Comments from the audience? It seems everybody agrees with that, okay.

MS. DAHLEN: How do I review and update my item number selections to select more electronic formats?

One way is to identify a peer institution with a similar collections scope that has already transitioned to be more electronic, and review that library's item number selections. Basically, don't reinvent the wheel.

Keep in mind that online materials can be found in many places in a list of classes. Some online materials are assigned a unique SuDocs class stem, and are specifically designated as an EL item number.

Other online publications are general publications, which are multi-format publications like the general publications in handbooks, manuals and guide. The point too is that you're already used to it.

If you select, then you are going

to get publications in various formats. And also keep in mind that you don't have to add EL item numbers to your item selection profile in order to provide access to them, because there are ways other than cataloging that you can promote them.

This often happens when libraries identify a new user need, or a new resource, but the item selection update cycle hasn't happened yet. And if you do subscribe to a vendor for bibliographic records, please don't forget that you need to notify them that you have updated your item selection profile. We've had libraries that update their item selection profile once a year, but they haven't notified their vendor in five.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Comments from council? Suggestions on reviewing item update, reviewing selection profiles?

Audience?

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library. I still think there's a lot that GPO could do to make the information about items and the various formats a lot

easier for people to access.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The tool -- I mean a lot of people use Documents Data Miner to do these kinds of comparisons that folks are talking about, but because of various reasons, people don't know about those kinds of resources. And I remember being at many meetings in the past where we talked about maybe perhaps item selection isn't the best way to go about doing this to begin with.

So I would hope that we don't have to just settle for the tools that are there, but we can still continue to see improvements tools make this to to process an easier process because the reality is we're always going to have people that are new and don't understand the way this works, and it's a real challenge for those of us who regionals to educate them about complicated system that I personally think doesn't have to be that way anymore.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. John?

John

Shuler,

University of Illinois at Chicago. I think

SHULER:

MR.

this is one of the deeper barriers integration of

alien

depository services mainstream in that if this is our principal means of selection of government documents,

to

normal

librarians

understand.

too

it's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

one of the discussions intuitions is how could we having at my integrate the selection of documents into our standard collection development method, such as using Yankee Book Peddler as an example?

Could develop Yankee we Peddler techniques that include government And everybody looked at me around documents? the table and said, "Why not?" I said, "You don't understand. We're special."

I think with the community and GPO, I think the burden rests on both partners in this case. Work towards that kind This problem will diminish integration. because we'll go right back to the idea of hiding in plain sight.

success depends not upon exceptionalism, but how we add value to the organization through existing services. And
that is no longer driven by separate expensive
collections, or separate public service desks.

I'm not just saying that we lose our
expertise in the mix. We keep our expertise.

We just practice it in a different way.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In my experience, that's what I'm discovering. They no longer believe the documents mojo. We've got to come up with a better trick.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Does anybody want to follow John? I wouldn't. Okay.

CHAIR BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department I like the idea of creating new of Energy. tricks, new tools. And one of the things that I think we need to do is at GPO, we actually need to create pre-selected catalog sets, sets of cataloging records on consumer information publications, on education publications. Something that is a fairly small set, a recent set, that could be marketed to libraries to their collection and have just load into immediate access to government information on a specific topic.

231 1 MS. STIERHOLZ: That's great 2 idea. Kathy? MS. LAWHUN: Isn't that what FDsys 3 should help us with? 4 MS. STIERHOLZ: What an idea? 5 MS. LAWHUN: That was Denise. I'm 6 saying it for Denise. 7 Oh, here MS. STIERHOLZ: 8 Cindy. 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. For those of you who were not at the library technical information service update that Lori gave today, but you may have heard a little bit about a little bit about SDI, Selective Dissemination of Information, coming out of the CGP, we're working on just what Tim is suggesting; that you can go in and do your searches, and then have the stuff emailed to you every time there is a new cataloging record put into the CGP on your whatever, whether it's a subject or a SuDocs stem, or an agency author or whatever.

So that's coming. That's on the drawing board for this year, this fiscal year.

1 MS. STIERHOLZ: That's great.

CHAIR BYRNE: This is the sort of response I'd like to get from GPO.

MS. STIERHOLZ: All right, now you've raised our expectations. Any other comments?

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. I have used Z39.50 to bring in maybe items I have missed, or online things. And one of the weaknesses is that they limit to 1,000 records, and I've sent it into askGPO, and they just told me, "Well, that's the limit we have to have."

But everybody that goes through CGP are just us, and we're good people. And you know a lot of -- even though OCLC allows Z39.50 for hundreds of thousands of -- I'm not saying one that should be hundreds of thousands, but maybe 10,000, maybe 5,000? And we -- I don't think there's that much strain on the system.

And when it's the 1,000 records, Z39.50 protocols are so weak that it's difficult to say, "Well, give me" -- you can't

just say, "Give me records 1 to 1,000, and 1,001 to 2,000." So for that reason, I would advocate that we need to up the limit in Z39.50 pulls.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. It really was a good session with Lori today, because that exact question came up and that's one of the things that Linda Resler wants feedback on, as to whether or not that 1,000 limit is sufficient. Do you need it to be larger?

One of the things that she explained was as we brought this up, we're also testing server load, but now we're looking at how or if we need to expand that. So you need to send something else.

MR. BROWN: Okay, I'll send it again because I've sent it before. But that was in April. So thank you.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you.

MS. GIBSON: Hi. My name is Karen Gibson from Ursinus College. We're a small selected library with 19 percent of the collection, and I'm facing a critical junction

right now because the last ten years the college president has been querying as to why we're still in the program.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I'm here on a fact-finding mission to make sure that I have all of my priorities and goals in place for my plan to stay because we still want to stay in the program.

I have a few questions about the -or comments about the items selections system, if it would ever be revised. I'm faced with selecting item numbers. It's hard for me to t.ell administration collecting we are currently 10,000 items numbers, but that can translate into hundreds of thousands of titles.

So I was wondering if that -- I mean I can see why the item selection system is great for distribution from the various agencies, but I was just wondering if that system would be revised in a way?

And then also, the separation of electronic formats from the print formats for the item numbers if that is in progress or in

place?

MS. STIERHOLZ: Someone from GPO want to take that? Everyone is looking at you, Robin.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO.

I answered this question probably 12 years ago, and then ten years ago, and then today.

So yes, we know that -- and Yankee Peddler was the one that came up with that about five years ago probably.

We know that it's a cumbersome system, and very difficult. And when I first became a documents librarian, I said, "They wanted to do that." The problem is our systems are 1992 systems, which is why FDsys is so important to us in trying to have a complete architecture that is into the 21st Century, instead of 1982 programming.

The one system works with another, with another in trying to separate those, kind of like detangling a ball of yarn. It's difficult to do. It is one of the things that we've heard as a need, and we did put forth a paper a couple years ago on item selection

number creation options for tangible and for online electronics.

I believe that's still on the desktop as a discussion paper. I'm not going to be able to make it okay for you this year, but we do hear you say it. We do know it's a need, and Ric Davis is coming to add something else.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. When I talked in my update speech about budget requests this year, we had a bunch of requests to a quarter million dollars to replace these systems in conjunction with what we're doing on FDsys.

I'm interested to receive that feedback too, and I think it's something you might need to talk about at the next council session.

We had some breakout sessions a few years back where a number of librarians said, "If you eliminate the items selections system, I'm going to march on Washington." I question too the relevancy as we go forward entering an environment where 97 percent of

titles are born digital.

So I'd like to have a separate session on that to have that discussion again as we look at what FDsys can do, and also looking at what we can do with modernizing our own systems.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you. Thank you all. Okay, our last scenario.

MS. DAHLEN: What are the benefits of selecting EL item numbers, selecting catalog or otherwise provide access to online publications that meet the federal government information needs of my community without selecting the FDLP item number?

And this is actually a rehash of a July 2003 AdNotes article called, "Consideration in Selecting Online Publications," but we get this question all the time.

One of the benefits is you will automatically receive newly created item numbers that are similar to the ones you already select. You will automatically receive tangible publications if an item

number changes from an EL to a tangible format.

You receive free use of online subscription services that are otherwise fee based. You all know you're supposed to be selecting the stat USA item number and things like that. For libraries that subscribe to cataloging records and/or record updates from vendors like MARCIVE, Auto-graphics, OCLC, it may facilitate receipt of records for online publications.

Libraries that don't select those EL item numbers may not receive the cataloging records for those item numbers unless they specifically profile with their vendor to receive them.

It assists researchers who are using locator services like the Catalog of US Government Publications, which direct users to libraries that select item numbers. A lot of people ask, "What's the point of directing somebody to a library when they're looking at an online resource," but it helps users establish who has a subject base, and it also

helps fellow librarians to determine who has a subject base in their collection.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. STIERHOLZ: Comments from council? Are there comments from the Should I open up the floor for any audience? other general comments about this? Since we have a few minutes at the end, I wanted to open the floor up for general comments about the whole topic of what we've covered here, which are really just a variety of scenarios of converting the library. Maybe not making a transition to a more completely, but electronic resource. And if people suggestions, constructive advice to give, I think some of the regional librarians have offered some really good constructive advice.

I thought if there were any other pieces of advice or comments you could offer that weren't covered in these scenarios, that would be great.

MS. MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch,
University of Kentucky. I actuyally just
mentioned this over in the operations forum,
but I'll mention it here since you asked.

regional, so it's not as big an issue for me, though it's nice to know. But my selectives who want to begin to do this would like to know that what they are substituting for the electronic copy is the GPO archived copy, and not a copy that's out on a website that might disappear and no longer -- and they would be left with nothing.

Is there a way that we can find -is there a way you could engineer indicating
what's actually in the GPO archive, versus
what's on the agency website? Does that make
sense?

MS. STIERHOLZ: Do you understand?
Cindy, are you going to take that?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I didn't come up here to answer that, but I'll try. Yes, we're looking at that. One of the things that we've done is just developed a policy on persistent identifiers and one of the things that we have in that policy is that we will be pointing to our archived version of monographs.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

۷ ـا

22

23

24

One of the things that we would like to see implemented first before we do that is the replacement of PURLs to Handles. And so a couple years ago, probably you all heard about our proof of concept where we tested Handles and created Handles, and got them to resolve and all that. That's now been turned over to the project management office for implementation in FDsys, and now I can't remember which release that's in.

But that's on our radar, and we're looking at that, and it may be that we have to do something before we go to Handles. understand that when you're because substituting, of the one things is completeness, authenticity, and permanently being able to guarantee permanent public access, and you can't do that unless you know we've archived it. So that's on our radar.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Keep going.

MS. ETKIN: Since you just sort of opened it up for everything, and I've been sort of lately wearing my think outside the box had that you all probably saw back in

Kansas City, and I just posed the question to some folks in a meeting one day what we think the depository library program is going to look like in 15 to 20 years, and we were talking about having no tangible distribution, except for those titles that have the legal

control and authority.

And so with 97 percent of publications being born digital, as you've heard several times here at this meeting, we all need to start preparing some of these kinds of activities whether it's being forced upon you from your administration, or from us.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Thank you, Cindy.

Tim has got an announcement here for the rest of the meeting, a little information for you.

But I wanted to give Ashley a round of applause for all her hard work. Great scenarios. Tim?

CHAIR BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department of Energy. I made this announcement before, but I just want to remind people that we have made some adjustments to the schedule because of the fact that the discussion on the future

of the FDLP, the strategic plan, really didn't
have enough time to deal with everything we
wanted to, and give everyone a chance to have

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

some input.

switching the We are council working session that is scheduled from 5:00 to 6:00 today in this room to а further discussion of the strategic plan, and we'll also be doing more discussion tomorrow from 1:30 to 3:00. So please, anyone with interest in the future of FDLP, stick around another hour.

MR. SHULER: May I make a small well? The announcement as Government Information Online folk that are here, and if you see other folks, we are still meeting at in this room despite what the council does. And if we have to, we'll meet over in that corner just briefly. That shouldn't take Thanks. That's too long. Government Information Online participants.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:57 p.m., and resumed at 3:34 p.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: This session, we're dealing with juggling the issues, balancing access resources and security concerns in the FDLP. So I'll turn it over to Robin Haun-Mohamed.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Good afternoon.

Those of you in the back, I ask you to join us up front. You're a long way back there.

We wanted to talk a bit about access and security outside of the public Access Assessment Program that we've discussed so often recently. And it actually has done its initial forays this summer.

In your council booklet, there is a PowerPoint, and following the PowerPoint is a small list of key assumptions, and also examples of access problems. And rather than go through all of those together here and now, you know that they're in there, and we'd like you to take a look when you get a chance.

For council, on the key assumptions listing, assumptions one through four have essentially already been validated through previous council members. What I would ask

you to do is take a look at assumptions 5, 6 and 7, and see if there's anything with heartburn or "Whoo hoo, you did a great job,"

on putting forth these next three assumptions.

We believe it's very important that librarians empower themselves to go ahead and make some of these decisions based on experience and discussion and guidance, such as the handbook. So just briefly -- and my colleague told me not to read out loud, but I'm going to go ahead and read out loud number 5.

GPO has never been able, and never will be able to publish a one size fits all set of rules that will precisely define every possible access challenge faced by every library in the FDLP. Is there anyone that has something they'd either like to add to that, or say that we're off track, or any comments from council? No? Okay.

Number 6: Since professional judgment calls must often be made in access situations that are not precisely defined, different depository library personnel will

make different access judgments in similar situations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I think it follows along with the not everything fits everybody rule. forward the idea professional puts of judgment. Librarians have very specific training, experience, make decisions every day in all kinds of situations, including access situations.

And number 7: While depositories strive toward access perfection, attainment of the idea of free and public access in depository libraries is never 100 percent perfect, matter what the no assessment person may think.

Okay, well just very briefly on the other side of that assumption page, there is examples of the access problems. And believe -- my colleagues Suzanne and David and I, discussed the situation. We had some input from other folks at GPO in preparing this think section, that and we most access impediments orpotential access problems situations proceed from these three

conditions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Robin, I'm sorry. DR. GREER: Ι interrupt? Chris Greer, National It's afternoon, and Coordination. so The sense of 5, 6 and 7, but catching up. particularly number 5 I certainly agree with assumption as written. Does assumption exclude the possibility that on specific instances there may be one size fits all rules? And should that be explicitly indicated here?

My concern has to do with issues of inter-operability where you're trying to fuse resources, things like that. In some cases you need to agree on standards for that purpose, and not on a one size fits all rule.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Chris, I can't think of one particular thing that would fit, but I'd be glad to have any input you might have on that.

DR. GREER: This goes back to the argument I made earlier about from the user's perspective, how many libraries do I want. I want one. All right? And so if you're going

to have all of those resources inter-operable,
there may be some technical standards on which
everybody is going to have to agree for access
purposes.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: There's the basic fundamental pieces a person should be able to access the depository resources in a library. But the exact way that a person accessed those will differ from library to library. Maybe I'm just not understanding your question.

DR. GREER: Well, for example adoption of Z39.50 and some particular application, things like that where we either essentially agree amongst yourselves as a community to a standard.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I understand about the Z39.50, and it's a standard that's used across libraries, but not every library is going to be able to handle the Z39.50 component. There are some institutions that will not be able to.

Do I require every library to have that? Not at this point. Although one of the

things I think Cindy brought forward was idea that materials be cataloged, all materials in depository libraries be cataloged. But right now, that's The materials requirement. must be accessible, but the way that your library makes them available is a local institution decision.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. GREER: That strikes me as a radical position; that there are no examples of a rule that could be applied to everybody.

That strikes me as radical.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Could I ask question? I read these as physical. This Katrina from the Saint Louis Fed. these physical access issues, in as entrance to a library. And so I read those in -- those assumptions in that light. And when Chris brings up these points, now I'm a little confused. Are these all access issues, or is this really about physical access?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: These are all access issues. Not just physical.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,

University of Illinois at Chicago. I think another way to rephrase Chris' concern is to express is there an absolute minimum level measurement for access that would apply to all depository libraries? And I think his point about digital access, there's -- in order to fundamentally provide access to electronic government information, the computers have got to do something at a basic level.

They've got to be able to read sw.

They've got to be able to read Adobe

Photoshop, whatever it is. Acrobat, thank

you.

If a library cannot or will not do that, doesn't that violate a basic principle of access that there is no getting around your special -- your exception of, "We're not going to apply that to you?"

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: John, thank you. You've gotten to where I've tried to get this question for quite some time. And Chris, I'm sorry. I just didn't recognize it. That is what we need from council.

MR. SHULER: Well, it's there. I

just said it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Is there --

MR. SHULER: Our job is done.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Is there Are there requirements to that degree level? be place in that have to in order to participate in depository program? And if that is the case, will council be working with GPO to put those forward?

Can I ask -- Ken, hold on one minute because David had something to say a couple minutes ago.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I'm actually the one who came up with this language, and I think that the -- one of the problems that we're having right in this moment is that we're stopping the sentence with "one size fits all set of rules, period."

The fulcrum of that sentence are the two words precisely defined. Now, I've worked in libraries a long time. I've been in administration, and I've realized that when you set a policy, you can never address in

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We make sure that this framework,

that policy every possible future problem that may come up that would be addressed by that policy.

There are always unforeseen things coming up, and the important thing about this sentence is that it says, "Yes, we do have to have a one size fits all set of rules for some things." But, we have to understand that that one size fits all set of rules is not going to precisely define every situation that may come up in the future after we agree as a community to adopt those sets of rules, and that's where professional judgment comes in.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you,
David. Ken?

MR. SHULER: But I think this --John Shuler, University of Illinois Chicago. If we look at our basic principles where it says, "Universal access to through citizens our federal depository libraries," that minimum presumes some requirements that are inviolable and cannot be excused by exceptional circumstances.

this structure at each of our individual libraries is there and in place, and if it isn't -- I understand the one size fits all, but I don't think that's what we're talking about here. I think we're all -- we've all been around the block enough times to realize not every situation is going to be anticipated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I think what we're talking about here is what is the minimum that you have to do in order to stay in the program? And it is to serve the citizens of your community, of the state and so on.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Do you want to rephrase that? Not citizens.

MR. SHULER: Okay, excuse me.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Your community. It's supposed your community to serve as represented by either the representative district, or by the senatorial district. library, whatever if you're a special however you're hitting the club, if you will.

I think that has to be the minimum,

1 rather than this kind of, "Yes, well, you know one size doesn't fit all." And to paraphrase 2 Dan from yesterday, we'll know an exception 3 I don't 4 when we see it. know if comfortable with that in the sense of what 5 does that mean for this program. 6

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Ken, did you have something further to add?

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. Wiggin, WIGGIN: Ken Connecticut. Actually, I had a different this discussion. question I'm on assuming that ADA is an implied assumption in that all libraries must meet ADA, and all government information produced electronically must meet ADA requirements, or is there sort of a review standard?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Well, in the Federal Depository Library handbook, there are some concepts and precepts that have been put forward, based on large part upon previous documents, including the superseded guidelines that we used in the past for assessment and onsite visitations.

I guess a sneaky way of getting

back to this is to say, "John and Chris, I welcome your participation on developing these guidelines and putting them forward." The superseded ones dealt a lot with processing and tangible products, and really didn't address electronic.

I think Katrina's assumption of this referring to tangible versus electronic was a natural one, but as Ric Davis has said, and Cindy has said, we're 97 percent electronic born digital material. How do we deal with those changes?

So that's why we're having this session because we're having lots of interesting discussions, and access issues dealing with what you just said, John. What does it mean if you're a depository library and you don't open your doors to the public? Are you still a depository library?

MS. SEARS: John, I would also like to know are we willing to give GPO some teeth to that? If we say these are these are the minimum standards, are we willing to say, "If you don't meet these standards, you're out?"

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

_ _

23

24

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois Chicago. That's always implied, even during the times been when inspections were active, that there consequences to how the depository libraries laid their services. And I think what has happened wasn't so much that we are backing away from the standards.

We have had maybe ten years of self-enforcement. Let's put it that way. There hasn't been consequences for about a decade and maybe enough generations of librarians that believe this has always been so; that if we can get away with it without attracting the mother ship's attention, we're doing our job. It's alive at the end of the day, so it's a good thing.

And maybe you're right. Maybe the council, maybe somebody needs to wake up and say, "It's a different world. We need to come back to this."

MS. SEARS: This is Suzanne Sears again, University of North Texas. I assert the way I feel in the ten years that I've been

part of the depository community that we sort of have two groups.

We have the group that is petrified that GPO is going to come down in the mother ship and blow up the collection if they break one tiny little rule. And then we have the group that really could care less what GPO thinks, and they're going to do their collection the way they want to do their collection.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. As we're talking about the possibility of should there be absolute rules, I'm reminded of in the FDLP handbook, and I wish I could remember the exact phrase, but we already to a certain extent -- I'm not saying we shouldn't have this discussion, but there is sort of a minimum standard already.

What's the phrase? It's reasonably approximate; isn't that the phrase that's in there? If your hours for reference services for documents should be reasonably approximate to your hours for reference and --

MS. SEARS: Comparability.

MR. OTTO: Comparability, thank you.

MS. SEARS: Right.

MR. OTTO: Reasonably comparable. So are we talking about sort of doing away with that as a standard, and saying, "You must" -- if you're not open to the public at this hours, you're not a depository library?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I don't think so, Justin. In fact, that's one of the scenarios we're going to hopefully get to.

What I'd like to do is say that number 5 seems to be a bit of a problem, and we need to work on that and go back to council with it. How about 6 and 7 since you've had a little more time to look at it?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. Having started this volley, I guess I wanted to finish it. And David's explanation I thought was well put, but there's a sentence missing after that that says that in order to meet the mission for anytime access -- sorry, anywhere, anytime access for an informed community, there may be

some minimum standards, which are required to 1 that mission while maintaining 2 meet flexibility for libraries. 3 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I like it. 4 Ι like it. 5 DR. GREER: So that would be the 6 modification I would suggest. Thank you. 7 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank 8 you. Anything else, folks? Okay, we'll try one 9 10 more time. MR. OTTO: We have someone at the 11 mic. 12 13 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Oh, I'm sorry. Ann-Marie? 14 15 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders from the 16 Library of Michigan. I have two thoughts on this whole discussion that you all have in 17 here. What the -- and apologies to those of 18 19 you who've heard me say this before, but what the old inspection guidelines did, and mind 20 you they didn't do it in perhaps the most 21 effective or positive of ways, but what they 22

did was they guaranteed a certain uniformity

of service across the country, and across the

23

24

types of libraries.

In other words, someone could come from Oklahoma to Texas and expect a normal commonality standard of service, all right? They may have visited Tulsa and served very well, and went to move to Detroit and might be surprised or pleased by what they find. But there was a certain minimal of consistency and that has been absent for as John says, the last ten years.

The other problem is is that you all seem to consistently -- and I'm talking about royal we of the council, not specific individuals, but you all seem to talk about this either as a tangible thing, or as an electronic thing.

Over and over again I hear language proposed that either addresses the historical tangible collections, or it addresses the online environment, and it never addresses both halves of the equation.

Yes, there are minimal levels of standards for the old paper system, and we still have some of those hanging around, and

we can no doubt improve on them, and we can develop some for the electronic. But my challenge would be is there a way for council to knit those together because it's still one program? And we keep trying to split into the before and the future, and it's still one thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO.

One of the things that Kathy Brazee and Ashley Dahlen have been working on is the Public Access Assessment Program. They reinstituted onsite visitations this summer. Because it was such a small set, we didn't want -- and because we've talked about what it will be, what it will be for the past several council sessions, we didn't want to do a presentation.

We're hoping to do one in spring. We found а lot of interesting information from the libraries that were that did go through the assessment process, visit all and didn't libraries, we everything wasn't wonderful and perfect, but it also wasn't horribly miserable and ugly.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It is, as we all know, in the middle somewhere, and that process was based on a paper, a focus on collection services which is posted from the desktop. There's a checklist associated with it, and soon there will be some regional guidance for assistance on helping their libraries in their area prepare for these to put across, Chris, those basic levels of things that have to be met for service, irregardless of format.

So I think we're going to get to that spot you just spoke about, meanwhile, did have change we а in administration, change in organization, change the manual, the instructions, in guidelines. And we do need council to weigh in on some of these really important issues because the program itself has changed pretty dramatically with the online environment.

Some of the questions we've been getting, you know, "Does a book equal a file?"

"Can we substitute at the is level and this level?"

"If a library is not open to the public, but they're still open as a

depository, what does that mean as part of the program?"

And so those are some of the issues that Cindy Etkin, working with Ric Davis, is rassling with with our general counsel. We don't have all the answers, but this was a way to put the issues forward to council, but hopefully to get good feedback and guidance on direction that will be supportive and clear to the community and to GPO, on the direction council believes GPO should go.

And with that, I am going to sit down and let somebody else talk.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay, what's going to happen here is that my colleague Suzanne is going to go through scenarios, and discuss possible reactions to those scenarios. And then I'm going to moderate discussion here. Before we do that, I'd like to turn your attention to the last page in your agenda handbook for today.

"Examples of access problems."
We're not going to read all of these, but what
we came up with are three groupings into which

we think that just about every access problem can fall, and I would be very interested in your response to these groupings.

The first is, "Access problems can result from overarching library policies that may conflict with FDLP access requirements."

And below that are some examples that you can read.

The second are, "Access problems can result from limited resources." And the third, "Access problems can result from security concerns at individual institutions."

First of all, council do you have any reaction about the appropriateness of those three categories, or the inclusiveness of those three categories? Do you need time to read? If not, then anybody from the audience?

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.

Just a comment in item 3D, as in dog. "A

library refuses to allow patrons to use USBs."

My experience has been that that's mostly a

policy restriction. So I'm wondering if that

examples is more appropriate in 1, overarching

library policies?

MR. CISMOWSKI: I think the reason

-- we could certainly put it in either, I

think, but I think the reason it was put there

was because libraries are afraid of virus

infection being brought in by portable

devices.

MS. SEARS: Right. The reason that the policy is in place is because it's a security concern, and do that's why we put it with the security concerns. But it could easily fit either.

CHAIR BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department of Energy. I think the number 1, overarching library policies, it may also be the policies of the founding institution.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes, and I think you'll see this in a future scenario that we're going to present here, but that's very true. Sometimes the -- it -- the parent institution and the library are -- their -- policies of either can conflict.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. I guess one other

mean we talked a lot about lack of space, or sometimes it's just physical access to a building could be an impediment, and it doesn't necessarily fit in these three, but I don't have a lot to add about it. It could be there.

MS. SEARS: You could fit it in limited resources, I would think. Because a lot of times the physical facilities are smaller because there are limited resources to rebuild or expand.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Maybe putting a specific example addressing that in that second category.

MR. WIGGIN: It could be resources.

Ken Wiggin again. It could be resourcesbased, but we've got some libraries that are
facing they're a historic building. Nobody
wants to touch them. I mean it's not
necessarily just a lack of money. So I mean
physical facilities is somewhat separate.

MS. SEARS: We could certainly add a few.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay, if there are no more comments either from council or the audience, then we'll plunge into the scenarios. These are not in your booklet, I don't -- are they?

MS. SEARS: They're at the top pages before the assumptions.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is one page 2 of your booklet.

MS. SEARS: Okay, scenario one: A student is dropped off at an FDL to do research for a school project. The library has a policy that prohibits unaccompanied minors from using library resources.

This information is posted on library web pages, and at the entrance to the library. The library's FDLP web page states clearly that all government resources are freely available to researchers. No age limitation is mentioned.

So these are the questions that we have for council and for the audience. We would certainly invite audience participation because we want to hear your input, as well as

perhaps actual examples that you've had to face in this.

Is there an access issue in this scenario? Does it make a difference what the age limitation is? What are the service requirements the library must meet under the FDLP for this underage depository patron? If the library has a history of problems with unaccompanied minors, is this policy the best overall solution for potential problem patrons?

What other solutions can be found besides referring the underage patron to another FDL that may not have this policy in place?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay, reactions from council? Ken?

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I guess in some cases, like in our state, it's not just a policy issue, it's a state law. Under 12 it is illegal to leave a child unattended in a public facility. So I don't know how state law and federal law in this case bump heads,

but just a consideration.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Any members of the audience?

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake Forest Law. My selective depository was designated under the 1978 law, specifically allowing law libraries to be depositories. We are a private institution. We do open our library to the public.

We have not yet put a written policy in place about children, but it's becoming a problem for us. And our library is primarily for people doing legal research. Not many grade school children are who actually coming to my depository to do legal research.

So we need some guidelines, and because we're a depository where anybody for any time for any reason, or our overarching purpose for being, and the law that designates us recognizes us as a specific type of library.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois at Chicago. I would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

make the observation that all of us are of certain types of libraries, whether we be academic, special or public, and that is often cojoined to our depository responsibilities. So we all face equal guided dilemma.

In institution, we focus specifically on our community, i.e., students, faculty and staff. And so very similar to that, even though the law may not specifically have designated us as an academic library, I think the historical roots of the law consider libraries of all types be public, "institutions" of а kind that best. was delivery associated with the of the traditional documents.

So in last century, many of the depositories were actually private institutions, rather than public institutions, and I think that is just an historical fact, rather than a destiny, if you will. But the burden of providing the service for government information remains regardless of the institutional affiliation, one could argue.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Any other reaction?

1 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, 2 University of North Texas. Ken, just for a point of clarification, since it's a state 3 4 law, what do you do? I mean do you -- if a 12-year-old -- say a 10-year-old comes to your 5 6 library for anything, depository or not, 7 mean do you just turn them away, or is that something that's posted? 8 WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, 9 MR. 10 Connecticut State Library. Ιf they come unaccompanied, the library can call parents. 11 I mean we don't have much of that at the state 12 13 library, but a lot of public libraries have posted policies and do have an issue with 14 15 parents who drop kids off. of 16 Some selected ours are depositories, so it can be an issue. I don't 17 18 know of any particular cases. I'm 19 bringing up the fact that it's not just a library imposed policy in our state. 20 state law. 21 22 MS. SEARS: Is it posted? MR. WIGGIN: Most all libraries --23

MS. SEARS: All the public

libraries on their website and --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CISMOWSKI: Ann Marie?

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I'm just kind of surprised by the whole thing. Of course there's an access issue. But I would say what I tell public libraries in my state - we don't have a law, at least not in place of it that meets Connecticut's - but we have internet access laws that affect minors.

But library's in any case, а responsibility is construct to behavior policy, and a patron access policy that focuses on the behaviors they wish to prohibit, not on the group of people most likely to exhibit them. And we say that over and over again to public libraries throughout our state on a regular basis.

And so if the problem is as indicated in one of the bullet points about having a history of problems, that's really simple. We should simple focus on what's acceptable behavior and what's not. You don't fool with the age group who is most likely to

be a problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It would be the same thing as blaming the homeless or non-citizens or anything else. I mean you wouldn't even have the discussion. And the fact that it might be a child doesn't, to me, make the situation any different.

MS. TROTTA: David, I have a comment.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes?

Victoria MS. TROTTA: Trotta, State University Law School. Arizona aspect that hasn't been mentioned at all is the personal safety of minors, and one of the reasons there are these laws is because public libraries are sometimes used as dumping grounds for minors, and they are at risk for -- they're a personal safety risk.

And is it the responsibility of librarians to ensure the personal safety of the children? And so it seems to me it's a burden if that's why the law has been put in place, or that's why the policy -- that that needs to be respected. Librarians do not have

capability of ensuring the personal safety of minors that come into their public building.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, the University of Hawaii. I was thinking that, the very same thought that Tori just gave voice to; that the reason we have a policy in our library is not because of behavior problems of minors. It's because of behavior problems of people preying on minors.

But then I also thought, "Well, we don't even guarantee the safety of people who are not minors, or staff members or anybody. We have problems with all kinds of people who are in our buildings, not just the patrons."

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. I would really
like to hear from council and the audience
some options to this, because it is
definitely, as we can tell from the discussion
so for it is definitely a problem.

It's something that we're facing, and as Ann Marie said, it is an access issue definitely. And so what are our options?

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of Michigan. We've actually had interesting situations with depository libraries in our state. We've had depository library who very unfortunately child being molested experienced a building. We also experienced a library who used internet sign up sheets because they wanted to protect themselves against state's internet -- children's access appropriate internet sites. And a stalker actually used the internet sign up sheets to target and choose a child.

Okay, so here they were using these internet sign up sheets to try to keep kids safe, and all they did was enable someone to choose a specific child. We can't, as institutions, as Gwen says, be responsible for the safety of anybody who walks into our buildings, and to limit access to an entire group of people based on their age is just killing a fly with an elephant gun. It's not the approach to take here.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre

the they are outsiders type thing. Some questions -- well, I'll say the same thing I said back here. When I worked the polls, the democratic person said, "You're not there to be a barrier to people voting."

That's how I think this has to be looked at. Okay, you've got this one. Number one, are you carding everyone who walked in, or are you selectively deciding you're under age; I'm going to ask. The next one will not be.

And then all right, what are you offering as an alternative? It would appear you're underage. Now, how can we facilitate your use of what you want to do? Do you offer to call the parent and have -- they have to come in and sit there while they use this? Again, I think it's -- we don't establish a rule without going, and here's how we're going to facilitate your use. "You're underage We can't let you in alone."

"We check everyone who walks through the door to make sure they're not underage, and yes, we're here to facilitate

you. What can we do? How can we do this?"

Not simply, "Sorry, you're underage. Bye."

It's that comparability again, I think, that

we have to always go back to.

Do you write something in that says, "You will do this?" Or what alternatives have you already devised that will facilitate this individual using the depository material in your care?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Any other comments?

Let's go to the second scenario.

MS. SEARS: Scenario number 2:
Computers in the library and across campus
have a security and priority statement posted
that clearly states, "Computers are for the
use of faculty, students and staff at the
educational institution." The depository
coordinator has one computer workstation in
the government documents area, but it also has
this label.

Is the library inhibiting access when signage such as this is placed on computers? What signage should be changed, if any? And does the library have support for

disparate treatment library changes at the campus administrative level?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CISMOWSKI: Council reaction?

Justin?

OTTO: Justin Otto, MR. Eastern Washington University. I think that it's -if there's a campus policy with regard to computers, let's say most of them are password protected and designated for like faculty and students only, that's fine. But if a library is going to take on being a depository library, they have to have at least a couple of designated machines that do not have any kind of access limitations on them.

I mean that just seems to me as -
I have no problem with a library having like

180 computers, and two or three of them are

not locked down. There just needs to be

something reasonable that meets the general -
I think that meets the general traffic. Like

if -- if a library gets a few people a day who

are really there to use the library as a

depository library, then maybe one terminal or

two is appropriate.

I think that's sort of a -- it has to be up to the institution to decide, but if you have a lot of traffic, maybe you need more. But I don't think that -- I think that -- I think that -- I think that signage that sort of discourages access like that, I don't think that's appropriate.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. We've certainly had this issue come up when we had -- when an inspector visited our library, although we were not being inspected.

We had a policy that stated that our computers were for the use of the faculty, students and staff, and all others were limited to one hour per day. So all we had to do is make a little exception in the policy that said, "Except people who are using federal government information under the Federal Depository Library Program."

Similarly, on our public computers, we just have a sign that says, "Priority for people who are using federal government information." And I don't even know that the

larger institutions' computer people even have
to be involved if you make a decision to put a
sign on a computer that says, "Priority," or
"For the use of Federal Depository Library
Program." If you don't tell them, maybe they
won't ever find out.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. There's a policy
of, "It's better to ask for forgiveness than
permission."

MR. CISMOWSKI: Any members of the audience care to weigh in on this? Kathy?

MS. BRAZEE: Hi, Kathy Brazee, GPO. Is this on? Can you hear me? I'm a former academic librarian, and I don't want to pick on academic libraries specifically. This case can actually fly to any type of library.

There are public libraries. For example, there's one other type of library that has signs up saying, "Computers are for the use of the residents of this city only." So I just wanted to mention this isn't exclusively an academic library problem.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I'd like to point

out that one of the -- I read a newspaper article just in the last week or two about a public library somewhere that was giving free access to their computers for city residents only, but anybody outside of the city had to pay a fee.

Would this -- I mean what -- if this were a blanket policy that applied to the library as a whole and that library was a depository library, would that be -- would the fact of charging a fee violate the access principles of this program?

MS. SITTEL: Robbie Sittel, Tulsa City-County Library. We actually charge a \$50 non-resident fee for people that want to use our materials. And the only thing that they essentially pay access for are the things that the library pays access for.

So they would still -- anybody that entered our library website or our library catalog would have access to our Federal Depository materials anyway, and we also choose to log people in as guests if they want to use our materials.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. TROTTA: David, Tori Trotta, Arizona State Law. I think that in general, that signs are a barrier, no matter what they say because there are people, if they're kids or minors or just people that don't -- aren't residents or whatever their limitation is according to the sign, about some percentage of those people who ignore the sign do what But it will be a barrier to a they want. large percentage or a percentage, and also some people just don't know to ask.

So it's always a barrier. The question is what's a reasonable way to run your library? And as I recall, one of the principles was you had to treat everybody the same. If you had a limitation, it had to be equally applied.

So to me, I'm in a university library -- I'm in a university that has 66,000 people that go to it, and I have a president who says he doesn't believe the university libraries are public places.

Really, I mean there are a lot of barriers that are imposed upon people, and we

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. In a previous life when I worked in a regional

spend a lot of time just doing what we want because we understand the principle of access.

But any kind of sign is a barrier to somebody. It's just a matter of degree. So I lost my thought, so I'll just stop talking.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Denise?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso State Law Library. I mean I'm with Denise. When the administration puts up signs then I just have my own little thing I paste on the bottom of that, except for users of Federal Depository information or government information.

Usually nobody ever notices, but I put that on there. But I mean I also agree with Tori that the sign in general people just see. "Oh, there's some limitation on this machine." But I can't take down the signs because they would notice that. But I just try to make sure that if they -- anybody that really reads it closely would see it was okay, so.

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

depository that will go nameless, but those of you who know me know exactly what I'm talking about, this was a huge argument in the mid-`90s when there were -- we used to have CD ROM farms in our depository collection, and the balance of very expensive and new databases that were available to the students limiting access to that campus population, and the argument always about taxpayer was dollars.

And at the end of the day, anybody who walked in that building was a taxpayer, and that was always the push back. Everyone who walks in here is a taxpayer. If that child is ten years old, someone in that child's family is a taxpayer. And use that as you will, but at the end of the day everybody pays some kind of tax.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay, let's go onto the next one.

MS. SEARS: Won't be real long.

Number 3: Two FDLs are located in the same

area. Both have tangible collections and

internet access. A patron walks into one

library academic institution, and during the reference interview, it is determined the patron does not attend that institution.

The patron is then referred to the neighboring public depository library for reference assistance.

So we ask for your comments on do both libraries have the responsibility for serving the non-primary library user? Does this procedure uphold the spirit of the FDLP? Is the referral to a neighboring public FDL an appropriate response?

What if the material needed is only held at the academic library, and the patron is then referred back to the first institution? And does this referral procedure limit access?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Council?

MR. SHULER: I think out of the -John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago.

I think out of the three we've seen so far,
this one is the clearest in my mind; that the
referring institution clearly violated the
requirements and the spirit of the depository

library system pure and simple.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I don't think -- if there was a court of department library peers, I don't think they would have a leg to stand on. It's simply -- having seen this myself in person, there's no excuse for it quite simply. There's no reason why it should happen, and I can't think of a situation that would excuse it.

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, Francisco Public. Actually, this does happen in the real world, and one of the reasons I know it does happen is the cost of photocopies. Different institutions have different costs for things, and if the public library happens to be cheaper, and academic library knows that they could refer somebody there to get a cheaper photocopy of something.

The other -- and I just want to say also public libraries refer people to academic, like the county law library. We do not have the laws of the other states, or complete sets of US Laws. So we sometimes

MR. CISMOWSKI:

clear cut as you can get.

Katrina, did you

definitely have to refer people to academic libraries. So they need to also be aware that our -- our collections don't always cover, and we do get some push back. "Why did you send somebody over there for that?"

So it's both ways is what I'm saying, and there is some good reasons to refer people back and forth, but the -- trying to help them to get started I think is -- if everybody starts to get somebody going, and then perhaps refers them because there's more room to work someplace else, or there's special study rooms, or there's some physical things.

MR. SHULER: The way this question

-- John Shuler, University of Illinois at

Chicago. The way this question was written,

they didn't even get to, "Can I help you?"

They were simply determined to be a non-entity

and refer to where they believed they belong.

So there was no issue of photocopying.

So as stated, I think this is as

1	have a comment?
2	MS. STIERHOLZ: I was just going to
3	answer. Yes, no, no.
4	MR. CISMOWSKI: Go ahead and
5	finish.
6	MS. STIERHOLZ: Angry patron and
7	an angry librarian at the public library who
8	has to then refer them back to the academic,
9	and is then getting yelled at by the angry
10	patron.
11	MS. LINDEN: Julie Linden, Yale
12	University. Can you go two slides back to the
13	scenario, please?
14	MS. SEARS: I'll try.
15	MS. LINDEN: Okay, so the question
16	I have is there's nothing in this scenario
17	that says that during the reference interview
18	it is determined that what the patron needs to
19	fulfill their research needs is government
20	information, or government documents.
21	So this is written really broadly.
22	So is this saying that FDL's are responsible
23	for handling any reference query that comes

through the door whether or not it involves

government information?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CISMOWSKI: I think that the people who wrote this question interpreted it exactly as John interpreted it, which means that the reference interview never even really took place. What happened was that the librarian or whoever referred this person to the public library simply found out that this person did not attend that institution, end of interview.

MS. LINDEN: I guess I don't read it as clear cut as that. It does say, "During the reference interview." I would suggest that maybe it could be word smithed a little to make it clearer when government information is involved. Thanks.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears from the University of North Texas. The purpose of the scenarios is to generate this kind of exactly what discussion to see are Is this an issue that needs to be addressed about what -- how much are you responsible for and this is exactly what we hoping back to get out of these scenarios.

David and I certainly did not write these saying, "Yes, this is an access issue."

We wrote them to kind of spur you to get up and talk about what it is that you're facing.

So I do think that this is an issue. I personally would like to hear comments from counsel and the audience on -- and I'm sorry, I used your name, but we -- this is an issue that does happen, especially in the law libraries.

And as Marian said earlier about she's a legal reference, so if somebody comes in and asks for some other kind of reference, what it her responsibility? And if they come into the depository desk, and they're asking for something that's not government information, where is -- where is that line drawn? I would like to hear discussion on that.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair,
University of Hawaii. Two things occurred to
me when I -- when we were discussing this.
One is does this library ask people their

affiliation when they call on the telephone?

Does it ascertain their affiliation when they email from a gmail account? Are they only doing this to people who don't look like they're at the university? You know, they don't have the right appearance.

And I had another thought, but it escaped me, so I'll think about it.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valparaiso University Law Library. Our
experience in our library in a small town is
that we're always the last -- we're at the end
of a referral. People don't come into our
library looking for other stuff. They come
because they've already been to five other
places. And I feel so sorry for them because
nobody has called to see if we have the stuff,
whether it's government information or some
form they think exists in Indiana.

We always bend over backwards to try to make sure that they don't go away that day. I mean people don't come to libraries that much. Some people, this is like a once in a lifetime thing for them, and if they have

a really horrible experience, it takes -- they have to get themselves up and ready and calm.

You know, I always feel like I want to give them something. And I would call other places if I were sending them, and nobody seems to call us. But when they come and want to do some ridiculous legal thing that they can't do, we at least try to take them seriously and give them something. "Here is a nice brochure," whatever.

But -- so I know it's different in different places, and maybe in your library, Marian, you're getting the opposite. You're in a bigger school and everything. But it is a -- it is a problem.

MS. SEARS: He would like you to go to the mic.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I finally remembered what I was going to say, which is you don't always know that the person needs government information until you get will into the process of -- you know you can do an initial reference interview, and sometimes

patrons are not always that forthcoming in telling you exactly what they want. They are kind of vague sometimes, aren't they?

So I think if you are hoping that in talking to them for two minutes to determine whether or not they need government information, you're expecting too much out of the initial reference interview.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Steve?

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I love these answers, these questions. If the purpose of the reference interview is to find a reason not to serve you, and because if you're not a foundation, it's not a legal research question or it's not something that an academic, "I could do public library stuff," it's not right.

I mean as Susan and I are back here, we walk into the law library and they say, "I want genealogy." And you say, "Well, let me look at the government information and see what I have that might help you with genealogy. Oh, nothing. Maybe Notre Dame Library will have something more for you."

MS. SAURS: Laura Saurs, New York

Come to me, and it's like, "Oh, I've looked. No, nothing. The public library probably has something a little bit better, or else I would help you now. Genealogy is kind of limited in government. Here's what I could recommend." And do the referral that says, "There are some better sources out there. Let me call and see if someone knows. Here's a pamphlet that says -- you know, here's some others that might do this."

But again, if the sole purpose of the interview is to figure out how I can not serve you, that's not the spirit of the Depository Library Program, let along librarianship.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Jacqueline Fitzpatrick from Wellesley College, and I'd just like to back up my colleague from Notre Dame. We get asked questions, questions by phone, and public libraries refer patrons in the Metro West area to us, and we answer and help any of them, whether it be reference questions or government documents questions.

Public Library in New Jersey. I think in the 1 2 scenario that we had there both of the libraries are sort of -- even if you assume 3 specifically 4 that the person came government information, both of the libraries 5 are falling down on the job a bit because they 6 should be cooperating with each other, and 7 each know what the other one has so that they 8 can make appropriate referrals. 9 10 The public library should also be cooperating with the academic library and know 11 what they have, and vice versa. 12 13 MR. CISMOWSKI: Spoken like a true regional libraries. 14 15 MS. SAURS: Ιf they're not 16 cooperating, I believe there is something in the old instructions about that; that you're 17 supposed to cooperate. 18 19 MR. SHULER: It's also in the new instructions. 20 CISMOWSKI: Anymore comments? 21 Let's go to number 4 then. 22

MS. SEARS: Number 4: A problem patron returns to a library. The patron has

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

been acting in a manner in which staff concerned for the safety of the library users, and the materials in the collection. The library staff asked the patron to leave, and the patron complies. However, the patron then alleges a complaint with GPO against the library, claiming the library is not fulfilling its obligations to provide public access.

Has the patron been denied access?

Does the library have an access policy? Does the library have a user behavior or patron conduct policy? If not, is one needed? What steps do you think the library and GPO should take under these circumstances?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Council? John?

MR. John SHULER: Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. the two middle points about policy are central to this, and if we go back to the idea of being fair, then handed in even don't think applications, and I bad criminal behavior is excused under GPO rules.

And I believe that it is in the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

interest of the institution to ensure the safety of its individuals that work and use the institution. And unless folks from GPO want to correct me, I don't think the depository library provides an umbrella of protection for that kind of behavior unless I'm wrong.

Ken Wiggin MR. WIGGIN: I agree with John. Connecticut. I mean we're running into more and more situations where there are people that are actually legally barred from some libraries for having a well, we have а situation now where individuals who are on sex offender lists are banned in some of our communities from going to public libraries, and you can argue that back and forth.

But if that's the current policy,
I'd hate to think they could start going to
GPO and saying, "I'm being denied access to
that library. And then I need to get in there
so I can see government documents." I can
just see it as becoming a noose to get around
legitimate cases of people being denied access

to a library, and I would hope that GPO would defer to the situation in that particular library that they know the situation.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Robin, go ahead, please.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Exactly, Ken, that is the case. We do take the complaints seriously. We investigate. We talk with the depository coordinator. We talk with the director if available. Believe it or not, we Google them. You'd be surprised how many of these folks you can find out there.

At that point, we've got a discussion going from the complainant. We've talked with coordinator. If necessary, it goes up to our general counsel and it's out of our hands. The letter goes back to the person that's making the complaint. "We thank you for your comment. We do not find that the library is denying you access. There are other opportunities here. They've taken the steps necessary."

It's all put very nicely and

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

documented in the library's file. We never take a complaint and just assume that it's valid, but we do investigate every complaint, and you'll know about it when it happens.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Tori?

Tori Trotta, Arizona MS. TROTTA: State Law. I think it is probably a best practice to have a behavior policy and to be sure that you do keep a file if you have any kind of problem patrons for this eventuality they're -- well, while everybody that remembers the circumstances, that's a matter of training in our place that if they do have a run in with a patron, or we do have to call the police or whatever the circumstance is, then voluntarily we do have an incident report that we file so that we can remember if we do get a call later on from somebody.

Sometimes the patron will be wearing several guns, for example, and we'll ask him to leave. DPS came, and then he did call the president's office to complain. So fortunately, we had a file that we could refer to to explain what the circumstances were, and

there was a police report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I think it's a best practice to have some kind of behavior policy available for people so that you can have a process for that circumstance.

MR. CISMOWSKI: John?

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I think this speaks to the complexity of our current library life, and when we talk about the other managing collections aspects of our separate institutions within our institutions are merged, it is no longer as easy to depository life from other separate out a existences in the building, or the management of the building. And I think it's -- again, it supports the idea that the more council and GPO can support depositories to integrate the depository system's responsibilities these kinds of general overall policies the better off we're going to be in looking at these situations, and the less change being a depository can be used as an excuse for something other than giving information to the people, which these next two points bring up.

And I think again it's just one more reminder we need to start to integrate as quickly as possible.

CHAIR BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department of Energy. The previous institution, a number of years ago, I had a case where a law student was banned from the law library for stalking another student, and he then came to my library to use depository material to research Title 44 to see what the public access law was. And even though I tried to explain to him that it really didn't apply in his case, he seemed to think he was going to take this into court.

And I then called the law library and told him to expect this, which gave him the opportunity to contact GPO and the general counsel to then work with him to supply the documentation to take into court that said that in this case it was permissible to bar him from the library.

So despite all that, he still won his case, and they had to -- the university

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CISMOWSKI: Before asking for Ι want to point out that

had to pay his tuition to any law school in the country that he wanted to go to.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Any members of the audience real quickly? We do need to move on, but if somebody has a burning point that they want to make on this -- okay, let's go to the next.

SEARS: Let's go to the next because it's very similar to 4, and we only have 15 minutes left. So number 6: A library is open seven days a week with extended hours of Saturday and Sunday evenings for students. The library has posted hours that do include late night hours, which are for students, faculty and staff only.

non-primary patrons being Are denied access because they cannot use the library during the late night hours? library is only open Monday through Friday to 5:00, what are the options patron that cannot visit the library during those hours?

particular problem appears on GovDoc-L has a question probably every six months like clockwork. This is a real life problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Council?

Ken?

just going to MR. WIGGIN: I was say Ι would like to hear from academic libraries where I know we have more and more now that you have to have keycard access to get into the library after certain hours, and how are they dealing with that?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Ann Marie?

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I would say that I would -- my library is only open limited hours because we're a state institution with a rapidly dwindling budget. I would try to serve this patron the same why I would try to serve somebody who had been banned, by mail if possible.

I would look for a work around. I would first want to know what it was they wanted. And if it was inappropriate, I would try to serve them in another way. It's not like we don't do that anyway with email

references as it is. So that would be my first option, and outside of that, I would probably offer to make a loan to them of something that could be loaned to their public library for use in their public library if I possibly could.

I think the number of circumstances in which you absolutely can't help somebody in some way are pretty small.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Anybody else?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I would just like to say like Ann Marie did if your institution is Monday through Friday 8:00 to 5:00, well, then that's -- you are offering those hours to everybody equitably that they -- that -- the concern is a library is only going to serve the general public from 8:00 to 5:00 Monday through Friday, but they are allowing access to the rest of their collection after hours for people who are their primary users.

MS. SANDERS: There's a concept called an appointment. I mean there really aren't that many situations in which a work

around can't be found.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CISMOWSKI: Ken?

MR. WIGGIN: Wiggin, Ken Connecticut State Library. I quess I'm of a couple minds on this. I'm still open for thoughts on it, but I've always felt that if you discriminate but discriminate equally, it's okay. I mean ALA has a lot of policies that allow you to deny as long as you do it to everyone. And if in fact and understand this.

I have kids in college. I mean the security issue is real. I think work arounds are a nice idea and we ought to think about that, but getting into an academic library at 1:00 in the morning, and you're not letting any member of the public that doesn't have keycard access in; is that really denying that person access? I'm open to thoughts on this.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Steve?

MR. HAYES: Two points. Depository status doesn't mean you have to give up common sense. Everyone has -- a significant number of people have a key to the library. Does

that mean I have to hand out a key to someone else who is not? And then a certain person sitting in the front in the white scarf always told me, "It has to be comparable. It doesn't have to be identical." Comparable.

And then I agree with -- with the State Library of Michigan. I have an executive MBA program who are not on campus. I try and feel how I can accommodate their needs. I may or may not be successful at doing such, but I attempt to accommodate their needs.

If 8:00 to 5:00 doesn't work, maybe I can try and accommodate you or some other work around that does that, but again, number one, no. I mean it's not identical. We'll do the best we can if you've got a real good reason to be at the late night hours. Again, I'll try and accommodate you. Second one, in terms of, "I'll try to accommodate you again."

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. Just a point of
clarification here. I think the way I was
looking at the question is an example of a

library in the State of Texas. They're a private university. They are open 24/7 for their students, but for the public, they are open until like 8:00 or 9:00 at night Monday through Friday, a couple hours on Saturday, a couple hours on Sunday.

So they are offering access to the public other than just 8:00 to 5:00, but they're not compromising the security of their students, or having to have the public in 24/7.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Please.

MS. BOSMAN: Renee Bosman, Virginia Commonwealth University. My point that I wanted to make was very similar: that I think a lot of academic institutions that do have card access; that it does start much later than 5:00. Ours starts at 10:00 p.m. So that certainly gives the public many hours after business hours where they could come after work and receive help before we shut down to affiliates only.

And I do think that may libraries that have that start at 9:00, 10:00 or

midnight, and it's much later than 5:00.

and the staff to provide service.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Thank you. Denise?

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.

Point of clarification for the people in the audience who have 24 hour availability in their library, are -- how many of you work at 3:00 in the morning? One, one person. I mean I interpreted this as late night study. I did not interpret this as access to the collection

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Carmen Orth-Alfie,
University of Kansas. I think maybe one of
the considerations is that in some campuses,
the extended hours are paid by tuition fees;
that the students voted to add enhancements.
And so I -- their money isn't going to help
the general public. It's to help them have
access to the library, not necessarily the
staff with reference, but to the facility for
study hours. And so I personally don't have a
problem with the general public not coming in
in the middle of the night.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay, and let's go to the next scenario.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

_

22

23

24

MS. SEARS: The last scenario is scenario 7: Publications are generally shelved in closed stacks or non-browseable compact shelving, including depository resources. The library has cataloged some older depository publications. The government documents' shelf list is not available in a public area.

Essentially, many depository materials are invisible to staff and to the public because of their shelving situation. denied when material is Is access not cataloged, and physical volumes are located in shelving that is not conducive to browsing? What other resources can staff use to assist in identifying federal material to patrons meet the patrons information needs?

What is the responsible balance between protecting the collection via closed stacks and providing access? What is the responsible balance between space limitation and providing access?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Council?

MS. SEARS: No. As for a comparability issue when all publications and

closed stacks or remote storage are cataloged except for depository publications, yet it access affected if a card catalog or shelf list in the depository publications are all housed in a non-public area so that library users are not able to access both the finding tool and the collection. What are the expectations of the public today to gain access to library resources?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CISMOWSKI: Now, council?

John?

MR. John Shuler, SHULER: University of Illinois at Chicago. Is this a trick question? It seems to me that there is resounding failure all the way around under current guidelines in managing and providing access to the depository library collections, but from any excuse that might lead one to believe that they're doing this responsible reasons.

So if I understand what a systemic failure for a depository library would be, it would be unorganized, uncataloged, unaccessible collections. I don't see where

that fits any kind of definition of being an adequate depository, regardless of the excuses that they might give for that being so.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Anymore reaction from council? The audience?

MS. SOLOMON: Judith Solomon, Seattle Public Library. Question for Robin. Robin, 20 years ago, would you have put this question up there? Because that's exactly what we had, I believe.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Judy, you know I love seeing you. To some degree, I don't think it would've hit this area because not all of it would've been as invisible. The shelf list 20 years ago was still a viable and active product used by librarians, but also by the public to some degree.

This is a real situation, and not in just one library and not in yours, okay? Let me make that clear. I wasn't picking on you with this one, Judy. But it is a real situation in a couple institutions that we visited, and it does seem to have been magnified because of the shelf list problem,

or the book catalog problem that the materials were putting into book catalogs, and those have since found their ways under and to the bottom of whatever dark room there seems to be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

knew And the folks that the collections years ago have retired, so essentially you have а collection uncataloged materials that no one can get to; no one knows about, and yet when you visit, you say, "Well, how does someone find this material?"

The response is, well, if we can bring them back here, we can escort them back here and they can walk through -- if we can find a staff member who remembers that -- well, and fill in the blanks there.

So 20 years ago, I don't think we would've seen it to this extent. To some degree, but not to this extent. The shelf list or the book catalog or something, or someone's older memory would still be available, and there are some places today where that is not happening.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And I personally can speak to the experience of a couple of my selectives who I visited them, and their collections were in closed stacks, and they had varying degrees of access to them by a shelf list or whatever means, and both of them said to me, "Isn't it an obligation to keep this material safe; to keep this away from people who might steal it because it's US Government property?"

I don't know who was first. Ann Marie?

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I'll share with you a similar sort of story. I have para-selective libraries who were in a situation where they had a joint catalog, and one of which was a major metropolitan library. This is in the past.

One was a major metropolitan library, had a large collection that was in closed stacks in the basement. The other library that was also sharing the catalog was a much smaller institution, but they had an

old and rich collection. They had a project in which they cataloged everything they could possibly get their hands on to catalog, and it was very successful.

The end result was that the patrons of the major metropolitan library would stand at the catalog and request from the small public library 50 miles away that which was underneath their feet in the basement.

Now, that situation has since been resolved, but that's a -- that's a classic example of the same problem. Now, does the Library of Michigan have 100 percent of its depository holdings cataloged? No, we don't, but we do work on it. We work on it steadily.

We work on it as a concentrated effort, and I think there's a sliding scale here of, "Are you admitting that you have this problem and you're willing to work on it, or are you just going to keep the door closed on closes stacks and see how long you can ride it out?"

MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis, Southern
Illinois University Carbondale. Robin, I'm

glad you clarified the fact that all of their book catalogs were not accessible because as I was reading this, I thought, "I don't see the problem because if their their available, catalogs still it doesn't are matter whether the patron can get to the shelf list or not."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now that you've explained that, my question to you is why is that library still in the program?

MR. CISMOWSKI: I take it Robin is not going to go there.

MR. WOODS: I just wanted to say a couple of things about -- Steve Woods, Penn State. About -- I just want to play sort of the devil's advocate about the positive elements of closed stacks.

I'd say that for me as a reference librarian, probably the hardest questions that I'm getting related to government publications are those pre-`76 documents. And let's just face it: we spent a lot of time with a system of cataloging -- cataloging, not like our online catalogs, but we did the best that we

could.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A lot of my research in assisting a patron is finding those things, discovering those things, and it's part of what makes me a GovDocs librarian. It's part of what the --part of the expertise that I bring to my profession and my job.

So I would say that in terms of losing the history, I spent -- when I come into a new institution, I spend that learning that history, and that's part of my job as a documents librarian to understand where my collections are, whether it's in a storage area, whether it's in the basement, or where my collection is. Because the fact of the matter is your government documents collection is always in a different place. Just because it has a different classification system, it's organized in a different way.

would So Ι quess I say the advantage of the closed stacks is you don't have patrons going in there and misshelving things, and you can retrieve them quicker, okay? Not saying you do want your patrons to go back into the stacks, but I'm just saying if you're thinking that you're going to completely get away from the hunt, because we do that as docs librarians. We hunt down those elusive documents.

Somebody comes up -- I mean we're sitting back here early in the morning, and somebody had given us a citation for a series, and we're just doing our homework. We're thinking about how to look for that. And I can tell you a patron going back and walking through the GovDocs stacks; they're not going to find it. Let's be realistic.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Thank you very much. It's 5:00, and I want to thank -- on behalf of Suzanne and Robin, I want to thank you all, council too, for your insightful comments on this. I think it's been a very productive session. Thank you.

MS. SEARS: Tim has an announcement if you wait just one moment.

CHAIR BYRNE: We do plan to, in the next session 5:00 to 6:00, discuss the FDLP -- future of the FDLP strategic plan. I think we

want to go ahead and take about a five-minute break now, and then we'll come back and get started.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:02 p.m., and resumed at 5:17 p.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: Okay, we're getting ready to go now. We are continuing the discussion of the presentation yesterday on the future of the FDLP and the strategic plan. So I think we'll first start off with Cindy, and let her come up and give some background again.

MS. Welcome to dinner. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Actually, I'm very delighted that we had this session tonight because we did get into some very good discussions yesterday and I'm glad that council is engaged in this, and sees the value of the publication, the strategic plan that we're trying to put together, and to have additional discussions since we didn't get through everything that we had hoped yesterday.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So thank you all who are here to participate again in some discussion, though unscheduled. I appreciate that very much.

Okay, what did you want me to do?

This all began in the fall of 2007 council meeting when there was а recommendation that in the spring meeting of the Depository Library Council that we will have -- that GPO will have worked with council to start the strategic planning process, and I was working with at the time two council liaisons, Tim and Denise Stephens. I'm working with Gwen Sinclair and Sally Holterhoff with this new council.

But what we did in Kansas City was to come up with some assumptions. Some of them were new. Some of them had been in previous documents that GPO had put out. Actually, I think we looked at documents as far back as the green 1996 study.

Some of you in the audience still remember that. It was the one where Congress asked us to identify the necessary requirements to move to a primarily electronic

Federal Depository Library Program in accordance with house appropriations something, something, something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We call it the green study, and a number of folks in the depository community and depository library council were very involved in putting that report together, and there were some assumptions in there.

Some of those we reviewed, found to be still valid today. So they were included. That's where the principles of government information came from. Although there have been many organizations that have had similar principles, conceptually the same -- the exact text may be different.

American Library Association, Commission National Library Information on Science, AALL has their government relations policy which covers some of the same things. So that's where the principles of government information from. of came Some the assumptions came from there. Some of the assumptions came from a strategic plan was done shortly after the green study, and

some of them were new from the brainstorming Tim and Denise I had done and telephone calls, well of the as some as discussions that we had been hearing depository library council meetings.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So we've been keeping our ears open and listening to comments, and -- and bringing in information from a lot of different sources, a lot of different people, a lot of different documentation that's already out there.

There have been a lot of papers written over the years about restructuring for the online environment. Some of those ideas that were put forth 15 years or so ago.

Some of them are still good ideas today and still valid, but we have of course emerging technologies since then, new and innovative ways to do things so we're looking forward to some more recent things as well.

So at the spring meeting, we looked a vision mission, the assumptions and we began the SWOT analysis, the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the Federal

Depository Library Program.

I've also been doing a lot of reading, which will go into part of an environmental scan. I don't think I mentioned that yesterday, but that's being done as well.

We put up a strategic planning page on the FDLP desktop, put some things together look including for people to at the transcripts from the Kansas City meeting, and links to some related documentation, including the more recent strategic vision of -- for the Government Printing Office: Strategic Vision for the 21st Century, which was issued by GPO in December of 2004, and depository library council document knowledge will forever govern, which came out a couple years later. September 8? No, six. Time is flying. September 2006.

So we've looked at those most recent documents as well, and getting the direction and guidance primarily from those more recent documents, and from comments that we heard in Kansas City.

We've also had Ric Davis send out a

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

letter to depository library directors, where
he asked for input on what they perceived the
value of depository library designation to
them locally, and I'm not exactly sure how

5 many responses Ric got, but there were quite a

6 number.

Nancy Faget is keeping a notebook full, and it's a pretty good size. So we've perused through those, gotten ideas from that.

One of the places where we took the values from we have yet to write the value proposition. That'll be part of this as well. So we've done that.

In conjunction with the regional report that we had to do for the Joint Committee on Printing, we looked at biannual survey data. We looked at a survey that was done, a very quick survey, to find some information that was not available in the biannual survey. Excuse me.

So we got some statistical data back on some issues about conditions and the future of regionals, and many, many directors made comments. And the comments proved to be

very, very valuable as well as the data that
we got from the actual survey tool.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So those comments have been taken into consideration well in this as whole strategic planning process, even though it was done for that other report. We got a good feel for how regional directors are looking at things, and the conditions and the future prospects of what's going in regional on libraries.

And so we put together this slide deck for yesterday, and the goals -- the -- I don't want to say one, two, three, four. The bullets, the four bullets as the main goals.

There also different were strategies later in the deck that we didn't totally finish going through, which in retrospect perhaps we should've looked at in conjunction with the goal because that would've probably answered some questions that came up about interpretation or what have you.

And so tonight, we are going to talk about the goals again, or what -- okay. So what do we want up on the screen? Do we

want the goals, or?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. SINCLAIR: I think what we left off yesterday was in the -- in the session was that people thought that the last bullet point was the one and only goal and that the other three were actually strategies. But I -- just before we sat down this evening, I was just looking at the vision and mission once again, this slide right here, "Mission and achieved through." Ιf you look at that's where those four bullet point goals came from.

And then in our discussion between 5:00 and 6:00 last night, we were kind of going in all sorts of different directions. So I was hoping that we could kind of go back to this, or back to the vision and mission, and once again remind ourselves of where those four bullet point goals were actually derived, and move on from there.

Because we just seem -- last night in our discussion, we just seemed to be questioning the whole thing, and I'm not sure that's what we really want to do.

We already went through a process in Kansas City to move to the point where we've reached now, and I don't know if we want to start over again and -- but in some ways, it sounded like some people really did want to start over again. So I guess I'd like to know from council whether -- whether we can move forward from what's already been formulated by GPO, or are we going to throw it all away and start over again? I don't think that's a very efficient way to operate, but I don't know what other people think.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. This was put forward as a discussion draft. So none of this is set in concrete and the purpose here was to have discussions. So -- and to find out if these were the goals, if there were other goals that needed to be added, and if we were heading in the correct strategic direction.

And so if we've identified something incorrectly now is the time to have those discussions, and -- and so we can start work on Thursday.

MS. TROTTA: Who is running this?

Are you running this Cindy? Are you going to

call on us?

MS. ETKIN: Go ahead.

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State. I have a couple of general comments. Although I don't want to start over, I think that what I heard last night was that we needed to get -- give our colleagues more opportunity to speak to what's here, first of all, from the audience.

And secondly, it seems to me that I am confused about the scope of the plan to begin with and I think that whatever the scope is determines where our conversation should go.

For example, the document that is sort of circulating here has a five-year window. That's a different world than if we are envisioning a strategic plan for 15 or 20 years. So I'm confused about that because I think that's a different kind of discussion.

So those are my two thoughts.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Valpo Law. Could you go back to the visions slide? Could we start back even before the mission, the vision? I mean did we talk about the visions per se yesterday? I mean is that the vision that we still have? Is that the right vision?

I guess I'm interested in what everybody thinks. It's like Gwen said, yesterday it seemed like we were questioning all of this between 5:00 and 6:00 yesterday.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. In Kansas City, there was a different vision that was put forward. Lots of comments were made.

Based on the comments and looking at the transcripts, it was rewritten to be this, what you see on the screen. "Federal Depository Library Program will provide government information when and where it is needed in order informed to create an citizenry and an improved quality of life."

MS. STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz from the Saint Louis Fed. I was one of the ones who was questioning sort of the

fundamental aspects of the whole program, and wondering whether or not we wanted to continue down the path that we have that exists right now, which involves libraries following rules regulations being and and part of wanted to change the program. Or if we structure of the program significantly, perhaps to the extent that we almost abandon the program and move to a more open model, where government information is provided by GPO and libraries provide access to that as it fits the needs of their community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. GREER: Chris Greer from the National Coordination Office. I guess my sense of the discussion last night matches similarly to what Katrina had to say. The vision and mission weren't at issue. I think that those are supported from a discussion that I heard.

It's the implementation. The vision and the mission don't predict an implementation mechanism. They describe an end goal of access at an informed community. So that wasn't at issue in the discussion.

It's how do you achieve that. And so this gets at the SWOT analysis, the threat in particular. The really big threat is that eGov phrase, the transition from a paper-based to a digital world, in which the previous model of a depository library is the public contact point for an interaction with tangibles on a local level is broken.

So it has not yet been replaced by a new model, and this strategic plan must play out in the time when either the program itself goes away for lack of functional model, an economic and business value proposition model, that works, or you replace it with a model that does work.

And so it's not the vision and mission. It's the implementation. It's absolutely critical that the sealant group plan get this right in this time frame and that's what was missing. So I think it gets right down to the goals and mechanisms.

And as Katrina said, there are a spectrum of possibilities from abandoning the whole model and using sort of GPO as a digital

access point, and everybody builds their services on top of that, or alternatively embracing the depository libraries as full partners in a new business model that gives everybody a reason to exist, a function in the landscape.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I think I heard an inkling of that remodel from what Ric said, this business of partnerships. What I'm not seeing is that playing out anywhere in the strategic plan or in the actual activities of the GPO right now.

For example, the FDLP desktop is pretty much all about GPO. It ought to be all about FDLP. Should be the libraries right up front, and about the partnership between the libraries, and GPO.

some novel concepts We need which GPO digital services are providing the foundation on which the expert libraries deal services expert that match information with their local government collections, their community's activities and needs, and provide a service that no one else can provide and that serves their communities

in ways that they are capable of doing.

A trivial example that probably doesn't work at all, but a very trivial example is what about the wikipedia kind of model in which you have a resource that is put up collectively by the depository libraries in which the articles perhaps are written by document experts and government document librarians.

And the references at the end of each article are government documents to which that refers, or maybe even the articles are written by people in the community and moderated and edited by the experts so that it scales.

Now, what would it take to set up something like that? Well FDsys has a concept that could do that, but you kind of have to change the basic approach to that. You've got to bring the libraries right into the application development and content development process right away.

And so what I thought was missing was if that's -- if we're not going to abandon

the thing and just make it GPO, and we're going to try to give the libraries a business model, then we better agree on what that business model is and we better write it into the strategic plan, and we've got to build it into those activities. That's what I'm looking for that I thought was missing.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. Chris, just a
point of clarification for me, please. I'm
not sure what you're seeing that is broken
with the FDLP.

I'm helping the public with my collection. There are a lot of libraries out there that are helping the public. I'm trying to get a grasp of what it is you're trying to say that's broken.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I'd like to hear a little bit about the response to Ric's question from the directives.

You don't need to take it from me.

I think you should take it from the folks who

are -- who are making decisions about whether

their libraries should continue as a depository library, as a regional or what have you, and why they're making those decisions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I guess that's not an answer to your question. I thought maybe I would get Cindy to --

MS. ETKIN: I'm writing down what you said first.

DR. GREER: -- respond to that -that qualification problem. My argument is as government goes to and more digital more online is much products. access more convenient than traveling to your library. a faculty member at a university, I long ago stopped going to the library and accessed everything I needed from my office. Not because I didn't need the library but because it was much more convenient to do it that way.

It's a very powerful model. If you don't provide it, these libraries don't provide it. That will create a vacuum that will be filled by other entities: commercial organizations, what have you, who are going to offer up services or note services that

anybody can get over the internet that will provide that expert capability that they're working for.

So you either fill that vacuum, or somebody is going to fill it for you. That's what I mean by the model being broken. It's possible for other people to provide the services you do now. They're going to unless you do.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. One example of what I think Chris is referring to as a competing entity for our ecosystem - is how I put it - is OSTI.gov, actually back there in one of the tables. We invited them into our meeting. How is that possible?

What they offer is exactly a version of a competing interest that Chris describes. A system and array of services that deliver scientific government information or citations to the citizens.

There is nothing on this piece of paper that suggests a library need be involved, and I think that is the essential

threat that Chris is describing. And as a depository library, I'm actually living that threat right now in my institution in that the structures of a depository library system have been removed from my environment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I exist only as a coordinator but coordinate nothing in a sense that I can't tell people what to do. I got to get them to go along with coordinating the repository responsibilities by convincing them its in the best interests of their departments to work with me.

have department no to behind my convincing, and so Ι have to convince them that government information of interest to them for the following reasons. subject, And not that I'm а but as bibliographer, I have another role to play in this in that I go out to the faculty and I say, "We have some other government information sources that are of interest to you as a public administration, as an urban planner, as a social worker. Don't worry too much how we get the information, but I'm here to help you get that information."

That kind of world does not survive in a traditional depository situation is -- no longer exists in our institution. It might survive. how it continues Т see can survive if one has a documents department. But since I don't have that anymore, I've got to recreate those mechanisms through other think this is another means, and Ι institutional threat that Chris is referring to.

defense of GPO in Now, in initiatives, I think there have been substantial steps towards this new environment that Chris is speaking to, and I think in some aspects of FDsys, if we look on the community desktop that GPO described yesterday, and with all due humble both for myself and those that are participating in the project, I think the information government online project represents a national collaboration clearly supported by GPO and the community in a direct and significant partnership.

That to me is one of the shining

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

lights on that hill that we see in the distance that we're supposed to be getting to. So Т think the elements that Chris is describing, the -- we could get there if we could figure out how to live outside of the traditional structures where primary our purpose of not collections. It's service and think that is the fundamental Ι access. challenge of this strategic plan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. John, as you were talking about having to go out to faculty members and departments to market services, it struck that that's me no different than other library in academia.

MR. SHULER: That's exactly my point.

MR. CISMOWSKI: It's no different from any other library anywhere these days. One of the points of this strategic plan is that this program is facing the same challenges and the same potential rewards in answer to those challenges is librarians and libraries everywhere are facing.

MR. SHULER: Exactly. Exactly my point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the Saint Louis Fed. David, I was going to say the same thing except that -- and sort of adding on to what you said, this is no different. Ninety-seven percent of what comes into the program now is electronic. And so -- and all librarians have to go out and find -- and reach out to people and let them know their expertise.

And so the program as this like club, everybody can get into the club. There is no library that can't access this government information, and that's a great thing. So this is where I get hung up on the value proposition. Go ahead.

The thing that we add MR. SHULER: as values, and here I'll speak in defense as a government documents librarian, is there's a knowledge certain Tassic that the GPO structure in its traditional way supported and encouraged, and it's not so much a knowledge collections, but knowledge of it's

government and how it works, and the byproducts that are created by that government.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it just so happens that encouraged that structure GPO kind at would thinking, and Ι argue that our collections were bibliographic models of how the government work, and we would use those collections in that fashion.

So yes, any librarian could find information about government information, but I would challenge whether or not that -- that government -- that librarian could make that information relevant to their user without the expertise that his traditionally being in the club of government information librarians.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, Nationally Coordination Office. So I would say that expertise gives you an advantage, but not an overwhelming advantage by any means. For example, using a correlation of network analysis, you can build a language translation device that simply uses webpages and their use to translate German into French. You don't

have to know any German, any French, never spoken a word of it, and you can translate it accurately.

I don't remember who said it, but it's just as easy for a machine using that approach to translate Klingon into Farsi as French into German. You don't need to know anything about that language.

Given the corpus of government documents, and an open use environment, I could easily build an expert reference device, a machine, that would probably be able to give as much semantic information about the use of these things as you can generate from your experience, and do it a lot faster and a lot cheaper as well.

So there is a technology threat out there to the expert model. I think the expert always wins if you're given the resources to get that expertise where it's needed, when it's needed in a model that's competitive that is convenience to the user.

I go back to this: How many libraries do you need? Usually it's one, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

_ _

23

24

MS. DAVIS

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. I'm

they want one expert to answer their question. So the FDsys approach and GPO holds the capability for you to compete very effectively here, but only if it's done actively and with that business model in mind. Otherwise, I don't think you can compete.

MS. ETKIN: Anybody else?

I'll follow up on my DR. GREER: Chris National own comments. Greer, Coordination Office. If that's the model, if it's to -- GPO providing the resources that allow you provide your services to competitively, then job number one in FDsys is That's how you build those services. the API.

None of this other stuff really matters except at the very fundamental level.

None of those interfaces are going to do anything for you to help you compete. They're going to help everybody else to compete.

If I'm a small business, I download the entire FDsys database every week, and I build my service on top of that, and I can out compete you that way.

listening to this conversation and several things are flying through my head. One is -- and I apologize for throwing data at you, but that's my job.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Only about 65 percent of the American public uses their library in a year, and those are individuals who acknowledge that they have a borrower's card for their public library.

So when you start looking at those demographics, what you discover is that there's a very controlled group of people who are strong library users for a very selective period of time, and then they drift away. when I think about that population, think about this fairly elite group of people who are experts in their field, I have to ask a question of whether that myself percent of individuals in American households really even know you exist.

And they probably don't. A very small percentage of them probably do because they've had some need for government information. They may not have known that

they needed government information but government information answered a question that they had.

Their experience is direct with an agency. They renew their motor vehicle registration online. They pay their taxes online. They don't engage through a library to handle local, state or federal government activities very much anymore.

The Social Security Administration tells you you can get the forms online, and they don't even help you anymore in that office. So the interaction at the household level with government is through a computer. It is not through a person in a library who is helping them access a computer necessarily.

The other reality is that we have people -- we have a society that is largely about CNN. That's how they get their information, and they're about -- what is the -- I don't watch cable, so I have to apologize, but like real TV. You know, real TV in somebody's house? Reality televison.

So how can GPO make the depository

1

program reality TV for the American Public?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SEARS: MS. Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I'm sorry to do this, but I have to respectfully disagree with the public does that not use the you depository libraries for interaction with the government.

They do. I experience it on a daily basis. When I was at the Tulsa Public Library, I experienced it by the hundreds on a daily basis. Working with the Denton Public Library, they experience it. There are an enormous amount of people out there who either do not own a computer.

Some of them don't even have phones. They have to use their public library for that interaction, and that's something that even with eGovernment services, they're still coming to us to get that interaction and they're asking for our help.

So I do see that is still occurring. We can't just say that just because there are those out there who are the haves, and who do understand technology and

who force

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

who do have computers that we're going to forget about all of those other people out there that are still trying to catch up.

I mean that was the whole purpose of libraries I thought was to help the underprivileged to get some equity of access to information.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Well, to follow up on that, the -- if you look at this more from the user perspective, and we look at the fact that since and government more more information is available online, and we've broken away from the wrapper of pages between covers, then we should be striving to make more of those libraries access points, effective access points.

And we've been doing a lot outreaches regional to our public libraries as well information as to give more information. government Ι mean they're choosing to not be selective depositories. other hand, they're asked to questions.

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So how do we move beyond the bounds of our depository concept to enhancing public access, whether it be at a public library, and academic library or a special library, and how do we move more in that direction, recognizing that we're going to have fewer print publications? But we also at the same time need to be concerned as libraries, I think, about the preservation of that which has been created before and is being electronically now.

I mean part of where we move, at least over the short-term of the strategic plan deal with both the is to legacy collection and moving forward as people do move to a more online environment, whether they're accessing it from their public library or from home, or out here in the hallway in the lobby of this hotel or wherever you can get access be it a coffee shop or wherever.

So how do we make that a valuable experience? We get a lot of users who are frustrated because they can't find it on the internet. Well, my wife and I always have our

family in awe because we found the answer and they didn't because we know how to maybe get a search structured better. But there's a lot of role here, but always I think with more of a view toward the user, and some of what's in

this plan goes back and forth.

We talk about the user, and then we're talking about the needs of the library.

And I think we need to balance that out better.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. See, they -- a notion of bridging the digital divide and making sure that everybody, regardless of geography, culture, economic status, what have you, has access, is a critical mission of all of us.

But I don't see in this strategic plan that that's the only mission. If you want to argue, that's it. We're going to focus on providing access to those who would otherwise not have access. That's a different business model than what's here, and that's providing for an informed citizenry, which would include the haves, the have nots,

everybody in between without distinction, everybody.

All right, and so if that ladder is the business model, then 97 percent of the documents are arriving in digital form predicts a need to get those digital objects to citizens in ways they can use and understand them for those who have a computer, for those who don't have a computer.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. Point of clarification. I do know a lot about public access internet study because it's managed by my office, and I've been involved with the project since 1996, and it's an annual survey. So just I know a lot about this.

The reality, however, is that when you ask public library directors and their staff about the kinds of services that they provide, eGovernment does not make it even into the top ten list. So they may be providing educational support to the public, but they do not perceive it as eGovernment.

So we have a messaging issue. We

have a marketing issue, and we have an advocacy issue for this program. And 99 percent of public libraries have access to the internet available to the public.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Very few of them have the level of access T1 or higher to ride the kind of access that's required to manage these collections, and we simply have to accept that. It is our reality.

When we talk about providing access to the haves and the have nots, the question becomes what is basic level of service? What are we expecting public libraries and academic libraries to provide to the public? What's a minimum level of service that we're anticipating?

And to talk about being flexible, to talk about being even inspiration is fine, but the reality is, and I'm harkening back to a decision by the Joint Committee on Printing libraries, about regional when somebody at the federal level who prevents GPO from moving а spontaneous way, collaborative way, I think we have

problem.

There are barriers at the national level that prevent GPO from modifying their program. And if what this group is saying is that they want more flexibility, they want more partnerships, then we need to do something about that barrier.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. We've got three minutes before 6:00. We did have a constraint on the amount of time that we were going to use here.

People do need to eat. This is obviously a very important subject. What do we do? Do we simply say we pick it up tomorrow afternoon and continue on until we faint from hunger?

MS. LYONS: I have to drive home tonight, so if I can ask a question before you adjourn? Sue Lyons at Rutgers Law Library in Newark. There are two parts of the program that are really valuable. One is the content, whether it's in tangible or evaluation format, but the other is this amazing network of

government experts, who are largely not on the federal payroll, distributed all around the country who are ready and able to service the needs of their community when they come in looking for the Internal Revenue Bulletin, or figure out how to open up the daycare, or find out the medicare guidelines for mom.

It's true you can get a lot of information on the internet, and I'm happy that people are looking at the Code of Federal Regulations in their pajamas, but there are so many difficult aspects of trying to navigate through government information. People who I'm sure don't want to trek down to the library make that trek because there's no one else who is going to guide them through it.

If you want to open up a daycare, is it state regulation? Is it federal regulation? Are there municipal ordinances that you have to consider?

I can walk somebody through that, and the program brings us all together. I mean hundreds of people have traveled from all around the country to be at this meeting as

they do every year. That is one of the most valuable parts of the program. And we can certainly be flexible in inviting other people to interact with GPO, or be partnerships, but being part of the program as a depository, whether it's largely electronic or we're still getting a lot of tangible materials; I think that GPO the government should be wooing us, get rid of saying, "Oh, not we can quidelines."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So my question is how does council see us preserving the tremendous resources, 1,200 plus libraries around the country, and keeping us committed to the program?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I guess my proposal is to enable you to provide that expertise in a digital environment.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. I think that the -- as we call it the club; I think the club, no matter what, needs to continue in some form. I mean maybe it won't be too long before the way we think of the depository program just

doesn't need to exist anymore because basically nothing is distributed in a paper format anymore.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I still think that there is definitely a value to having an organization of -- and like you -- maybe like you put it, a network of people who interact and are connected across the country who are experts in this kind of information.

Maybe the future is we're no longer designated federal depositories as places that hold these materials, but we're designated as government information centers with someone who people who is one or more are considered to be experts in information, and it becomes more of a, "This is a library where there is someone who" -- you know, "We've got this logo. There is someone who knows about how to navigate this sea of government information."

But I still think in some form that's where a lot of the value is. And if -- and it's going to be -- it's going to be like a completely service based thing because it's

no longer -- we're no longer going to be the keepers of the GovDocs because they're just

everywhere.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I think that -- and my -- here comes my educational background in economics. Ι always think, "What are people's motivations for doing something?" partially, the reason that there is network of experts in government information is because there needs to be someone, or some people who know a lot about this stuff when you have a lot of this stuff. And "stuff" is a technical term by the way. You know, this stuff in one location

So if you keep this network flowing fashion, some kind of like **GPO** in some sanctioned network of information experts, that solves the problem of if there's just no FDLP and there's this GovDocs out libraries there will Well, maybe some someone who cares a lot about it and will pay a lot of attention to it, and know about it, but in other institutions they just won't be anybody because there's no mandate, there's no

requirement.

So I think that's -- I don't know of that's what's going to end up being what happens, but I think that finding a way to maintain, no matter what else happens in terms of how people access these things, finding a way to maintain this network of expertise, possibly with GPO's help and guidance, might be an important way to maintain it.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valpo. I'm just going along with what Justin said. I think we really need to find a way to kind of reinvent the program. But within the law that we have, I truly don't think that we dare open up Title 44 right now until we have a champion or two that will help us do that.

So it's going to be kind of a fine trick. I mean in a way, it's a very flawed system. We know all the flaws. We're up close to it. But on the other hand, there's a lot of good coming out of it and I just -- I really worry that we're forgetting about the value that there is: the things you mentioned and the that Sue mentioned, and we ought to be

able to figure out some way to like reinvent it below the radar.

It's changed to something different, but do we -- once we start like examining the whole thing in the broad light of day, we may lose the whole thing and that's what I worry about.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken WIggin, Connecticut. To follow up on John and all of you, I guess, maybe our next step is to step back and say, "What are we trying to achieve with the strategic plan?" It may be that we want a one-year strategic plan to answer some of these big questions.

We can't do this by naming four goals. We sort of have a goal that we want to improve government -- access to government information, but maybe we need to spend a year -- our strategy should be to spend a year and figure out how to approach answering some of these big questions.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Let me just follow up on something that you just said, Ken. One of the

things that's been going through my little bit -- well, a lot actually. the recommendations that made in we the regional report - I keep going back to that report - is that we needed to look at the Federal Depository Library Program as a whole, and not just the regionals, and that we needed to continue the dialog that we started with the regional report, and then we might better understand our real problems, our strength, and where we want to go after doing a much broader study than what we did for the regionals.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I'm just thinking that maybe we need to step back and do that study, and then come back. And let me just throw that out as an option.

So I know we're running out of time. We're going to I guess continue this discussion at 1:30 tomorrow afternoon in this room. Is there anybody out there that can't be here at that time and would like to comment? Because we do want to hear your comments if you've got something to share with

us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. HARTMAN: Yes, I can't be here tomorrow. I'm Kathy Hartman, University of North Texas. I guess one of the things that I'm not hearing addressed is who is going to be responsible for all of this digital information, the bits on the disk? Who is going to keep it?

Are we trusting the government to do that for us, and should we trust the government to do that for us? Should we be stepping up to the plate to actually keep copies of this information as well to keep it available to the public?

Т think the service t.hat. is provided is important, but I think this also an important issue. We do keep a lot of government information on our servers, and we regularly have take that requests to information down because someone is unhappy that it's there. And we feel that pressure much less than a government agency who has a congressman after them because one of their constituents wants that document removed from the government website.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I think this is something that you don't need to -- you need to not forget about. Keep this in mind as you plan the future of the depository program.

MS. ETKIN: Thank you, Kathy. Cindy Etkin, GPO. Anybody else that would like to comment that can't be here tomorrow? Please.

Kerry Gibson MS. GIBSON: Ursinus College. I came here because I really figure the values need to out of library program is going to remain in the Federal Depository Program. So I'm really glad that you're starting to open up more of the dialog of reinventing the FDLP as -- how do I put it that way? I mean as far as the benefits of why I'm going to remain -- remain a Federal Depository member, or whether going to just be able to refer my patrons.

I'll still have the same expertise as long as I remain in the library, or whatever library I work in, but I'd be able to share the government document knowledge and

expertise that I have gained form programs such as these.

So I guess it's a way of thinking about opening the FDLP to the broader

community of this country. Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: Thank you. Anyone else? Let me also say, if you didn't hear me say it yesterday, this stuff will go up on the desktop and we'll put comment forms up, and perhaps council might come up with a list of questions that you would like people to specifically address.

It might be one option to help spur on the discussion as we take off and go back home and give those an opportunity who could not make it here to this meeting. Okay, Tim. Thank you all.

CHAIR BYRNE: Well, thank you all for staying this long and we'll see you tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 6:12 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE

AND FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2008

+ + + + +

The Council convened at 8:30 a.m. in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the Doubletree Hotel Crystal City, 300 Army-Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Tim Byrne, Chair, presiding.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

TIM BYRNE, Chair
CHRISTOPHER GREER
KATHRYN S. LAWHUN
JOHN A. SHULER
GWEN SINCLAIR
KATRINA STIERHOLZ
VICTORIA K. TROTTA
KENDALL F. WIGGIN
DAVID CISMOWSKI
SARAH G. HOLTERHOFF
JUSTIN OTTO
SUZANNE SEARS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

8:36 a.m. - 9:43 a.m. Council Plenary Session:

FDLP Guidelines

John Shuler, Associate Professor
Bibliographer for Government
Information and Urban Planning,
University of Illinois at Chicago 4

Victoria Trotta, Associate Dean for
Information Technology and Ross-Blakley Law
 Library, Sandra Day O'Connor College of
 Law, Arizona State University......20

Discussion of the depository library guidelines that focuses on user needs and services within an environment of distributed digital collections.

10:33 a.m. - 12:05 p.m.

Council Session: Authentication on

GPO Access: A Closer Look.

Ted Priebe, Director, Library
Planning and Development.....91

This session will provide an overview of GPO's current Authentication process, discuss assumptions and pose questions on the path forward.

1:34 p.m. - 2:46 p.m.

Adjourn

PROCEEDINGS

(8:36 a.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: Good morning. This is Tim Byrne from the Department of Energy. I'd like to welcome you to our final day here.

I do have some breakdown on the registration. We had 488 people who registered and, as of this morning, we had 443 who actually were in attendance. And in the breakdown there were 215 academic, 42 law, 26 public, 48 special, three others and 134 with nothing selected.

But they're leaning towards Obama. (Laughter.)

CHAIR BYRNE: There 52 from regionals, 50 speakers, 108 first-timers, 14 Council, and only 45 no-shows. So, I think at this point we're ready to move on into our presentation on the guidelines.

So, Tory, are you --

MS. TROTTA: I think that John is going to take the lead on that.

CHAIR BYRNE: All right.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Yes. Good morning, everyone. I've got to tell you, when I got up this morning and I realized that I'm going to be talking about guidelines in about two hours, I was excited.

Nothing energizes a documents librarian, a depository documents librarian more than talking about documents librarianship. Right?

Talking about those guidelines and energize our lives right? Can I have a Hallelujah, please. Hallelujah.

So, Tory and I have been talking,
Tory Trotta over here, and we figured, could
we last another 90 minutes talking about the
guidelines in the way that we always talk
about the guidelines.

And, frankly, we decided no, we can't. So, we want to offer you the guidelines from an entirely new perspective.

Not as limitations, but as enablers to empower you as depository librarians.

And the fact that we can do this is because of the good work that the GPO folk have done, that you have done over the years to actually embed the guidelines in the handbook, so we don't have to show you the guidelines. They're already there. They're highlighted in the handbook and we don't have to go over it again.

So we're going to talk about them in a new way. So here we go.

(Off-mic comments.)

MR. SHULER: So, the Legacy. What we are leaving behind. What is in the rearview mirror or as the old country song goes, "How can you miss you if you won't go away?"

The 1996 perspective is largely tangible, is largely based on a particular structure that, over the last two or three days, we've noticed is beginning to shift out of existence.

It assumes -- I dare to, hate to say this early in the morning, one size fits all. It assumes -- looks like minimum

standards are back, anyway. And I love this part, "Dense process centered handbook." What else is documents librarianship but about dense, complicated handbooks.

And finally, all of that has been remaindered, if you will, with the new handbook. Tah-dah! New and improved! It articulates the FDLP responsibilities and requirements in a much more effective way.

The new chapters talk about the obligations and the purposes in our new environment in a much more effective way, the reason, the whole reason why Tory and I were invited to the stage is to talk about whether or not the guidelines are necessary in the old 1990's kind of fashion.

And we would argue, no. Why? Because, it is a Council document, and the Council can do whatever the hell it wants to.

But, more importantly, we get a sense from you that you don't want to be talked to in this fashion by Council. You want to be more active. You want to be more

enabled, and not talked down to or told what or not to do.

So, with this spirit in mind, Tory and I have a suggestion of power slides on how you could think about these guidelines in a new light. And it is something that we want to encourage discussion around, so we're going to go through them, talk about them briefly, but what we're really looking for, and I know it's early in the morning, but relationship is important to us, so we want to be able to expect that you can contribute, and we want you to talk back to us. Seriously.

We'll see how this works. I'm getting a sense that this isn't going right.

MS. TROTTA: It will work.

MR. SHULER: It will work. Okay.

MS. TROTTA: Trust the process.

MR. SHULER: I love them so much.

Do they show the love back? No, they don't.

Wither the guidelines.

MS. TROTTA: Or wither.

MR. SHULER: Or wither. Or

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

whether.

We want to shift the discussion from a point of process. We have these guidelines and we're going to use these as a checkpoint and then punish you endlessly.

And we want to shift them to the idea of principles. We want you to embody these guidelines in your document souls as guiding principles so that you become internalized.

And then we want you to acknowledge the profound challenges -- I think you already get this -- that we are facing as a result of the changes in our institutions, changes in how government information is distributed, and even with the mother ship changing. I'm not going to leave that alone.

And finally, we want you to understand that these guidelines are a point of opportunity to think about being depository librarians in interesting and new ways.

MS. TROTTA: Can I add something?

MR. SHULER: You sure can.

MS. TROTTA: The other important question is to who the guidelines are directed. Are they directed to the depository community, are they directed to the directors.

And, as I recall from my limited experience, that the guidelines were supposed to be sort of a helpmate for directors who didn't want to plough through the huge guide books or the handbooks.

So, that's one question: Is it still -- who's it for? Is it for the community or is it for directors or some other bodies.

MR. SHULER: So, we're placing a bet that the directors care about us in different ways, but they really don't care about us through the handbook.

So, we're placing the bet that it is us who cares about the handbook and the guidelines, and that's how we want you to think about it.

But, then, you could tell us differently.

So, here are the three ways, the three options that we're going to talk about the guidelines. The guidelines as a purely marketing device, as a way to talk to people amongst yourselves about what the program does, both through its obligations and its opportunities.

The guidelines is a vision document. Now, there's a scary thought. They're actually -- if you read the guidelines in their separateness from the rest of the handbook, they are actually quite visionary statements, if you think about it deeply.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

finally, And the how to use quidelines in order to encourage the discussion of strategic planning that's been going on at least for the last two days if not for the last two years concerning the system, because the guidelines do embody the basic obligations we have as depository librarians.

Option number one. Or, rather -one extra step. Whichever focus is selected,
Tory and I argue that we do not need to

reinvent the wheel. The good work that the ancient government document librarians did, lo! those many decades ago still stands as a worthy progress. And also, that the guidelines are fully invested and appear in other documents that the depository system uses.

So, though we began this journey a year ago with the idea we were going to reinvent the guidelines, we've decided if it ain't fixed it, don't broke it. No. If it -- no, what is it?

MS. TROTTA: If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

MR. SHULER: Absolutely.

MS. TROTTA: But, John, we're arguing that they are broke.

MR. SHULER: Oh, really?

MS. TROTTA: And we are going to fix it.

MR. SHULER: Oh, is that right?

MS. TROTTA: Yes.

MR. SHULER: I didn't get that

21

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

memo.

MS. TROTTA: And we don't want to reinvent the wheel. There are plenty of documents that reflect the new realities of the depository program, and what I remember from the last Council meeting is they directed the guidelines to be short.

MR. SHULER: And embedded in the big document they are short.

As we move into that new century of ours, here are the points that we wish to consider about the guidelines.

At this point, anybody on Council want to comment on these points?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: John.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I'm Sally Holterhoff, Valpo Law. I just have a question, maybe GPO people can answer.

Weren't -- I mean, back in the rustic days of long ago, weren't the guidelines what inspectors used to rate the libraries? Wasn't there some reference to

these, like, you know, you were not in compliance with the 8.2 or whatever?

Is that correct, Robin?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO. There was a piece that -- not the 1996, but before that, that gave teeth to the inspection process and in the revision of the -- done along the way, including the '96, allowed the electronic world requirements brought the depository so long, so in a lot of ways the guidelines have been that future vision in a succinct spot, it allowed people to know what -- what was expected.

So, the inspection report, after '96 did move on, but they were based in a large organizational part of those guidelines.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: My question was just do we -- are we getting rid of something we need, but I guess we don't need them for that purpose anymore, because there's another assessment tools, whatever.

MS. TROTTA: Well, that is one of the questions: Do we need it, and who the

audience is. So, do we?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. From a public library perspective, I think that the guidelines are important and when you go talk to your director, just as the inspections were always important, because it does help.

You know, maybe the focus isn't -the directors' not going to read them on their
own, but when you go to the director say, you
know, "I'm supposed to be providing free
service," or "I'm supposed to be putting a
sticker on my door that says I'm a
depository," if you have something.

And it may be that it's already in the handbook and we can get that from there, but there do need to be some set standards that you can take as a depository librarian to your director and say, "We're a part of this program and these are the things we have to do."

MR. SHULER: Anybody else on Council?

MR. BARKLEY: Let the gentlemen from the government speak first.

MR. SHULER: The gentlemen from the government.

MR. DAVIS: Gentleman from the Government, Ric Davis, GPO. I was at an ARL director's meeting last week, and I asked the directors if they knew that the handbook was and I got a lot of blank stares.

So, I would encourage something like this written at a level that they would be able to read and take with them.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
University of New Mexico. Without trying to
reveal my age, I was the one, along with
Ridley Kessler that developed these guidelines
back in '96.

And so let me dispel one myth. These things were not aimed at directors. They were aimed at the depository community, trying to deal with the variety of electronic information that was being disseminated at the time.

If you recall, we still had CD ROMS, diskettes, what, five and a quarter, three and a half, or three and a half and five and a quarter, whatever those things were. And it was -- it also dealt with, believe it or not, issues of access.

We were trying to figure out how to provide the public access to this electronic information that many of us were, at the time, didn't quite understand or how to deal with.

So, we developed these guidelines as a set of suggestions that depository librarians, along with their directors, could use to try to figure out we were going to deal with this new source of information.

So, I realize that these things sorely need revised, and I'm sure that some of them are antiquated, much like I am. But, let's keep in mind that even though we have a lot more electronic information, we're still dealing with issues of access.

We're still dealing with issues of capturing and all the other things that we

talked about throughout the course of the last five Council meetings.

So, I hope that kind of clarifies the myth that this wasn't developed just for directors. Thanks.

MR. SHULER: You're welcome.

MS. TROTTA: As a follow-up, Dan, or anybody, does the new handbook with its clearly-delineated chapters that cover these help at all in terms of having the handbook be easier to use or easier to access that kind of information? Does it need to be repeated in the guidelines?

MR. SHULER: Because, what we'll be talking about is separating out the guidelines from the handbook again. The guidelines are clearly embedded in a contextualized way in the handbook.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
University of New Mexico. I can't speak for
everyone in this room. And, looking around,
I'm sure most of them don't want me to.

I would suggest -- I would like to

follow up with what the gentleman from the government just proposed. I understand that they need to be in the handbook, but as Ric mentioned a moment ago, many of the ARL directors don't know about the handbook, and that's probably more our fault than it is theirs. You know, we should be pointing it out.

I think if you're going to do this, a good place to keep it is in the handbook, I agree, but I also think that these need to be at least promoted individually, by whatever means you think are necessary to do so.

Now, having worked on the handbook as well, I've read it and I look at it occasionally because I still have to do process and all that, wonderful things. I don't think there are a lot of people that are fully-aware or may only focus on one aspect of the handbook.

So I think it's a twofold operational issue that, yes, you revise these and put them in the handbook, but I also think

you promote them enough so that everybody in the community can hug the bear in this issue, including the library directors.

That's me. I don't know how anybody else feels.

MS. TROTTA: Thanks, Dan. When I went through all these documents, I mean, there's an appendix for library directors in the handbook. So, again, you know, we were thinking of it more as a targeted piece at a little bit of a -- more of a marketing or vision level.

But, what I'm hearing is that there needs to be maybe some of that targeted information that's in the appendix, entitled for library directors out into the guidelines.

Is that what I'm hearing? So, it would be duplication.

MR. SHULER: I don't know exactly what we're hearing. From the reaction I see stares. I don't know if it's stares of agreement or stares of "What the hell are they talking about?"

MS. TULIS: Okay. I'll bite.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis -- where am
I from? -- Southern Illinois University,
Carbondale.

Speaking as an associate dean who no longer is actively involved in this, I do think it would be to your benefit to have either an appendix, a separate chapter, I don't care what, something that can be pulled out by your documents librarian and given to the director and say, "Okay. This is what you need to read, and if you have additional questions, come talk to me."

Does that answer your question?

MR. SHULER: Yes. Thank you,
Susan.

So, other than those tools that are designed to be pulled out that are aimed directly at the director to talk about the importance of the depositories in the library system, I'm hearing somewhat a notion you want something else. Is that right?

MS. TROTTA: Why don't we --

MR. SHULER: Move on?

MS. TROTTA: -- talk about the three options.

MR. SHULER: Oh, okay.

MS. TROTTA: Maybe that will -- they'll have some things --

MR. SHULER: Okay. Three options of how one could talk about the guidelines as they are presently embedded in the handbook.

The Joshua version of the marketing focus, as you can tell -- and I actually wrote these bullet points with the idea that this is the documents librarian talking to his or her community on the importance of the -- what it means to be a depository, and using the guidelines to back up these statements.

I'll give you a moment to digest.

Any thoughts of Council?

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public. This is recreating to me the -- what exists. You're just putting it in a different format to make it a little more

pizzazzy.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. LAWHUN: It's still too long. I mean, I thought a lot of our discussions last spring were on trying to make it, you know, quick, bullet points that somebody could digest very fast, but get the essence of the program.

MR. SHULER: Well, I think actually, rather than thinking of these as the guidelines themselves, this is a way of explaining how the guidelines can be used to talk about them and whether -- and certainly your own guidelines could be much shorter and briefer than this.

MS. LAWHUN: Okay

MR. SHULER: Another perspective?

MS. TROTTA: The short one. My view on the marketing idea would be directed towards directors and it would focus on why it's a good thing to be a depository.

It would speak to that kind of -the values, a little bit about the -- the

basic responsibilities, but how being a depository library can be used and be responsive to the pressures that libraries are facing, both in terms of resource allocation and space and as an answer to why, you know, if everything's electronic, why we need to have this function in the library.

I think you could do that, but that's a different kind of document than pulling out -- my basic philosophy is, we have a really good handbook.

There are discreet pieces that can be pulled out and discussed with your director and that my view would be we might not reinvent the wheel. We might take a chance and talk at a little higher order about the values that would be good.

And so, that's the conversation the two of us have had and what we'd like to get some comment on which way we should go. And we're starting to get that, I think. So, thank you.

MR. SHULER: Anybody from the

audience?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valpo Law. I like Tory's approach, just I don't know that you want to call it guidelines anymore, but I think that the guidelines from '96, looking at them, I mean, that was focused on everything that you had to do was a lot of, you know, just the requirements which is already in the handbook.

I think now what Tory's talking about of why, even though it isn't the, you know, get a bunch of paper stuff, free program anymore, why it's still important and valuable, but it seems like we need a different name than guidelines.

I don't know what, but I mean, I think what Tory's talking about is a document or a thing that would be really good to have for those directors that might be wavering or might be talking among themselves and thinking why don't we just all drop this, what's the point of it.

I think it might be good, but a

different name. And I don't have an idea, but

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. First, in response to Sally, maybe we won't have a checklist, and those are simple when you're managing a program that you don't know a lot about, here are the things that I need to do.

But maybe we should totally change the focus. I mean, you asked earlier who's this for, and I was thinking yesterday as well, we were trying to be more customerfocused and user-focused, and maybe we need more of a customer bill of rights.

I mean, what -- what should people expect when they go to a depository library, and if you approach it that way, the other things fit in.

I mean, should they find -- what should they find and what should their expectation be when they get there. We are arguing a lot about justifying your program to

your director, and that's a very important, we need to do some FAQ sheets on that.

But, it doesn't really get to -- so when the person walks in the door -- and can they walk in the door, what should they be getting for service.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair,
University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.

At breakfast we were talking about how maybe we should be having library directors sign off on a document that includes the FDLP mission, but this could be something else that they sign off on.

It's a set of expectations as Ken was saying, so that they actually know what's expected of a depository library because I think many of them don't know, and it also would force them to really think about what it is that they have to do in order to be a depository and can they actually commit to it, and it would also stretch that commitment beyond the tenure of a particular director.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,

California State Library.

Ken, I think you're really on to something there. If it was part of the purpose of this is to inform directors of -- I don't know, the basic responsibilities of the program, approaching it from a bottom-up point of view instead of the top down, that that is the customer is driving these expectations, not GPO or the federal government.

I think that could be a very effective way of weathering whatever guidelines we come up with because, you know, at every level a director's basically concerned about the customer.

MS. TROTTA: Thanks, David, and that's also Option 2. That's the focus of Option 2. Why don't you put that up.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Any comments from the audience?

MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. I'm a little confused by the discussion that's going on. It's unclear to me whether these

guidelines that you're talking about are for the directors, the practicing librarian, documents librarian or for the public.

And I think until you figure that out, it's going to continue to be muddled.

MS. TROTTA: What I'm getting from the conversation is that it needs to be a document that is targeted towards directors whether or not the depository librarian is the one using it as a tool for them, but also that we could craft it so that it emphasizes the customer, because that is also, to me, could be persuasive in terms of couching these requirements or these responsibilities.

So, I agree there's still a little confusion, but it doesn't seem as confusing to me.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
University of New Mexico. Just as a follow-up
with Susan, I kind of wondered what is your
goal here. I'm not trying to -- I'm not
trying to be sarcastic here.

MS. TROTTA: I understand. The

goal -- when we were trying to do this, we got this assignment, it was clear that there were -- it needed -- we needed to decide whether we needed a guidelines in light of the new handbook, which is basically how this came up.

And then we said, okay, do we need -- that's a threshold question. In light of the new handbook in its approach, its flexibility, able to be easily determined and communicated, do we need a guideline.

Secondly, who is the audience for the guidelines, and thirdly, is there a way to couch the discussion that's slightly different than what came before, because we do go on the premise that the information in the guidelines is out of date and most of it is in the handbook.

So, do we need to repeat ourselves? That's our focus.

MR. SHULER: And I think I should point out, we're actually talking about two versions of the guidelines. There's a 1996 version, okay, which in a sense is out of --

out of commission now.

It was superseded in a lot of ways by the new handbook, and many of the old ways of looking at the technology were updated and integrated into the new handbook.

So, the original job of the guidelines to address those technological shifts in the mid-1990's have been integrated and updated in the handbook.

So, the purpose of the old 1996, that job is done. So, the question before us is: Do we revivify the approach that the 1996 handbook guidelines took, or do we just simply say the game was won, the guidelines exist within the handbook and if we want a separate document, what do we want that document to be.

That's what began as this dialogue
-- and if you ask for a goal, it is seeking
guidance from your esteemed wisdoms of where
you want us to go.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sanders, University of North Texas.

John, from what I'm hearing, I

think, you know, the guidelines were huge, and the reason we did the handbook was to combine that stuff so the depository librarian had one place to go.

So, I think for the depository librarian, the handbook is very good and I don't know that we need something for the depository librarian more than that.

But what I would like to see, I mean, what Ken was saying is a really good idea. I mean, you need FAQ sheets for people who are not depository librarians who don't want to go through the whole handbook.

A library director wants a one-page summary of what they need to do. The customer bill of rights is just a fantastic idea. I would love to see that, and maybe even, in a poster or laminated for us to hang in our depositories.

MR. SHULER: Over here.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I think the short answer to your question do you still need guidelines, is no.

Do you need -- could we use something else, is a very good starting point for discussion, and I think Ken and David have started something here.

I just want to share that in Michigan we have a state plan. All library directors in our state sign off on each edition of the state plan and in signing off they are agreeing that even if they don't meet all of the criteria that are laid out in the state plan, they can at least agree that they are standards to which we can all aspire. Okay.

And so that's what their signature means. And it is proven to be useful in situations where a selective library has wanted -- as their larger governmental entity has wanted to pull out of the program, and that's allowed the state library to send them a letter with a copy of ballot and that says your institution agreed to this and we consider it a contractual obligation that you'll follow the standards in this plan,

whether you want to stay in the program or leave it.

And it's been very useful. So, when you're talking about something that might be geared towards directors, that directors might sign off on, you may be into something that's already proven useful for us.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame. I'm a business librarian. I don't do documents anymore, either. In the business school we talk elevator pitches.

Directors are busy people. They all want to know in great detail everything about everything, you know. You need to craft short informational messages that get your point across succinctly.

Yes, you're giving them very well their responsibilities. That's not a motivational one, but benefit is what you need to be delivering to your director in a short sound bite.

Susan only has an attention span of

X amount of time because -- because directors have a lot of things to do. You want to have that short elevator message as to why it's important to them from their customers.

We're not their customers. We're just their minions. You know that, you know, there's real faculty and real citizen opinion, and then there's the staff's opinion.

And who carries the biggest weight, we're on that. Team faculty carries the biggest weight. I'm just another one of her minions that is trying to make her and the faculty happy.

Short sound bites, positive benefits, and then deliver, and here's the responsibilities you have to get those benefits.

MS. BAEZ ORTEGA: I'm Gilda Baez Ortega, Western New Mexico University, and I am a library director. I was just struck by the -- a lot of what I know about government documents -- by the way, I'm here because I have a vacancy in government documents.

This is the first time I realized there was even something in the handbook directed at library directors, and I think that just speaks a lot of a lack of communication.

I think direct communication to the library carries a lot of weight, otherwise we're dependant on our government documents telling us what we need to know.

I've been fortunate that I've had passionate library document lovers under me that have been communicative, but I didn't realize these documents were already available, so please direct them to library directors as well as to the government documents.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, and welcome to our tribal meeting.

MS. FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley College. And I may have a slightly different perspective. The letter to library directors that was recently in the boxes of mail that came out that's been referred to a few times

this session, and it came to me, and I dutifully gave it to my library director and then I got an email.

And it said, "Betty, let's talk about what is the value of us being a depository library. I'd like you to convene a group that talks about the value of us being a depository."

And after my heart calmed down a little bit I truly am not looking at this as a threat. I really do not think that we are in danger at all.

In fact, you all now know before my regional library because I haven't even told her because I don't look at it as a threat. I look at it more as an academic exercise.

So, I've been thinking about how I'm going to craft a response and what I'm going to say and what I'm going to focus on and I feel like what she wants from me is not a bulleted list of the value.

She's been our library director for as long as I've been at the library which is

over 20 years. I feel like she -- she knows the main purpose and mission of the depository library.

What she wants to know from me is what is the value of Wellesley College being a depository. Looking at our situation and what our staffing, our financing, our responsibility to the public, who uses our library.

So, I feel like she's looking for me to take -- to look at these main points and cull out points that are germane to us. So, I guess I wonder at trying to craft another document that just sort of pulls out the main points that I feel like she knows.

I feel like it's my responsibility as documents librarian to -- to look at those main points and then to make them relevant for our situation at Wellesley, knowing the collection we have and the direction we want to go.

I do -- when Ken talked about the document from the point of the user, I think

that has some possibilities, because I think that's where maybe some of the concern of being a depository is, who does that mean we have to let in and what does -- what is our responsibility for the user, the public user, and can we meet that responsibility.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn State. I do like the idea -- and I'm not surprised that this conversation is going so far and wide into various concepts and ideas, but the concept of having a director sign a contract, I have some cautions about that.

I would -- if you guys craft something like that, I would really -- our -- our administration takes seriously contracts that they sign, obviously. And the kinds of things that you just might up and sort of flippantly write into a contract, you might end up finding that they're going to react back to you, because they're going to send it to their lawyers and send it back to you and say, "We can't" -- "You can't say it this

way."

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I just think you should have somebody that's involved in those kinds of discussions. That said, there are many programs -- the Library of Michigan gave an example, but we're a state -- we're a state data center affiliate, and every five years my director is -- has to sign off a contract with the state data affiliation program.

And so they get a contract, but it does -- I think it's really valuable, because it does bring up this is the value you're getting, but likewise, I think in terms of being able federal to step out as а depository, Ι think they don't really understand the ramifications of what they're going to lose by stepping out of the program, and how much work that's going to be in terms of stepping out of the program.

And so, being able to communicate these kinds of things somehow in a positive fashion could be really effective, but I would caution, if you guys are going to go down that

road, bring some people in who understand contract writing.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. I think, having listened to the gist of this conversation here if, indeed, Council's thoughts are to try to use this as a marketing tool or a marketing focus then, yes, like Steve said, you need to make short bullet points to the directors, and use it as such as a marketing tool to remain in the program.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If Council's idea is to develop quidelines these reinvent these or quidelines sorry, realign I'm these guidelines to today's environment and you're using it as sort of a document for those of us still practicing, then orient it towards us so we know how to provide access, how to provide service, and along the same lines, talk to our library directors.

If you're just doing this for a pedagogical exercise, then I think you should

stop and we should all go have coffee right now.

So, my point being that figure out what you want to do and then orient this document to the audience you want to orient it towards, whether it's directors, us, people who use our depositories, because in some ways I'm smelling some fear in this room, like all of a sudden we're all afraid that things are going to slip away from us, and we've got to develop this one tidy document that everybody can go by and promote ourselves.

And I'm a little concerned with that kind of approach. Thanks.

MR. SHULER: All those in favor of going out and getting some coffee. I though it was coffee I was smelling, not fear.

Well, actually, Dan, we are pushing back because I think what we heard in the comments, if I could have an editorial moment here, is we're getting pushed two different directions.

Talk to the directors, market the

program. Totally two different purposes from the original guidelines, if you understand the drift, so it is a conversation we need to have even if it doesn't seem to have an overarching direct goal at the end of it.

So the pedagogy is actually the conversation, if you will, that needs to take place to figure out what Council, one, needs to do on you all's behalf, if you will.

Okay. I mean, Council could come up with a document, yes, but if it's a document that doesn't listen to what you guys have to say, then what's the purpose?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Any other thoughts, comments?
(No response.)

MR. SHULER: The next set of slides is going to be much in the same vein, and from the next one is a vision focus.

The document talks about the program in this way: Again, it has an idea that it speaks of the higher purposes of the program, and certainly can be incorporated as a marketing device, or a letter to the

director or a letter to ourselves of why we're doing this. Not specifically these phrases, but speaking to the ideas that could be included in that particular document.

Any responses from the Council?
(No response.)

MR. SHULER: From the audience?

I see Dan went out and got coffee,
but he's back.

MS. TROTTA: There are some aspects of what -- the conversation we just had, I think, embedded in this particular option, so there may not be anything else to say about it, except that it is a slightly -- it has a slightly more -- in my view it has slightly more substantive bent than the marketing approach.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

I guess, you know, sitting here as Council Member, but also as a director of a library that has a depository and other federal programs, it's kind of like, you know,

do we need guidelines, yes or no; what do you want; and who's the audience.

But, it seems to me there's a whole bunch of communication issues that we're trying to address. I mean, you all go home from here and what are you going to hand your director to tell him about what's happening here.

I mean, you know, you're hopefully not hand them this book, because they aren't going to make it through it. I'm going to hand mine back to my documents librarians and say, "Here."

But, it's like, you know, how do they know -- how does a library director know where the discussion is going about the future of the program. You know, I'm often asked, you know, "So, why do we need all the paper? You know, what are you doing about electronic access?"

We have a lot of conversation here.

In a totally different hat, I'm often asked

by school superintendents: Why do I need a

school library? Everything is on the internet." Well, you could ask the same question about, you know, the depository program, lots of things. So, what's your response? So, I guess I'm back to maybe a sheets that are updated series of FAO periodically that address different audiences, 9 10 may be more useful and a better summation of the current thinking or direction. 11 Without getting too technical, I 12 don't have a lot of time to digest all of 13 this, but I do need to know what the 14 expectations are of me to provide a service. 15 16 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Would you bounce back one slide? 17 Dame. SHULER: Sure, if I could MR. 18 19 figure that out. 20 MR. HAYES: Page up. I know. SHULER: Just be 21 MR. patient. 22

MR. HAYES: You slept through that?

23

MR. SHULER: Yes, I know. MR. HAYES: Library PowerPoint 101, didn't you? MR. SHULER: Yes, I did. MR. HAYES: Right. When you read these, again, you notice that there's no balance in here. Okay. Start A, B, C, D, E, F --MR. SHULER: Yes, I know. All 10 right, already. MR. HAYES: Oh, I missed it. All 11 right. 12 MR. SHULER: As Jay Leno would say, 13 "Shut up. Shut up." 14 15 MR. HAYES: There's no balance, I 16 understand. He'll get to it. MR. SHULER: Oh, is that right? 17 Okay. Brilliant. So there. 18 19 MS. TROTTA: Thank you, Lance. MR. HAYES: Thank you, John. 20 Thank you, Mother MR. SHULER: 21 Ship. 22

MR. HAYES: Now you know why he's a

23

department head and not doing documents anymore.

Notice that, again, the -- it appears to be one-sided. You are doing expectations and obligations. And the vision that you're focusing on is Councils and GPO's. You need to plug in the vision of the director.

This is not our vision, you know, you ask whether you're contributing to our vision and where the program's going, and our vision can contribute to your vision in these particular ways.

Here are the obligations and expectations that derive these benefits for you and for your population that you serve and all the altruistic you do.

It's a good start, but you still need to add the other half of the coin in there in terms of whose vision are you supporting. You know, my director is going great, Steve, you do that vision all you want so long as you do my vision, too. But the

benefit.

So, it's a good start, but you still need another half to put in there, and now I'm going to get some coffee.

MS. SINCLAIR: John, this is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii.

Following up on what Steve just said, I wonder if the could incorporate in the material that Cindy collected in, you know, all the comments from the directors that were solicited and compiled, and I don't believe we've actually seen, but I'm wondering if that could be used to perform the function that Steve is talking about.

MS. DeDECKER: Sherry DeDecker,
University of California, Santa Barbara.

This is made for tall people.

Okay. To speak to what Kenneth was saying, what do you going to take back from this conference -- oh, that's so much better. Thank you.

Okay. What I've heard all through the conference, I've seen programs on how to

collaborate. I've heard space issues. I've heard "We're being asked to reduce our collections."

You know, that's not a bad thing.

I'm a documents librarian and I'm also an associate director for public services, and I'm looking at my document space. There will be renovation coming. I need to reduce it.

Is that bad? No. Should we collaborate? Yes. I think it's time for us to look at our collections and see what is it in tangible form that we need to keep and then look around, who's close to us who has something else, and how can we collaborate.

And I think that should also be in anything speaking to anything towards the director, in short.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything?
Anything else?

(No response.)

MR. SHULER: We will go on to the next one now that I have learned my new techniques.

This point incorporates the guidelines, principles into a strategic planning focus.

MS. TROTTA: This one we talked about -- since, as a director, what I'm trying to figure -- if I don't have endless time to focus on this, I don't have anyone that can feed me information, I would like to know more -- you know, where can I get, what's going on with the program really quickly.

I think this sort of harkens back to what Ken was just saying, that this approach would actually incorporate sort of a status report on the strategic planning and where the program is trying to get.

As, again, the audience is basically directors, people that are wanting to know. They are under the impression that everything is online and therefore, why do we need to have a depository, that if something could be more strategically crafted on an ongoing basis, this approach would take more interaction of Council to update it.

Would this be useful as an approach, and that's what we were thinking of when we crafted this option.

MR. SHULER: Council.

CHAIR BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department of Energy.

You know, I like all three of the options you're talking about here. I think are all things that we might want to consider doing, but I don't think any of them are really -- have anything to do with the guidelines.

The guidelines were originally created during a time when there were a lot of new libraries that joined the program after the '73 law. Now that there are limited opportunities to get into the depository program, it was very prestigious to be a depository.

When they opened things up, a lot of libraries jumped at the opportunity to get that prestige, but they didn't want to invest what they needed to to run a depository.

So, the guidelines were established to tell libraries how many staff they really should have, because they weren't investing that staff, how many hours should they be -- giving them a real guideline of what to do to be a depository.

And I think at that time it was really needed very much. Whether it's needed today, I don't know, but those guidelines, the instructions to depository libraries and the federal depository libraries, manuals have all have been incorporated into a handbook.

And so, it is all there, but the question that we have is how easy is it to draw out the bottom line. And that, you know, when we talking about what the director wants to know, what's the bottom line, what do they really have to do.

And I think a lot of librarians, depository librarians looked at the handbook and that was the thing that they saw, too, that there wasn't an easy way to draw out that bottom line.

So, your three options here, as I said, are good things. We should probably do them, but I'm not sure it's even known that that was brought by the depository librarians for being able to find the bottom line easily.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
California State Library.

I totally agree with Tim that as good as the handbook is, its primary audience, I think, is the depository coordinator, and not the director. Even though there's a section at the end of each chapter that is directed toward the director, it's -- the stuff is spread out over the handbook, and given the yellow highlighted portions are primarily aimed at the depository coordinator.

And the directors, let's face it, are not concerned about where the depository stamp is placed on each tangible item. And so, something needs to be crafted that his short, -- that is -- that, as Duke says, emphasizes the benefits of being in the program as well as the responsibilities, and

that we are doing this for our customers.

CHAIR BYRNE: Anybody from the audience?

MS. McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, UK.

I'll date myself. And I was involved in the very first edition, not the 1996 version. And if you go back and see that old edition, it really was an attempt to show what all of the partners were responsible for doing, not only libraries, but GPO. There is a section about what GPO will do for us as well.

And I agree with David and Tim, that the handbook is very dense, and if you want to communicate any of that information to a director, I think it would be -- and Steve, too -- to have a succinct document that says, here are the benefits and what GPO will do for you if you will do this for GPO and the citizens of the United States.

Sorry. The communities around your libraries, which I'm -- but it has to be short. And I guess, from the last spring's meeting, I -- and last fall, that we -- I

thought that's kind of where you were going, let's create a new version that reflects our new environment that can be used to educate people.

CHAIR BYRNE: Any other thoughts?

MR. BARKLEY: I don't want Lance

coming to help me out here, so -- Dan Barkley,

University of New Mexico.

I agree with Sandy and the comments made by Tim and David, as well, and I think one of the things -- let's eliminate some of the confusion. Let's drop the word "guidelines."

Okay. Because everyone -- or I shouldn't say "everyone," but when I hear "guidelines," all of a sudden it's kind of rules and regulations that I must follow.

You know, I have guidelines when I officiate a basketball game that I've got to follow, blow the whistle, things like that.

If we're going to have a discussion document -- and we all understand that the handbook is an organic document and it will be

revised when it's necessary, but in the ensuing periods things happen.

So, if you're going to direct this again to directors as reasons for staying in the program or enlarging or decreasing your participation in the program, point it to them, half a dozen bullet items, telling them why it's great to be here, the "Gee Whiz" that you've developed -- I like that.

And if you want guidelines, then let's work on guidelines down the road for electronics or digitization or the retention of tangible products and things like that. Let's not try to create any more confusion than what we have right now.

MS. RHODES: I'm Sarah Rhodes, the Georgetown Law Library.

I'm -- this is my first Council meeting. My previous career was in marketing and public relations. And it does sound to me like what we need, instead of guidelines is a communications plan, and I think that there's some tools that have already been established

that we can use to build it.

We have these comments from directors. I saw on Monday during the future of the FDLP session an elegant SWOT analysis. I think maybe that can be revisited from the approach of our audience being law library directors, deans, stakeholders, decisionmakers at our libraries.

And like everyone was saying, I'd just like to echo, it seems like everyone has these ideas already kind of solidly thoughtout.

I think that what we need is probably a one-page FAQ sheet that's based on kind of this analysis that has to be done first in terms of defining the audience, defining, you know, strengths, weaknesses, opportunity sets, you know, creating some -- an ethics Q sheet and then creating a list of -- in marketing and PR you call them key messages.

And I think we all know what they are. You know, we've heard, you know, Barack

Obama is untested. John McCain voted with George Bush 90 percent of the time.

These are messages that are short, succinct and that you drive home at every opportunity and repeat over and over again in dealing with your director and dealing with other people in your library.

And I thought there were some great ideas in terms of having a poster or a FAQ sheet, something that maybe you post in your break room or your meeting room at your library that has kind of these things laid out very succinctly, very briefly.

I know that GPO has created an elegant marketing plan, really aimed at users, I think, and patrons. And so, I think it's really an idea for us to maybe, you know, since we've got this wonderful resource in the handbook, to keep that for us, but in terms of communicating with directors and stakeholders to have kind of a separate document and a separate strategy and kind of take the responsibility on ourselves, since we work

directly with our directors to identify what those messages should be.

Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MS. FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley College. As I was sitting here listening, it almost feels like we're back to sort of thinking about one size fits all, and I wonder if we're talking about developing some kind of a FAQ sheet for library directors.

Ιf we could have a few bullet points that talk about the program everyone, and then we have a few points that could perhaps be targeted to public library directors or academic library directors or law library directors, because sometimes their needs and their concerns and their mission and their philosophy even are а little different as -- you know, as we think about our users.

So, to have a few points targeted to each one of those, perhaps could make them sit up and take notice a little more.

MS. RHODES: I'd like to say I think this is something that should definitely be considered. We should consider like defining our audience groups.

You know, lay out a plan for the various types of libraries that are involved in the program and communications strategies aimed at each of them.

And I also wanted to go back to Option 2, the vision focus. You know, one thing when I worked in public relations and marketing, often for a client, the vision is one of the big selling points for a product or a company.

And, in terms of, you know, me being new -- new FDLP from my library, I can say that I've been very inspired by this kind of greater vision of the FDLP as a mechanism for providing government information to the people.

It's wonderful and it's inspiring, and I think that we can take kind of these various options that we've explored and

integrate them into key messages without listing them too long, but still tapping into the library's function in terms of providing information.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing Office. I really like the approach that you just mentioned as well, about -- about segmenting the message a little bit in terms of bulleted points.

That's kind of the approach that we took when we sent the value letter out to directors. And, granted, it was a starting point. It was only a couple of pages, but we took the approaching of talking about, you know, the difference about how the FDLP of the future might look to a public library versus a law library versus an academic.

One of the things that we're going to do is we are going to share the comments from directors. We were thinking through our community, .FDLP.gov, but also through other means.

A lot of good comments came back

and a couple of the comments that I found really interesting from the directors were, you know, I'm an academic. I didn't know how this would apply to public libraries.

So, I think that the path that you guys are talking about is the right thing. I think it needs to be targeted so it's specific in a communications piece to the library and the type of library they are, but there's also a cross-educational aspect where it helps them understand how this applies to other types of libraries as well.

MR. SHULER: So, I think we've been actually wrestling with these questions for the last hour or so. This is how Tory and I imagined it would be before we met you all. I don't think we were far off.

MS. TROTTA: No, No.

MR. SHULER: Any thoughts from the Council?

From sitting up here, or standing up here, rather, listening to this, I get the sense maybe we can come to some consensus on a

couple of points.

One, the 1996 guidelines are done.

You don't have to worry about them anymore.

Stop it, Dan. Just stop it.

They did their job. They were uplifted into the new handbook. They live properly where they live now, and the handbook is a happy document for us as practitioners.

Would that be about right? Okay. So, any future Council discussions about the guidelines in that fashion don't have to happen, correct?

All right. Now, second point. The handbook is invested with a lot of information of about the program that is, quote, unquote, "varied," right?

And what the community desires are tools or techniques to unbury that measure -- to unbury those communications to be delivered to particular audiences, correct? Is that about right?

So, instead of Council working on new guidelines, quote, unquote, to update the

1996 guidelines, Council should invest its energy in sharpening this, what's been referred to, new marketing messages. Is that right? Did I get that right? Council, about right?

(Off-mic comment.)

MR. SHULER: Okay. I think that pretty much delivers what we wanted to do here. I think there might be other opportunities.

Dan. Speak.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. Yes, I think you guys are on the right track, and I certainly appreciate the discussion we've had and for allowing all this input into this.

Let me suggest that as you develop these guidelines, Council used to form working groups that were comprised of Council Members as well as those from the community.

Let me suggest that you pull that wisdom from the community from all aspects, library directors, regionals, selectives, law

librarians, you know, the whole gamut that we run of institutions in this program.

I don't -- I'm not suggestion you form a committee of twelve or anything like that, and have food and all that stuff, but you know, at least solicit some wisdom from the community so that, as you develop these guiding document, make sure you cover all your bases again so that we don't have to have this discussion again in another year or two, or a decade, for that matter.

MR. SHULER: The sense I get, it may be a document and it may be several documents. So -- and I don't think they're going to be guidelines. I think we're pretty much over that. I hope.

Okay. Does -- anything else, then, that we need to bring to bear on this?

I hate to think of the idea that we would have actually 20 extra minutes. It's such a waste.

Well, hell, we did good. Let's go get some coffee. I'm sorry. Sorry, Jim.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon the above-entitled matter went off the record from 9:43 and resumed at 10:33 a.m.)

MR. PRIEBE: Okay. I think we're going to go ahead and get started. My name is Ted Priebe, the director of library planning and development.

We've got a good session on authentication for you today and I just wanted to give you a little background on what our objectives are in this session.

Lisa Russell, who is the manager of our library -- excuse me -- content management unit, is going to give you an overview, and that's going to consist of talking about where we started, some background in terms of authentication for those of you that haven't had a lot of exposure to it, and then we're going to close out with some assumptions and questions that we're going to start off with Council to get perspectives on, and then open it up to the audience.

So, we should have a member from our PMO to talk about FDsys if you've got questions in that regard, as well as one of our technical security folks in terms of how we implemented the PKI technology.

So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Lisa. Thanks, everybody.

MS. RUSSELL: Thanks, everybody, for coming this morning.

I should start by apologizing. I'm a little congested today, so if anybody asks a question and I have to then sort of take a deep breath in and let it out slowly before I answer. Please don't take that as an editorial remark on your question.

GPO is engaged in the major authentication initiative designed to assure users that information made available by GPO is official and authentic and that trust relationships exist between all participants in the electronic transaction.

This initiative which employs PKI or Public Key infrastructure technology will

allow users to determine that the files are unchanged since GPO authenticated them.

For almost 150 years GPO has been the official disseminator of the government publications and has assured their authenticity.

In the 21st Century the increasing use of electronic documents poses special challenges in verifying authenticity because digital technology makes such documents easy to alter or copy, leading to multiple nonidentical versions that can be used in unauthorized or illegitimate ways.

You can think of this -- if you heard the story of -- you know, in the print world you used to get something in an envelope that you would open and it came from GPO. You could verify that it was authentic and that it hadn't been changed because it has a fixity on the page. It hasn't been altered.

GPO's charge is to meet the challenge of the digital age. GPO has begun applying digital signatures to certain

electronic documents on GPO access that not only established GPO as the trusted information disseminator, but also provide the assurance that an electronic document has not been altered since GPO has disseminated it.

The visible digital signatures on online PDF documents serve the same purpose as a handwritten signature or a traditional wax seal on printed documents.

A digital signature with at GPO seal of authenticity verifies document integrity and authenticity on GPO online federal documents at no cost to the user. And here we see a shot of the actual seal.

So, how does it all work? GPO uses a digital certificate to apply a digital signature to PDF documents. The digital certificate is issued by a certificate authority or CA upon receiving proof of identity.

A certificate path, certification path between the certificate and the CA must be established to validate the signature. You

can think of this as sort of a driver's license. You have to prove your identity to get a driver's license, and the same thing happens with the certificate.

So, to continue that -- that comparison, John Doe lives in the State of Iowa, he goes to the Iowa Department of Transportation to get his driver's license, and the State of Iowa grants the Department of Transportation the authority to grant a driver's license.

In the same way, the Superintendent of Documents gets our certificate from the GeoTrust CA who gets their authority to grant that certificate from Adobe Root CA.

Next, I'm going to take you through a few slides that tell you a little bit about the validation process in Adobe Reader Acrobat or Reader Acrobat 7.0.

When you open a digitally-signed file in an Adobe Acrobat or Reader 7.0, you'll see this dialogue box. The blue ribbon will let you know that the digital document has not

been modified since it was certified, and if the digital signature is valid.

You can see that the blue ribbon up on the top of the document at the background.

You can also see it in the window that shows the status.

If you click on signature properties to see more about the signature. This tells you that the document certification is valid.

You probably can't read it very well from where you're sitting, but do you see the blue ribbon up at the top, that tells you it was signed by the Superintendent of Documents, that -- the reason is that GPO attests this document has not been altered since it was disseminated by GPO.

It also gives the validity summary that says the document has not been modified since it was certified. The identity is valid and that it's time-stamped.

If you'll click on the document tab, that will tell you a little bit more

about the certification on the document.

Here again, you see the blue ribbon. You see that this is document version 1 of 1, some additional versioning information, and it tells you that it has not been modified.

If you click on the signer tab to find out more about the signer, here it tells you the identity is valid, signed by the Superintendent of Documents. There's additional information. A lot of the same kind of stuff that you've seen in the previous windows.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

If you click the show certificate button, it will actually show you the certificate that used to siqn the was document.

This dialogue box allows you to view the details of the certificate and it also shows you the chain, like we showed in that comparison to a driver's license that shows you it was signed by the Superintendent of Documents who got the certificate from

GeoTrust who got their authority from the Adobe Root CA.

If you click on okay, it will close all the dialogue boxes. Here you just see the document with a signature on it, see what it looks like.

If you right-click on validate signature, you can actually validate the signature to find out if the signature is valid. You can think of this sort of as, you know, if you give someone your driver's license to get into a building to prove your identity, they'll look at it and say, "Okay. It looks good. We'll let you in."

If, on the other hand you get stopped by the police, they might take it and run it to find out, you know, if you have any outstanding warrants or anything. That's a little bit extra validation checking on that.

So, if you right-click you'll get this box that says the document certification is valid and it was signed by the Superintendent of Documents and has not been

modified since it was certified.

And the blue ribbon, again, that lets you know that the document has not been modified since it was certified.

If you click on the right, the signature tab on the left-hand side you'll see a little bit more about the signature. Again, it shows you that it was signed by the author. It shows you the blue ribbon signed by the Superintendent of Documents, and so forth, and you see the document itself in the right-hand side.

And then, again, we're back to just seeing the document itself.

I'm not going to go through the whole process with Adobe Acrobat 8.0 because it's pretty much the same process, but it looks a little bit different, so I'm just going to show you the first screen so you can see how it looks different.

When you open a digitally-signed file in Adobe Acrobat or Reader 8.0, you'll see this pink box across the top instead of

the blue box. And again, you see the blue ribbon and it tells you that it was certified by the Superintendent of Documents and that the signature is valid.

So here you can see all of the different validation icons that you can get.

Obviously we want you to see the blue ribbon.

If you see anything else, that could mean that there's something wrong with the file.

One thing you may run into is that if you have a file and you're opening it with -- with Adobe Acrobat 7.0, since -- if you don't have an internet connection it actually checks -- goes over the internet to check your validation in that case.

And so, in 7.0 if you don't have an internet connection you'll get this question mark that tells you that the validity is unknown because it hasn't been able to make that validation check.

The check mark below it is what you'll see if something has been signed, but not certified. When we certify a document,

we're actually locking it down so that no changes can be made.

And when we put stuff up on GPO access, we're signing and certifying, but if you had something that was just signed, but not certified and it was valid, you would get this icon.

The question mark in the top right-hand column indicates that the signature could not be verified. This is what you'll get again similar to the person with the question mark. If there's no internet connection and you can't validate the signature you'll get that icon.

The warning sign below it is where
-- is what you'll get if the document has been
changed, and then the red icon below that
indicates that the certification is not valid
and obviously you don't want that.

So, that's kind of how it works, and now I'm going to go into some of the --some of the issues and how -- that we've run into than when we're implementing.

GPO access currently uses WAIS search technology. The resources on GPO access have a number of different scenarios. Some of them are text only. Some of them are PDF only. Some of them are both, PDF and text.

Additionally, some of them have search features. Some of them have browse features. Some are both. And there are also some differences in the data structure.

The GPO access resources basically have two sort of major scenarios that affect the search and retrieval. In one situation there's a one-to-one relationship between the file residing on the server and the file that's retrieved by a user.

An example of this scenario is the public and private laws application. Each law is stored as a separate file and the whole file is retrieved when the user requests it.

The other scenario, the content is stored in large files, and a section of the file is pulled out when the user requests it.

An example of this is the Federal Register.

Each issue is stored on GPO servers as three to five large files. If a user requests a proposed rule, the pages for that rule will be extracted from the large file and a temporary file is created and retrieved for the user.

When content is stored as a large file and the requested content is extracted for retrieval, this extraction breaks the signature. So, if you think about it, you're really changing the file by taking a piece out and making a new file out of it. So, that breaks the signature, so we can't effectively sign those.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Some of the that resources structured in this way in WAIS are also available through browse table а retrieves the whole files and do not have -do not break the signatures during retrieval.

So, in those cases we could sign the files that are available through browse, but not the files that are available through

search.

Providing digitally-signed content through the browse function and unsigned content through the search function of the same resource could confuse users.

In addition, the staff time required to manually break down large files into small files that could be retrieved whole is prohibitive.

GPO currently does not have the processes in place to automate that process. So, how have we dealt with these issues? GPO has adopted the approach of implementing authentication first on the applications that are already structured with a one-to-one relationship, because we are able to do those without having to change what's in the database at all.

GPO is also talking to content originating agencies to get permission to authenticate their content on GPO access.

GPO initially approached Congress and the Office of the Federal Register or OFR

about authenticating their content on GPO access.

Discussions with OFR originally centered on the Federal Register until the data structure issues caused us to consider the public and private laws to be a better first application to sign.

In May 2007, GPO launched a beta 110th Congress Authenticated Public and Private Laws Application. And here we've got a screen shot of it. You can see where you can go in and search, and if you scroll down you'd see a browse function, and there's also a big box in the left-hand column that says provide feedback so that people could go take the survey and tell us what they thought about it.

The beta Application included unsigned text files and digitally-signed PDF files of public and private laws passed during the 110th Congress.

This was a WAIS application with the same look and feel as the previously-

existing public and private laws application. The existing public and private laws application contains the text files and the unsigned PDF files and will continue to be available covering the 104th through the 110th Congresses and it was still available on GPO access.

In order to enable the beta site, GPO staff manually signed the PDF files before they were ingested into the application. No additional applications or Congresses were to be authenticated until digital signing could be automated by a system that was under development, and you'll hear a little bit more about that in a minute.

This approach allowed for testing of the technology and analysis of user feedback before full release. There was a link from the application web page to a survey to collect feedback. That was that big button that we saw down on the left-hand corner.

After successful automation of digital signing and a production site for the

110th Congress Authenticated Public & Private Laws, GPO would begin signing and implementation of an additional Congresses and applications.

GPO plans to sign from the 110th Congress forward or from 2007 forward for all GPO applications with PDF files, and this is just to give a consistent starting date because the 2007 is the first year of the 110th Congress.

So, now we're up to the automated - automation of the process. And GPO applied
an automated PDF signing system in January of
2008.

The APS system allows GPO to automate the digital signing of PDF files so that PDF files can be efficiently signed and posted on GPO access.

The first application of this system was to digitally sign the PDF files for the FY 2009 E-Budget on GPO access, which was released in February 2008. And for that we signed 389 files with the APS within a matter

of minutes.

This is a slide that we like to show, you know, the handshake between GPO and OMB on the signing of the budget. You can see Public Printer and the head of OMB shaking hands in front of the cover of the budget. You know, everybody's happy, so we like that.

GPO deployed the automated signings. Okay. So, this just shows a screen shot of the budget as it is now. We've got mostly the same text as we had before.

We added a paragraph that says, you know, starting with 2008, we're authenticating. If you scroll down you'd see that the 2009 is available there and the 2008 foreword is also available, but not -- not authenticated.

GPO's second use of the APS system was to integrate it into the workflow for the beta release of the authenticated public and private laws for the 110th Congress on GPO access.

Once that was up and running

successfully, and we had all of the -everything worked out with that, that database
was integrated into the existing application.

And here you just see a screen shot of the public and private laws. And again, you see that little paragraph that says, "Starting with the 110th Congress, we're authenticating the files here."

So, what are the next steps? We're working through the resources with the one-to-one data structure first. We're also planning to sign for the 110th Congress or from 2007 forward for all GPO access applications with PDF files.

outdated. It was -- it was true when we signed it, but we've got an update on it. GPO's in discussions with the House and Senate regarding signing of the bills and if you heard Ric speak earlier, we have an agreement with them to go ahead and sign the bills starting -- yes.

And we're going to do a soft launch

probably in November where we're going to set up a beta. We're going to do it a little bit different than what we did with the public and private laws because of the number of files that are available.

With the public and private laws we were able to do the beta so that we're automatically updating as new laws came in. But the bills have a much larger number of files out there, so that doesn't work as effectively.

As of -- just to give you an idea, as of six o'clock last night, there were 329 public and private laws from the 110th Congress, as opposed to 19,502 bills. So, that would be double work on our productions staff, so we decided not to take quite the same approach.

What we're going to do, instead, is to have a test database that has roughly 100 to 250 sample files out there that will be representative of all the different versions of the bills that people can use and take a

look at and give us some feedback on it. And, again, we'll have a link to a survey with that.

And then the plan is to have a hard launch in January with the beginning of the new Congress, and at that time, in order to be consistent, we'll also put out signed versions of the 110th Congress and then work forward in the 111th Congress.

So, this slide just shows that we've got an authenticated webpage, gives you the URL, it's www.gpoaccess.gov/ authentication/.

That has links to the E-Budget and the public and private laws. When we get the bills signed, that will also be out of there. It also has slide presentations describing the validation process and Adobe Acrobat Reader Version 7.0 and 8.0. A lot of that is the stuff that I covered earlier.

And there's also some general information on authentication, including definitions and many terms.

And with that, I'll turn it over for the assumptions.

MR. PRIEBE: And -- this is Ted Priebe, GPO. Before I introduce Dr. Chris Greer who, from Council, will be running those assumptions and questions for Council and the audience.

I just wanted to take a brief break. We've covered a lot of ground there, but we wanted to be a little more pragmatic in showing you just some examples of what we did, where we started and where we're at now and then where we're going.

So, before we jump into those assumptions or questions I wanted to give at least Council and then the audience an opportunity if you wanted to clarify or have any confirmations from GPO on a lot of what we showed there.

David.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
California State Library.

Lisa, I believe that you said that

if you don't have an internet connection and you attempt to display an authenticated document, that the icon will change. Now, does this also apply to documents that have been saved, say, to one's hard drive, if you open that document again, will --

MS. RUSSELL: It depends on what version of Adobe Acrobat that you're using. If you're using 7.0 and it's been saved on your hard drive, if you have a live internet connection, when you open it up, you're going to get the blue ribbon.

If you don't have the live internet connection, you're going to get that person with the question mark.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And if you have a later version, what --

MS. RUSSELL: If you have Adobe 8.0 or later, you don't need the internet connection. Actually, when we were testing this, at one point I unplugged my laptop from the wall and was running around the office going, "See, it works. It works."

So, I can verify that you can -you actually can validate without an internet
connection in 8.0.

MR. PRIEBE: Katrina.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Two quick
questions. One, how far -- so if you have

questions. One, how far -- so if you have something, an older version of Adobe before 7.0, will this appear, like 5.5?

MS. RUSSELL: You can -- it works

in 6.0. 5.0, I'm not sure about. The problem with 6.0 is that we'd recommend 7.0 or 8.0 because there are some additional steps in 6.0 that you have to take to go in and say, yes, I trust the certificate, which we thought would confuse users.

So, if you use 7.0 or 8.0 you won't have to go through those additional steps.

MS. STIERHOLZ: But the files do open and they --

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MS. STIERHOLZ: -- do function.

The second question, just remembering the old
days when we would get these little sheets of

errata. When you have to make a change in a document, do you make the change in the document and note that there's been a change, or do you issue an errata?

You know, your thing said it had never been changed. I just thought a --

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Depending on a specific example that you might have, that's really dependent on the publishing agency and how they choose to disseminate that update.

For GPO, if it's an application that we're posting, whether it's that entire document that's updated, it's really not our choice on how an agency would update their content.

So, it could be, I think, a couple different scenarios.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. I think a couple of examples of that are there are -Congress has star prints which let you know that it's been modified. I know there are some cases with some Department of Justice

publications where they've got PDF files where they've put a little post-it stickie note on there that says, you know, we've changed --we've done some recalculation and figured out that this -- the year isn't quite right, and this is the new figure or whatever.

So, different agencies will do it a little bit differently.

MR. PRIEBE: Lisa.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois at Chicago. Maybe this
is better approached under the assumptions,
but I'm going to throw it out anyway.

Is authentication through the GPO system, both present and future, an option for the user?

Because, as a practicing librarian,

I understand the importance of authentication
in certain moments of our interactions with
our public, but the ad hoc nature that you
just described with Adobe Acrobat and
everything else, downloading and opening, a
lot of our users are going to be very

confounded by that.

And if all the documents that are going to be embedded in the GPO system are going to be infested with that kind of opportunity, let's say, I see it as a step backwards, embracing fully the idea of authentication and trust and validation.

But, given the -- the somewhat still we're making -- we're forming this as we go along, I can see that there is going to be a point of conflict between what our users want.

And I may point out, in light of our conversation this morning, another level of authentication, as indicated by Denise yesterday, is using a government documents librarian in a depository, and sometimes that form of authentication is enough for 80 percent of our traffic.

So, I want to just raise that as an issue.

MS. RUSSELL: I think Ric wanted to say something on this.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Yes, the goal in this process is to think of it in terms of the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval, you know, when you get something and you see the Good Housekeeping Seal, it's there, but you want it to sort of fade into the background.

The trick in this is to make sure that for persons who need to cite this information for legal purposes or historical reference purposes, particularly, you want to make sure that it's there and the integrity mark is available, but at the same time, you don't want it to be in any way obtrusive.

You have the ability right now, when you first encounter this to click a check box and check off so it's not as obtrusive when you open it in the future.

So, I think that's -- we're kind of doing a delicate balancing act there. I also want to make a point that Lisa made this sound pretty dog-gone easy but, you know, as you've heard about waste, and we all know and love it

so well, we've essentially taken a 21st Century technology and applied it to an 18th Century -- maybe 19th Century search engine.

And I think it's going to be a lot easier when we do launch under FDsys and you have the fast capability. I think we'll have more options to make it less obtrusive for those who don't want to bothered with it in the future.

MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State University. I'd like to go back to the nomenclature of who the author is. Am I understanding that the author in this application is GPO, which is really the publisher.

But what I'm getting at is, the author in the case of the bills and the public laws would be the Legislature, the Congress. So, at what point do they weigh in and say "This is the document that is the true manifestation of the information in the document we want to transmit"?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. What

we did as part of this first effort is to authenticate the information as coming from the Government Printing Office as being authentic.

We're basically saying from the time it left the Government Printing Office, the Superintendent of Documents is certifying the fact that you can trust the information.

When Mary Alice stood up and talked about some of the things during the opening session about what our long-term strategy is and what we're going to do under FDsys, we're going to establish full chain of custody full provenance, so what we want to do is reflect essentially in the equivalent of the metadata of the PKI signature, that full chain of custody, a recognition that the content is digitally signed and certified from the point that it's created by the content originator, passed to GPO, GPO is validating it from the point it left GPO to you as the end user.

We didn't really publicize this that much, but that entire chain of custody

and provenance actually happened with the budget this year. OMB digitally took our PKI and digitally signed the files, submitted them to us in a secure fashion over a network, and then revalidated them.

So, we've had, in addition to our authentication effort, our first full chain of custody effort with the budget.

MS. TROTTA: And, Ric, Tory again.

And is that the model for the future?

MR. DAVIS: Absolutely. When Lisa LaPlant gave the presentation yesterday on FDsys and she talked about digital deposit and being able to digitally sign a document when it's ingested into FDsys, associated it with the unique ID. That's the plan for the future. We want that full chain of custody throughout the information lifecycle.

DR. GREER: Ric, while -- Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. As many of the agencies began doing their own authentication process and had their own PKI structures, is it the intention as you cite

that they would continue when things are coded, for GPO to use your PKI authority or their own?

MR. DAVIS: With PKI you have -Ric Davis, GPO. With PKI you have a lot of
options. You don't necessarily have to use
our PKI that we have physically in place at
GPO.

As a certification authority we offer the capability to provide digital certificates to other agencies, but we're part of the federal bridge, which I know you know about, Chris, as part of the PKI effort, so we're collaborating with other partners.

So, if you choose to use, you know, the PKI incidents program through GSA or something through a private sector vendor like MicroSoft, we have cross functionality with our PKI.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I'm not sure, maybe I misunderstood what John was saying, but I don't think I agree that this is in any

way obtrusive or confusing to users.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think -- I agree with what Ric said, that it's unobtrusive, it's just a little blue ribbon, and I'll wager that most people who are not looking for a certificate of authenticity wouldn't even notice it.

MR. SHULER: Т meant --Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. meant the description, the discussion over the Adobe Acrobat versions as an introduction to problems with formatting that I have -- as a librarian practicing for 25 years, it's a very difficult moment with the user when they can't open up the format, for any number of reasons, but if this process is still in formation and it introduces another complexity in the format issues, I would want it not as an option at this point until they've worked out those issues.

I'm not saying it's a bad idea, in general, for authentication or that authentication gets in the way, I'm talking about the mechanism that was just described to

us as being a problem, and that's what I was asking for, an option out if that is still an issue, technologically, until we work it out.

That's what my point was.

MR. PRIEBE: Is the audience -- nothing more from Council --

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake Forest Law. I've got two or three small questions. And the first one is really simple. Why did you go from a blue ribbon in Adobe 7 to a pink ribbon?

I mean, if you're branding it as the blue ribbon, you know, certification -- are you going to change colors every time we have new version of Adobe?

MS. RUSSELL: That's actually part of the Adobe software, so it's not anything we had any input.

MS. PARKER: I'm sorry.

MS. RUSSELL: The ribbon itself actually isn't changing color, it's just the box that tells you about the -- about it.

MS. PARKER: Well, yes. It's just

not --

MS. RUSSELL: And you can -- as Ric said, there's an option when you go into it that you can click a box that says "I don't want to see this pop-up box anymore."

MS. PARKER: Okay. And following up on Katrina's question: And you're not two things yet, that are like this, but we -- I think what we need to understand is: If you have a document -- and we'll use a Supreme Court case as an example.

In print, the first issuance was a slip opinion. Then they pulled those together into a pamphlet and they might have made some changes. But the real final official version wasn't till it was in the bound volume.

Well, if you went to a library you could put your hands on each one of those pieces and see if there had been any changes, but you knew that that bound volume was what you got to rely on.

Now, if you have a document that's going to be ingested into the system, and it

starts, and then they make a change and they send you, you know, the second version of that document, then they send you that third version.

Many legal researchers and historical researchers are going to want to see all those three. And I understand, if an agency says you have to match them all together, don't leave any of the old pieces out there, you have to do that.

But if you're allowed to leave version one, version two, version three, number one, are you going to identify those in some way and, two, are you going to then tie them together so that somebody who, you know, today goes and picks up a document and what they got was piece one and what they needed was piece three, that they're not just hanging out there.

MS. RUSSELL: I believe -- I don't know if Lisa LaPlant wants to address this, but there are requirements in FDsys to sort of link those --

MS. PARKER: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: -- different documents together. There's also in Adobe Acrobat, if you do have all three of those versions, you can pull them up and see what the differences are.

MS. PARKER: Okay. Okay. Because that will be really critical. And that's what you were trying to get to, more or less? Yes. Okay. Thanks.

MS. LaPLANT: Hi, Lisa LaPlant, GPO.

The intention is to -- that all of those documents would be ingested into FDsys and they're all separate packages so, you know, as the slip opinion comes out, all the way up to when it becomes in the bound record, that those would be made available if that's the policy decision that GPO chooses to go with.

Technologywise, we could make all of those available and we can have the document relationships between them to say,

"This one became this one, became this one."

MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University of Delaware.

Recognizing that GPO access, as currently standing, contains, I think, many versions of Adobe files. Many different Adobe versions, I mean, that have been in use over the years.

And I remember some years ago the implicit promise was these will be migrated forward as need, you know, arises. You know, we're now on Acrobat 8. I think there's some people that may have a beta version of nine. I'm not sure.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

But, move forward, as we things are less readable, and at some point you all will probably have to migrate some of your earlier files forward, and I would like know if you will somehow have to revalidate, since if you migrated forward, it strikes me that this will have to warn you that the file's been changed, and I wondered if you could discuss that a little bit.

MR. PRIEBE: We have, actually -Ted Priebe, GPO. We have certainly had that
discussion internally, particularly with older
PDF files and our current APS signing system
in terms of version X, Y, Z or older that we
would need to bring that up into a common
level before it would be digitally signed and
authenticated.

So, in terms of that transition of -- sorry. Okay. I got thrown off there.

So, is your question more in terms of when we make that migration before digitally signing? Is that associated in the metadata so that there is a mechanism to record that that action occurred, if I'm understanding your question correctly?

MR. STEVENSON: Well, it actually is two different things. You know, the ones that weren't digitally signed I imagine that you'll want to say this is a legacy file, but we say it's authentic.

But, I guess my biggest concern is that something that you create now with this

Congress and it's valid today and everybody can see the blue seal of approval, if you migrate that one forward at some point, Adobe will probably want to warn people that this has been altered since it was originally signed, and I wondered if you have any thoughts as to you will double-sign it? You'll have one thing that says it's been altered and then another signature that says, but it's okay, it was done by us.

MR. PRIEBE: Got you. Do you want me to take it or --

MR. DAVIS: Let me try. Okay. All right. That's a good question. Ric Davis, GPO.

Let me back up for just a second. One of the things that we are going to do going forward as well, recognizing that technology changes and the Adobe of today may also be the something else of 20 years from now, is we are also going to keep in our archived collection an unaltered, unsigned version.

You know, our plan is, as technology changes over time, and digital signature technology becomes replaced by something else, we're going to need to be able to migrate that forward as well.

I think one of the things that we need to do as well is, we've got -- we do have a lot of older, you know, PDF files on GPO access that we're looking at as part of this migration to FDsys.

A lot of files were created that you and I have talked about, John, as press optimized or print optimized files, not screen optimized files, so we need to look at those as well.

But I think that is our game plan for the future. We want to keep an unsigned copy that we'll be able to migrate into the future if technology changes and causes us problems in migrating the already signed version.

I think the one thing we don't want to do, though, is we're not going to have

multiple screen displays and multiple types of signatures over time.

I think what we can do to get at your second point is, is as technology changes reflect those changes in the metadata associated with the file, but the key to the future is going to be the seal authentication and we want the technology to fade behind the scenes as we take care of migration and refresh.

Does that help?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. STEVENSON: Yes. Thank you very much.

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker. One more from your earliest example. You said that you'd put off doing something like the Federal Register because it's a lot of files, instead of one.

But I would like to understand where we're headed with that because, as I heard what you said, you can authenticate the entire day's Federal Register, but if all I need is the one regulation that's relevant to

what I'm dealing with out of that, I can't print it off and have it show that it's authentic.

I'd have to print off the entire day's issue to be able to take it in to court and say, "I've got an authentic version of this regulation."

And, clearly, that's not what we want to do in the long run. So, am I correct in assuming that that's the problem you're having to work with, how you can digitally sign a piece that's been pulled out of a larger file?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The challenge that we have right now is we're able to authenticate at the full document level. So, you take an issue of the Federal Register or an 800-page congressional hearing, you have that authentication for the full document.

MS. PARKER: Right.

MR. DAVIS: But, as you mentioned, the key is being able to take a piece or a part out and that's what -- when Lisa was

giving her presentation yesterday, she talked about granular authentication that we're looking to enable through FDsys.

We want to be able in the future to not have to take the entire document, but to take down to a paragraph, a sentence level, a section level, to take that, have the authentication come out and carry forward, and that is our plan for the future.

MS. PARKER: Okay. And that's just further down the road. Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: Just to add to that - Lisa Russell, Government Printing Office.

To add to that a little bit, we -- actually for the -- for the budget is set up where we can pull out smaller files in the earlier versions.

This year, in order to make the authentication work, my staff and I went through and manually separated out the files. It took the three of us two and a half days to do that. So, it's not feasible to do it on a day-by-day basis.

MS. LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant from GPO. And actually going forward, one of the things that we're planning in the workflows for the first public release taking those files and actually physically breaking up of the granule file so you'll actually have the individual Federal Register notice in PDF and also in text in preparation to be able to put those digital signatures on it.

And, actually, breaking up those files is something that's part of the automated process within the workflow so we won't have somebody having to sit and chop up the files for X number of hours.

DR. GREER: Lisa, before you go, Chris Greer, National Coordination Office.

That granularity you proposed for DFsys is the article level, not the sentence or paragraph levels. Do you intend, with the initial FDsys implementation to provide finer granularity authentication?

MS. LaPLANT: That is -- it's not

23

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the intention with the first release. With the first release we have the requirements to provide at more of that article or document type level.

And, really, the enabling technology to be able to get down to a lower level of granularity, both for the authentication and also for access is really making sure that we can have the documents in a format like XML where we can pull out at that lower level of granularity.

So, we do have those requirements in later FDsys releases, but for this one, we're sticking with the same level of granularity that's available on GPO access today.

MS. McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, UK.

Ric's comment about the archive having an unsigned copy reminded me that I've not heard much about a back-up site for GPO's archive.

Is there a second copy somewhere?

I think that's an authentication issue as well, if you've only got the one, corruption

and disaster can occur.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. In current state for GPO access, there is redundancy on multiple fronts. In terms of FDsys, when we get into that structure and disaster recovery, you know, I can't speak to that.

There are requirements for all of those things, so to answer your question, yes, today and as we move forward, redundancy is a key for us as well from the public access. It's not a one-stop archive, if you will.

MS. McANINCH: On different machines in different places, geographically speaking?

MR. PRIEBE: Yes.

MS. McANINCH: Okay.

MR. PRIEBE: Okay. Without any other questions, I'd like to introduce Dr. Chris Greer to go over some assumptions and questions that we've got.

DR. GREER: Okay. Thank you, Ted.

This process, as you've seen, is

challenging. So, GPO is to be commended for taking this on. It's a tough workflow and data management challenge. There's a lot to it, and so they're showing real leadership at the government level, and I appreciate all that your team is doing to make this possible.

In the process of implementing this kind of capability, there are many, many choices that have to be made. There are lots of options, lots of ways in which this can be done. And so they're sort of working their way through this trying to figure what works, what's appropriate.

And so, this session is really important for them to make some fundamental decisions about how to proceed in this very early phase.

So, these assumptions or the assumptions that they have made so far that they need some feedback from you on, and so we'll go through them and get some input from Council and from the audience about how they work.

So, this first one is a very basic assumption that the authentication mark should be visible in the printable image area of the document on the very first page.

So, can we get some input from Council on this basic assumption? I would point out that this isn't a simple -- it seems like a no-brainer, but it actually isn't quite that simple.

For example, the -- what's being authenticated is the digital file. All right. So, if you print out a copy, a hard copy of that file and it has this little blue mark on the top, that hard copy is not authenticated. It can be altered in lots of different ways.

So, I think a concern is avoiding the impression that when I print this out and it has this little blue seal on it that that is authenticating the hard copy that somebody is holding.

And so, I would be concerned that that seal provide an indication that this is an authentication of the digital object.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. So, I was thinking just now, well, why not, you know, put the seal on every page so that if someone was to, you know, what they really wanted to do is show someone page three of ten in a, you know, a 10-page PDF, that they could still have that seal.

But I suppose -- maybe that doesn't -- maybe that's not the issue after all, if what we are talking about is what's really being authenticated that, you know, the actual digital document, in which case, you know, you're not -- not going to be pulling pages out of that -- you know, extracting pages from that document.

So, as long as it -- the intention is, you know, that it's that one thing is what's being authenticated, then page one is there with the authentication seal and everything. It shouldn't be an issue, right?

DR. GREER: Yes. It's important to remember that what's being authenticated is

the whole file, and not a page-by-page or item-by-item.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Chris, I just think this may not be the perfect answer, but it seems like a reasonable assumption.

DR. GREER: As a starting place to -- for them to make this choice. I think, from my perspective, if that object on the printable page indicates that this is an authentication of the digital file, then I don't have concerns about that.

An alternative, of course, is to have it appear on the -- on the screen image and not on the hard copy when you print it out. Is that something that is worth thinking about?

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. I want clarification on that. When you print the file, it will print the GPO seal with the eagle and all of that, but it actually does not print the blue ribbon?

DR. GREER: I don't remember the text that goes with the GOP seal -- says what?

MS. RUSSELL: The text in the -this message appeared. The text was actually
part of the seal says "Authenticated, U.S.
Government Information."

But if you open up the information on it there's a statement on there that says "This file has not been altered since it was signed by GPO" or words to that effect.

DR. GREER: So I guess my question is whether this text that appears on the seal "Authenticated U.S. Government Information," should that test be altered to indicate "U.S. Government Digital Information" or something of that sort?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair from the University of Hawaii. Ι'm thinking of this in terms of what we do for printed documents, and I don't know others do, but in our library we have certification that this is а сору document that was distributed by the Federal Depository Library Program.

So, we don't make any guarantees

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about, you know, whether it was altered between the time GPO shipped it to us and the time it ended up on our shelf, but we're simply saying this is out -- the best of our knowledge, this is the provenance of this document, and maybe that's what's needed in the -- whatever prints out on the document is here is the provenance of it, but this is the source that you need to go to verify authenticity.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One of the things that I would encourage us to kind of shy away from is doing any wordsmithing on the logo or the language that appears directly on the logo.

It took about six months and 50 versions to get approval on that and we've actually trademarked it, so we got it out there and we've used that.

What I do think we can do wordsmithing, though, is we have a lot room on that underlying metadata that I talk about associated with the digital signature, and

that's a space that we can play with.

DR. GREER: Ken.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. I guess I go back
to, you know, who's this for. I mean, the
basic user wants a copy of something to walk
away with.

If they're concerned about, you know, submitting it in court, I mean, there's some different levels there.

As the depository you may need to certify something, then you need to know -- you need to see that certification and understand it.

Walking out with something printed,

I mean, somebody's going to figure out how to

do that, you know, make a copy of that little

logo as well.

So, the logo doesn't mean much on the printed page necessarily, but I think as a depository librarian, being able to say, yes, that is a legitimate document is more -- because we don't have it on the shelf, we have

it, and how do we know -- what are we certifying to, because we certify a lot of documents.

So, I think it's like who's this intended for. The person walking out, they've got a little logo on the page, fine, but --

MR. SHULER: I think -- Jim Shuler from the University of Illinois at Chicago. That speaks a little bit to my earlier concern about these levels of authority that we're talking about here.

One could imagine a creeping legalality in throughout all our interactions with our public, and already we see this in this first assumption that we seem fairly comfortable with a digital signature assigned to a digital document, but what happens to that document as it migrates through its format environment.

Where does our authority authentication responsibility begin and end?

I would imagine in a very pragmatic way my responsibilities would end with the digital

version saying there it is, what you do with it is up to you.

And with the person that walks out of the library with it, it's on its own. I can't control it anymore at many levels.

My other question is: Just as we're raising the digital concerns over the authority of the digital documents, what are we doing to raise the bar on the printed documents coming out of GPO? Are they going to have a comparable seal of approval?

I know historically we have markers that indicate that it's official publication, but it seems to me that if you raise the bar in one format, you're going to have to raise the bar in all the formats.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think when Lisa gave her presentation yesterday, she talked about a Phase 4 where FDsys could enable time travel, and somewhere this fits in between at release three and time travel.

It's a good point. We've been

having discussions with a number of private companies about what digital sector signature means on a printed document coming from the government in terms of authentication, and we copying and making changes.

It's a technology that's still a bit in its infancy as well, but a copy of this seal on a printed document, to me right now doesn't mean the same as what we're making available through a digital copy, but it is something we've got to look at in between release three and time travel to enable the capability so that when you're receiving a copy from the government you can't just go out and, you know, pull up a laser jet with the latest software and manipulate it and make that change as well.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It has to have some type of validity going forward.

MR. SHULER: I'm just -- I just want to keep coming back to the point that the business of government documents librarians is

a very pragmatic one, and if our mission is to get government information to the people, that's what we should do.

If authenticity gets in the way of that traffic, then, yes, authenticity is an issue, at least with this practicing documents librarian.

And I think we need to keep that in mind as we talk about this.

DR. GREER: Ted.

Ted Priebe, GPO. MR. PRIEBE: brief add to One of had one that. benefits that we have at our disposal in applications that we authenticate via GPO is access, FDsys, have about we an authentication link, and one of the things that we can do is perhaps provide even a bit more detail to further strengthen the topics that you've put forward is the GPO is, you know, digitally signing the digital version and, you know, even add in some additional clarity on this -- on this front.

But clearly, the challenge was you

23

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

pull something down from any internet site, how do you know that it wasn't altered, and this was what we saw as one of GPO's core missions as we move forward, is to be able to give that trust relationship with the government agency to say it has not been altered, but it's only related to that electronic file as Ric has described.

So, I think we can really revisit what we have on that authentication page, and maybe add even additional clarity based on what you put forward. So, thank you for that.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I think this point is critical, and that is that in a distributed information area where I can get files from lots of sources, being able to check myself whether a file has some authority and some validity, empowers me significantly.

So, it's -- the individual user who also benefits from this, not just the librarian.

David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Going back to what Gwen said about printing out one of these authenticated documents and maybe handing it to somebody, it strikes me that this process is similar to those warnings on band-aids that say "Sterile until opened."

That, once you open a band-aid and put it on a kid, you know, it's sterile at that moment. But when the kid goes outside and plays in the dirt for while, it's no longer sterile.

And I think that the transitory nature of authentication is important to remember here that, you know, at certain moments the document is authenticated, it's on paper or whether it's fixed in a digital file on somebody's hard drive, but after it's taken off of the internet, you know, maybe it's no longer authentic after a certain period of time, depending on how it's handled, and who wants to alter it.

DR. GREER: Tim.

CHAIR BYRNE: I think in this assumption where it's asking whether the printable or the authentication should be on the first page of the document, I think if you're going to put it on the first page, it should go on every page.

It's kind of meaningless if just it's on the first page of the document whether the document itself is an authentic document, it's authentic from what it was printed from and you should see it on every page.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I guess I have the question, then, in the current paper realm, is the seal on every page of every document?

CHAIR BYRNE: No.

DR. GREER: No.

CHAIR BYRNE: Basically it's no.

DR. GREER: So that would be --

MR. WIGGIN: Tim Wiggin from Connecticut again. I mean, in a way this is misleading because I don't think the mark means anything. Really. I mean, it's -- the

authentication is in the certificate. That's what I want to see.

I mean, I want to -- as Chris said, you want to look and see where it came from. You could get the same document from four different places. Only one may actually have that certificate.

Putting something on a piece of paper -- I wouldn't want the user to walk away thinking, "Ah, I have an authentic document."

Because, if you slap something on a copy machine out of our print collection, you get the page. You don't get anything else on top of it.

So, I mean, this is kind of an interesting feature, but it's not really an authentication mark.

DR. GREER: No, it's not.

MR. PRIEBE: One last thing, I take responsibility for this discussion because part of this language in terms of what we drafted, our initial intent -- Ted Priebe, GPO -- was where to validate with Council and the

community, when we use the term in the printed image area, when you think of on your monitory and a full page screen image if you will, that you would see that logo.

Really didn't intend to drive it on that tangible angle of, hey, this is an authentic -- authenticated tangible output, it was more for the community to know when they go to GPO access and FDsys, they're going to pull up that image and they will see it on the image area of the page.

I guess the printed was an unintended consequence, although I think it brought forth some good issues that are helping us as well. So, I just wanted to clarify that was at least our intent, and I take responsibility for throwing this one all the way out.

DR. GREER: But I think this discussion's been valuable.

MR. PRIEBE: Yes. Anything else from Council?

MS. TROTTA: Well, I guess -- Tory

Trotta, Arizona State University, while the file is what's being authenticated, if there's going to be a mark it should be on the first page, but as the migration is to parts or whatever the discreet parts within a document are, then I would hope that authentication would be available for those parts also within the file.

MR. PRIEBE: Yes. Ted Priebe, GPO.

Next, that's the plan, is as those granular

pieces are made available they'd be on that

first page.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. Now that I think about it and, you know, the more we have this discussion, maybe -- maybe the logo should appear on every page so that if for nothing else, you know, let's -- you know, if someone does print -- you know, print the document and take it with them, at least what they have, then, is an indicator that there is an authenticate -- you know, on every page, you know, so even if you just -- all you've got in

your hand is page three of ten of this document, at least there is a -- there's a notation on that page that there is an authenticated digital version of this that, you know, that people can go and verify.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. My concern is that it implies that what you're holding in your hand is authenticated. Avoiding that implication is what my concern is, and I don't know the answer. I don't.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. And my question goes to the same thing. What are you trying to do here? Are you trying -- what are you trying to imply by having that image appear on a piece of paper.

And I think, one is, you will define that. What it means to me is it was printed -- assumption being, unaltered from the time you pressed the print button till it actually came out from an authenticated source.

That's all. Now, if a user asked

me what does that mean, I spout back again,
"It was printed from an authenticated source."

"Well, does that mean it's accurate and everything else?"

"It was printed from an authenticated source." That's all you can do.

If you go to the paper environment, you know, how did you know it was authentic? Well, it hadn't been taken apart and rebound. You know, the GPO on the very back officially printed what the GPO -- dah, dah, dah, dah, dah.

So, what are you trying to imply or communicate to your user when they see this on a paper image? I think once you do that, put it some place because of us will interpret it for anybody anyways.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. This is a question for GPO. Does the PDF file name appear at the bottom of each page? The URL for the PDF file, does it appear at the bottom of the page?

MR. PRIEBE: I don't believe -- Ted

Priebe, GPO. I don't believe so. Off of GPO access, if you launch a browseable PDF -- no. It does not.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis ALA. The reason I'm asking this is, if what we're trying to understand is where this document originated, the only way we know that is by having the URL to the file, once it's been printed.

So, having a brand at the top is lovely, but it's really about the source filename.

MR. PRIEBE: Let me take that back with me with the suggestion -- Ted Priebe GPO -- was potentially could GPO consider that as providing the filename or URL for the actual document. Okay.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I would second that. I think Denise's idea is an effort to try to tie the physical artifact to the digital one, that the physical artifact is a representation of a digital object, and by putting that URL at the

bottom, it allows the user to fall back to the source.

MS. SEARS: Chris. Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. I'm sorry, but
every single -- you know, I want to tie back
into what David said and what Steve said.

In the current environment and what we've been living in for over a hundred years with the statutes at large and the US Code, there is a bound volume, and on one page there's an authentication, and that's it.

And when somebody makes a print copy, it's certified that they made that print copy from a certified source right then, and we cannot guarantee that it's sterile past that.

And it doesn't say -- you know, it might say on it -- Denise with the URL, it might say on it "Statutes at large." I mean, it does give you -- say that you know that that's where it came from.

But, you know, putting an authentication on every single page, I really

just think that we're creating a lot of work.

It's never been there before, so why is it
now necessary?

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I guess I agree with you in the terms of complexity, but I don't want to add complexity where it's not adding value.

On the other hand, this authentication approach adds value in the sense that it allows a user anywhere, anytime to authenticate the digital object. And that's part of the vision of the strategic plan.

It's not to provide access anywhere, anytime to the community. This is a new kind of access where you can -- it's as if you could call up Ric Davis and say, you know, I'm a user, I have a copy here. Can you tell me if this is the original? You can do that in a digital sense here.

Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think it's a good discussion. I don't know if

we have consensus on it yet. I think it's a good discussion to continue. I will tell you that in conversations we've had with our federal agency partners, keeping in mind that GPO here is the publisher, we kind of operate on this a bit, too, at the wishes of the federal agencies serving as the content originator.

They've been a bit reticent thus far about having it appear on every single page. They've been very comfortable -- this is Executive and Legislative Branch conversations thus far, comfortable with it appearing on that first page in terms of the entire document.

I'm interested in our collaboration on this as we go forward and it's points I can take back to our federal agency partner for further discussion.

DR. GREER: Thank you, Ric.

Let's go on -- one more comment?

Go on to the second assumption.

This has to do with a focus initially on PDF,

given the capable of Adobe certification system, however, there are lots of files that have utility in form -- when they are in forms other than PDF, and so this says that, initially, those would be provided but, as I understand it, not for authentication, for certification. Is that correct?

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. Just to give you one idea of where this is coming from, with the budget, they have -- most of their -- most of their files are available with a PDF in a table format, and then there's also a spreadsheet that you can download and manipulate for your own use.

But they also had -- I think there were three files in there that were basically data dumps from databases that they had. And when they converted those spreadsheets to PDF in order to sign them and authenticate them, we ended up with something like 60 rows across and 300 rows down, and you end up with your headers across the top and your headers are down the side, but then if you want this page

here, you just get a bunch of numbers that don't mean anything because you don't have the headers.

So that -- even though, yes, that was authenticated, it wasn't really very useable. That was provided more so that people could use the spreadsheet and, maybe, benefit from that use.

DR. GREER: From Council?

MS. STIERHOLZ: I hadn't even thought. This is Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. So, the only kinds of files, really, you can authenticate, are text? PDF text documents. And are there no other digital signature vendors out there for other kinds of files?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Certainly they are working on that, but our assumption was really the validation that today, based on technology and where it stands, it's the PDF files that we can sign, but by no means are we going to constrain FDsys or the ability to sign documents as we

move forward as the technology matures.

MS. STIERHOLZ: I mean, I would just encourage you to seek out other kinds of certification, because that will be helpful.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think Ted covered this very well. The capability technologically exists right now to digitally sign PDF files and to take other file types and convert them to PDF.

It's called encapsulating the native file with a PDF wrapper and digitally signing that PDF format.

We've been working with the Program Management Office and others at GPO, and others in government to look for potential technology partners to be able to digitally sign other file formats.

I would say it's in its infancy right now, and we haven't found anyone that has stepped up to the plate, but we're continuing to talk to technology companies.

I think one way we might want to address it going forward is, you know, putting

out an RFI, request for information from the government through Federal Business Opportunities sometimes gets a response, but we've been talking to the National Institute of Standards, companies like Adobe, IBM, MicroSoft and others that sort of play in the space, and it hasn't been on their radar.

I think they see it now as being something that should be on their radar.

MR. HANNAN: This is John Hannan from GPO. I just want to amplify on what Ric said. The issue really isn't that there aren't techniques, it's that there are too many, and there's not a standardized way.

That's really the challenge for us at GPO. I work with Ric and others at GPO on this. So, that's really the issue, is there are too many to choose from right now, but I think we'll see some coalescence and consensus probably over time.

We're certainly helpful and looking to exploit that as we can so that it's effective for the community. So, we look

forward to continue to do that. I hope that helped amplify it a little bit.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. I guess I would second There are lots of custom solutions to that. this that businesses used out in the commercial realm, and so on, but not standard reader that would be available to just anybody out there, to your libraries or your patrons as well.

And it would be valuable for the Federal Government as a whole to explore the issue of standardized approaches.

Ric.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One final comment on that. That was one of the dilemmas that we faced in terms of being able to deal with PDF files. We did not want to put out any type of plug-in that you needed to use external to your browser.

We've been putting out stuff in PDF format and Adobe and other types of readers work with PDF files for years, but it's a

challenge that we don't want, you know, allowing the people at your libraries or our phones to light up the GPO about having to have some customized proprietary technology that may be here today, gone tomorrow.

So, looking at this in terms of dealing with other file formats and having standardization is critical.

DR. GREER: Okay. So I think we hear that the PDF approach now is one that is practical and is accessible. There are a lot of questions about how to do this in the future so that Council is going to have to stay engaged on this topic, particularly as FDsys moves forward.

The third assumption based on the GPO authentication process, documents will be -- will successfully authenticate using the free Adobe Reader.

This is a huge assumption, although

I can understand why -- why you made it.

Council.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National

Coordination Office. I guess the issue of versioning and forward migration we kind of touched on, I'm anxious to see over time GPO develop a systematic approach to forward migration of these technologies, so I think that this is something that, again, has to stay on the Council's radar.

John.

MR. SHULER: No. No.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

I guess I have a concern, though, specifically to this, but the whole migration issue. If an individual or a library downloads a file, and then continues to use that, and let's say they can do it offline with the new version 8, there's no need to go back and to check to see if there's a newer version necessarily.

So, how are depositories particularly going know that the copy they have -- unless they've continually checked.

So, I think there's some potential issues with

downloading these files locally and assuming that, well, it says it's got a certificate, it's okay. It may be four versions old by then.

Ted Priebe, GPO. MR. PRIEBE: Τ It's quess I'll take а shot. not professional librarian, but I think dilemma is comparable to what we have in the tangible world when you have a document, it was current at the time that you got perhaps from GPO or whatever method, but referencing bibliographic without that information to validate if there's a more recent version, the authentication solution that we have is really only providing you that assurance and it hasn't been altered since GPO authenticated, but it does not, in today's realm, provide that mechanism of a validation that it is also the most current.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So, it really is a part of the whole package of what's the value of a depository and having that mechanism with the bibliographic, I think, is still the critical

component of is it the most recent, as well.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

Then you may want to disable that feature. I mean, to be a pain in the neck of the local library, but if you can't go on line to validate it, you can't validate that version.

DR. GREER: Anything from the audience on this assumption? You're the ones who will get the questions when it doesn't successfully authenticate.

I look of resignation out there saying, "Yes, that's right."

Okay. Fourth assumption. When each new collection is authenticated, the library services and content management folks will review cataloguing and classification practice with that collection, and look into how to adapt to that.

And this is the issue, I think, that Ric brought up, and it relates to his focus on PDF files, different kinds of

collections will be more or less suitable to that approach, and it's going to have to be something that is solved over time as the technology migrates, would be my sense.

So, comments on this from Council?

I think this is related to the same issue we had -- we talked about before with respect to the choice of PDF as the way to go here.

Here's MicroSoft Windows, interrupting, as it often does. Anything from the audience on this?

(No response.)

DR. GREER: So, some questions here. First, this business of appropriate level of granularity, and this has to do with how the certification process actually works now.

It's a file-to-file, object-toobject comparison for authentication and
certification, and then in the future, that
technology may change, allowing dynamic
certification of content that's being

exported.

The choice at the moment is on the PDF file level, but I think that's technology-driven. Am I mistaken about that?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I would agree right now it's at the document level and it's technology-driven, and that's probably a good assessment of the current state.

And then as we look to the future, this is really the opportunity for additional discussion of where, you know, Council sees how far that should go. What is the appropriate level as the technology enables it.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I'll plead my ignorance of this whole technology, but one would almost think, sort of from a naive standpoint that you could certify things on the fly if they came from a certified repository.

So that if you put documents that

had been authenticated into a repository and then you're serving those up that the authentication would be based on where they are coming, you know, the URL or whatever they're coming from, so it could be on the fly authentication instead of this certifying each piece and part.

So, if I pull up a page, it came from an authenticated version. I mean, that's all I need to know.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago.

That's what I would call contextual authentication, and it's really what depository librarians have been doing for a century, over a century.

The relationship with the GPO means they got stuff from GPO, they housed the stuff in GPO, designated it as stuff from GPO, so that was a web of authentication. It wasn't legal authentication, but it was authentication that was good enough for, as I said, 80, 90 percent of the traffic.

And as we just talked about the legal authentication material, that has profound implications on the day-to-day practice of our business, and I embrace legal authentication when it is appropriate.

But I made the observation that not every single interaction with our public is a legally-bound interaction, and we've got to be able to have the flexibility to decide professionally when we have a legal relationship and when we just have simply a librarian relationship.

And I don't want the technology determining that for me. I want the option to choose.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination Office. In my mind, this potentially, as the technology matures, the potential for on-the-fly certification is an important thing to keep in mind for FDsys.

I think that that's a powerful enough capability that could be deployed in a lot of applications such that a significant

amount of the band width and the storage capacity of FDsys in the long run might well be devoted to certification authentication kinds of -- because it's so unique to GPO.

You know, it can't be provided any other way. That makes you the focus point if that capability expands and companies want to build a business model around validation of information.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. LaPLANT: Hi. Lisa LaPlant, I would encourage Council also to, as GPO. we, you know, from the technology standpoint, GPO will definitely continue to look and continue to investigate new technologies, but I would encourage counsel to take a look when you say "certification," what exactly, you know, what do you mean when you say "certification."

Are you meaning digital signatures, are you meaning information in metadata, is it some sort of secure transfer?

So, just kind of be thinking about, you know, what that certification means and what your needs are

and your patrons' needs are for that type of certification going forward. Thanks.

DR. GREER: Yes. Thank you, Lisa.

Chris Greer again, National Coordination Office. think, I for purposes of this discussion, we're focused literally on, is the information you have identical to the information that disseminated, as opposed to security and other issues at this point.

But, you're right. Down the road that question expands.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

From the audience on this question? MS. SINCLAIR: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. From the user's perspective, and going to the question of the appropriate level of granularity, I want you to go as low as you can go, because as a large research university, medium-sized or а university, research I can see creating digital products that incorporate materials at Northwestern, materials from our Africana Library and legislation around U.S. foreign policy with Africa.

And I want to create new products.

And the granule level is great, but in some cases, those granules are too big. So, I'd like to go as small as you can go.

Three is an issue of context there, and the user may lose the context, but I think that when we're saying "authentic," we don't mean that you're getting the full context, we mean you're getting the words.

And so, if you can get down to the sentence, excellent.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame, and I have concerns in the same way. John touched upon it. The library world has always had to spill over between the assumption that my users have that this is an authentic to this is an accurate.

And we all know from transcripts as to -- not within Congress, they're always highly-accurate. But what was said in the hearing, not necessarily is what came out in the printed word. What is the official text,

et cetera.

So, I have some concerns about -about the implied -- again, I'm back to what
are you trying to do here? I mean, if you're
trying to get it that, indeed, t-h-e between a
space and a space in this document is
accurate, authentic because that same space-th-e-space came from the document, the source
document.

Okay. It's going to be meaningless to my user. So, I think granularity has to stop some place because it is implied authenticity, also implies accuracy, and I don't think you can -- you're going to split hairs, but lawyers will split hairs.

So, I think you do have to draw a certain amount, I mean, in terms of where you want to imply this is an accurate rendition of the letters and spaces and punctuation.

Do you go down to three words? You know, do you stop at a capital ending in a period, meaning a sentence? You know, how do you do it?

I think you're going to have to fish or cut bait going -- we're not going to go too much further than it's a whole, and that's your problem to decide a whole what, document as defined by blah, blah, blah.

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake Forest Law, and I will speak for the people who actually have to have this stuff in as pristine a condition as it's possible for the government to provide it to us, because it's the primary source of the law that governs the actions of the people.

And the lawyers have to have it. We've had it on paper for the whole time that we've been a country. If the only official -- big O official, authentic version is going to be digital, unless everybody starts reading everything digitally in the courts, then we're going to be able to -- we're going to need to be able to take in an accurate representation of what that digital document is.

And as a general principle, whatever percentage of us are law libraries

who are providing this to lawyers to use for legal reasons, you know, we're a small percentage, but it is the coin of the realm in which we work.

And we must have it. We have no choice. And we're all working hard with everybody to say, yes, you can actually provide us a digital document, because GPO's figured out how to authenticate it, and make it available to us.

Otherwise, we are going to tie part of the documents to be imprinted in paper until the end of the time.

DR. GREER: Okay. So you've heard fairly clearly how important that is.

I think this is the last question.

What does Council expect from GPO upon launch
of FDsys related to Legacy documents? Do all
Legacy documents for the 110th Congress also
need to be authenticated.

And I think that last comment goes to this issue.

Council.

I hear a resounding "Yes" from across the Council.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. I mean,
particularly, if we get into scanning or
digitization projects we're going to have to
have a means to know that those were from -first of all, from an original document.

So, there is going to be a need, as things go up that we know they're as good as the paper one.

DR. GREER: Got a clear message on this question from the audience? I think probably the same message. Okay. Let me turn it back to Tim.

CHAIR BYRNE: I love it when they turn it back to me and I have nothing to say other than I think we can go to lunch.

I do remind everyone that we will be meeting here at 1:30 and continuing a discussion of the future of the FDLP and strategic planning.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled

matter went off the record at 12:05 p.m. and resumed at 1:34 p.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: This session, on the agenda, says it's for the Council to make recommendations, but we really have changed the intent of this one.

At our working session on Monday, we got into an extensive discussion on the future of the FDLP and strategic plan, and really felt that there needed to be a lot more discussion of that, so we devoted our working session to it last night and so we really don't have any recommendations. We want to continue that discussion.

So, I'm going to turn it over to Gwen to start it off.

MS. SINCLAIR: I am Gwen Sinclair with the University of Hawaii and I'm thrilled that there are so many people here for this session, because we were predicting that there would be about four.

So, I am expecting you all to participate and not just sit there, because

that's what we're here for. Counsel really wants to hear from the community about your thoughts on the strategic plan.

not have attended the session last night, we continued our discussion from Monday and I think I could fairly characterize last night's session as inconclusive, in that we don't really have anything more that we could point to you that we got consensus on than we had ended up with on Monday.

But what I hope that we can do at the end of this session is at least agree on some goals, because it's really important for the Government Printing Office folks to have some goals that they can use to build a strategic plan.

Whether that plan is for one year, two years or five years, they need to have something so that when they are going to the JCP, they can point to what the FDLP is all about and what we consider its priorities to be.

So, I hope that -- first of all, I guess I'd like to ask Council, is that something we think we can achieve today, or at least try, can we try to agree on some goals.

Okay. So, in talking with several of my fellow Council members, we keep going back to the vision and mission of the FDLP from whence the goals that were drafted that are in our packets came, and in case anybody needs to remember what those goals are, here they are.

So, when we had talked about them the other day on Monday, we did some -- well, people had things to say about the way these are worded. So, I'm hoping that what we can do is to get some consensus about what we do need to say in our goals, and how many goals are needed.

So, with that, I'd like to go back to our vision and mission and then the mission is achieved through and find out if we can at least agree on these, because these are the points out of which those four goals came.

So, at first I'd like to ask counsel: Is this something that -- that needs to be tweaked? Or, is it perfect in every way? Ken.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut. Well, without wordsmithing, I
mean, yes, I think some things need to be
tweaked, because we've separated -- we're
still talking of some old concepts.

I mean, collections of publications

-- there should be collections, and it could

be -- you know, and we talk about online

information below, but it could necessarily be

part of the whole piece.

I mean, just to throw it out, I was looking at three basic goals based on the pyramid that appears somewhere in what we received. And as developed new service models, developed new collection models and developed new communication programs, three kind of big picture things we need to do.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois at Chicago. Are you

saying, Ken, that we shouldn't focus on these, that you want to jump immediately to discussing those three goals you just stated?

MR. WIGGIN: Well, to me, missions are achieved by meeting goals, and if you're going to say these are goals, then we need to look at them. If we want to -- I'd say kind of ignore this -- the mission is achieved through.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. WIGGIN: Because I think that presupposes we, you know -- and it puts them in place of goals.

MR. SHULER: So, we're in agreement
-- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago -- we're in agreement, then, that the
four stated goals that were in the power
points for taking those off the table for a
moment and we're starting fresh. I just want
to make -- give an idea where we're going
here.

MR. WIGGIN: I was throwing that out. Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. I was throwing

that out. You can throw that out as well.

MR. SHULER: I'm confused as who's throwing who, but -- if we can agree as a Council that we're starting with a clean slate and that Ken has put new words on the slate, at least that is a start.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of Texas. The triangle that Ken's talking about is on slide ten, Gwen, and it does say at the top, new shape for the FDLP, so I do think those are words that they are looking at. If that's what they're looking at, then maybe our goals should be based on that.

MS. SINCLAIR: Other thoughts from Council about going back to the pyramid? Pyramid Power. You can tell I had too much tea at lunch. Gwen.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff
Valpo Law. I would just say that at the
bottom of the pyramid it says access to
depository materials and I wonder if we don't
want to say government information there. I'm

not too big on "materials." And then I don't -- I mean, it seems like that would broaden it.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes, I see what you're saying, but I think there's a deliberate method to putting those particular words there because what depositories are about is depository material. It's not government information.

You know, depository materials, to me, is a specific set of materials, and as we discussed the other day, there are certain government information products that are outside the scope of the depository program, maybe the word "materials" is what's bothering people, that it implies physical collections, but I don't think of it that way.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Gwen, this is Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. That's where I kind of get hung up, is that whole depository concept, because we're not depositing anything anymore.

There are no depository materials.

There are --

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, that's right.

MS. STIERHOLZ: There are government access -- I mean, but everybody has access to it, so it's not like only depository libraries have access.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valpo Law. That's not true. We get a box
almost every day at our library. I mean, we
are still depositing things. Things

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of Texas. And even in a digital world, we have been discussing depositing digital materials and possibly having digital regionals that are going to archive those materials and keep them and be a depository for the electronic collection as well.

So, I don't think the word "depository" is necessary archaic.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. Katrina, I think I understand what you're getting at, but I'm not sure that we can make that decision today. I think, today, we're going to have to

go ahead and live with the word "depository."

So, I'm -- but I'm not sure if redrawing the pyramid is what we really want to do here. You know, I think -- you know, Ken has put some goals forward, and we should be discussing those.

Can you restate them, Ken?

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Libraries. Develop new
service models to address the service fees,
develop new collection models to develop
collections, and development of communication
programs.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Should we take those one at a time and start off with the developing new service models? You know, there's that word "model" again.

So, Council, what -- what about that? David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
California State Library. I guess I
personally don't have a problem with the word
"model" because it presupposes that there's no

one set way that things are to be done.

It's a pattern, and it's up to individual depositories or libraries or whatever you want to call the new thing that we are going to be, to follow that model to develop programs that are locally applicable.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valpo Law. I think that Ken's got it as plural, and I feel better about that because what was in the goal before was a model for the FDLP which, you know, sounds like one way you have to do it.

But he's just taking the three things on the pyramid now and sort of brought, you know, said them a little bit differently, and making the models plural, which would allow for what you just said, David, of, you know, possible alternate models that still fit in the scope of the thing.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Chicago. To follow through on
Ken's suggestion, but also to look at the idea
of the blur that Cindy introduced in her

conversation, I think we need to move beyond the fact, if these -- or we're trying to come up with goals.

If we leave it at the model stage, then we are saying the goal of the depository is to build models. I think we're moving beyond that. I think we need to move up.

The goal of the FDLP is to sustain services, sustain collections, and to sustain communications that are innovative, and I think we need to move into a much more proactive, rather than a theoretical kind of "We're going to build a model that we can use to energize the rest of the discussion."

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. I guess, I mean,
it's all semantics, and I think models can
also be actual -- I mean, when I build a model
car, I've actually got something at the end of
it. It's not just hypothetical.

And I think what I was trying to get at is, however you want to call them, but there should be some different -- I don't have

my thesaurus here, so I'm not sure what else to call it, but you know, there could be one way to do a regional -- there could be a different way to do selectives, if that's what we still want to call them.

I mean, I think they're sort of the how we're going to deliver services, and I still think "model" can work either way, whether it's hypothetical or this is the model you are going to follow, or the method.

And we can wordsmith it, but I was trying to get at, yes, we should, at the end of the day, say this is where we're moving, and "model" had been used in the other documents, so I kind of just stuck with them.

MS. SINCLAIR: Well, let me ask this: Council, can you live with that goal as it's stated with that word "models" in it?

COUNCIL MEMBER: Yes.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Now, we need to get some comments from our community about that goal. Community, what do you think? We're doing them one at a time.

Dan

Community, can you live with that qoal? COUNCIL MEMBER: Somebody's not going to live. COUNCIL MEMBER: Restate it again. MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Ken, can you restate it one more time. MR. WIGGIN: Develop new service models. MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Yes. Hi. MR. O'MAHONY: I'm O'Mahony from Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Whether it's around that kind of a structure in terms of services, collections, or communications or some other way, I guess I think that the preeminent goal that ties all of those things together, and then some, that the program is about, is about permanent public access to government information content.

That's sort of what it's always been about, the geographically dispersed 1250 libraries across the country, that's the model that has worked in a tangible world.

I think that the biggest challenge for all of us is to figure out how that works in an electronic world.

So, whatever goals and whatever structure that we come up with, the ultimate goal I think is to develop models that make that happen, permanent public access to government information content in the digital era.

MS. SINCLAIR: Well, I think you're pointing out what our mission is, you know.

MR. O'MAHONY: Well, that's not exactly what I'm pointing out. I think the goals -- the mission and vision, I think, are rock solid. But over the next five-year period, which is what I understand the strategic plan to be trying to accomplish, I think specifically steps to move us closer to an era where we're -- an environment in which we are permanently preserving and making accessible electronic government information

is what these goals should be focused on.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois Chicago.

So, what the sentence could read in order to address that, Dan, is a -- whatever Ken said about models of service aimed at achieving the mission of the Federal Depository Library.

Would that cover the marker?

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

I guess when I do goals I've already got a mission, and so I'm assuming that my goals refer back to the mission -- try to keep them short, and I thought -- well, words was pretty good.

But -- and if we need to, but I think then after that the strategies will address some of those very specific points about permanence and whatever, but the goals should -- I expect that the goals refer back to the mission.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. Ken, I would -

- that was what I was thinking as well, is that your mission is sort of assumed when you develop goals and you don't really have to restate it as part of the goal.

Any other comments from the community?

(No response.)

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. We have one goal down. Yes.

Okay. Our second -- maybe I should go back to the pyramid. Okay. The second goal was, if I'm not mistaken, to develop new collection models. Is that correct?

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Council. Tory.

MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State. To me, this is the cornerstone of the whole strategic plan. It's the whole purpose, is to position ourselves for a digital environment, so to me this is an important part.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,

University of Illinois Chicago.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I am not a champion of including the notion of collections within any of the goals of the program. However, as a useful tool, the bridge between, and sustain some kind of ongoing relationship between our legacy collections and our future collections, where collections can I can see if we don't freeze the idea purpose collections into a particular format, still respect that we're going to be responsible for both the Legacy formats, the present formats and the future formats. Whatever that is.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
California State Library.

When I hear that particular goal, I don't just assume tangible collections inside of depositories. What I hear are the entire gamut of collection possibilities, not just what we have now, but what we may have in the

future.

So, it would encompass the tangible collections that are in depositories. It would encompass the content of the future -- of the federal -- excuse me, Federal Digital system, and it would encompass possibly deposit of digital content and depositories.

It would be the whole package.

MS. SINCLAIR: I guess the thought that went through my mind just now is, if you give this to somebody outside of our group would they understand what was meant by that, develop new collection models.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library. I guess it would
be informed by adding additional action items
underneath that.

I think what David has said is what I meant, is that we don't want to define it too carefully here, because we don't know what it's all going to be. It should be as inclusive as possible.

But I think we, as libraries deal

with collections. They may be virtual. They may be tangible, they may be whatever, but I think the concept of libraries and collections still goes together.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I'm certainly no glowing expert in the strategic planning process, but my understanding of vision, mission and goals is that they should be short and somewhat ambiguous.

What is not ambiguous are the strategies that inform -- that proceed from those goals and even if the goal is ambiguous, when you read the strategies that follow that goal, it becomes clear what that goal means and now, because strategic plans cover a follow-up period of time.

So, for five years, these are our strategies to meet this goal. After five years the goal may really be talking about some different set of reality, realities, and then you develop new strategies, maybe keeping the goal the same.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valpo Law. Actually, we have -- if we use the new model that Ken's suggesting and accept all three of these, we have strategies. The are under the four things that we have in here. We can just move them onto -- I mean, they would fit really well, so yes.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Counsel, any further comments about that goal, or are we -- do we like it the way it is?

Okay. Any comments from the audience? You're all so sleepy after lunch that you're just struggling to stay awake?

Let's hear from Sandy first.

Go ahead, Sandy.

MS. McANINCH: Sandy McAninch,
University of Kentucky.

I guess it's more a question than a comment. I -- as you were talking, I kept thinking maybe the words "collaborative, collaboration" or "flexibility" ought to be put in front of services or collections, in particular.

I wasn't sure where you were going to factor in those two phrases, but those are critical to our moving forward effectively. That's in my opinion, the crux of the issue right now.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

I would say that those should be paramount assumptions in everything that we do at all -- you know, do we want that collaboration and that flexibility, and that's why I started -- it's kind of like -- I like the peer amendment and I think it works well, but I think we should have that in our assumptions very clearly.

MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office.

I just -- oh, man, here we go again. I just want to point out that once the plan is completed, it's not just going to sit on the shelf.

It will be reviewed, and extended,

revised, however, as new things come up, so that there would be a 2010 to 2015 or some kind of addendum with -- refreshing when new things happen.

And it's more -- perhaps as more functionality comes with FDsys, and we may want to change, so there is an opportunity for that, but we need something to get started.

MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from the audience or Council?

(No response.)

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Then we have two goals. One more to go.

The third one was developed, New Communication Programs, is that right? Okay.

MR. SHULER: What happened to "models"?

MS. SINCLAIR: Programs. Okay.

MR. SHULER: We deviated.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin. I guess I was seeing as not so much as models of communication, but actual developing some programs, as we move forward with the plan, we

11

12

13

10

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

need to have at various levels some communication plan or -- it could be communication plans, too, I guess, but -- or tools, but it wasn't just really "model."

"Model" fit the other two nicer.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valpo Law. And that's for maybe the FAQ
sheets that Ken thought up this morning, and
people seemed to like which fit under
communication, tools and programs or whatever,
as an example.

MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from Council?

(No response.)

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Audience.

MS. SOLOMON: Judy Solomon, Seattle Public Library.

I just wanted to clarify. We're talking about developing these models. I'm assuming a little bit down the line we'll also talk about implementing them.

MS. SINCLAIR: Right. These are just overarching goals, and then strategies

follow under them.

MS. SOLOMON: Right.

MS. SINCLAIR: Steve.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I think that that's a little too fuzzy. I mean, communications is one of those things we like to beat to death that's always, it's never enough, it's never right, it's not always its fault.

It may need a little bit more. Communication towards what? I mean, towards end user, internally, between GPO and, you know, I think I would like a more, you know, to what end.

It's one of those mom and apple pie ones. It is just so general that anything fits into new models of communication. You know, I'd rather use email. There's a new model.

You know, so it's a little too fuzzy. And I may -- I don't know, I have no recommendation how to tighten it up.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Yes, I --

when I think about it I think there are kind of two pieces. One is education and one is promotion, so I'm not sure how to weave those two concepts into the goal.

Sally.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: If you have to have one word to put on the side of the pyramid, though, Steve, can you think of a word that has the same number of letters? I mean, really.

I think we probably need to just explain that in the strategies, because I think what you just said, going about the two aspects, education and promotion, they're good, but we can put that in the strategies.

But, I mean, it is fuzzy. I agree, but what's going to fit on the side of that pyramid.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. I mean, if we
can't live without those two words in the
sentence, couldn't we just, in the goal we
could say "Develop new communication programs

for

just

Sears,

for education and outreach." MS. SINCLAIR: Steve, would that -- would that work? Any other thoughts from Council about that edition? MR. SHULER: I'm not sure what --John Shuler, University of Illinois Chicago. I'm not sure what we did. Somebody -- are we keeping communications? MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. Suzanne, can you restate what you just said. MS. SEARS: I didn't write it down. new communication program Develop education and outreach. MR. SHULER: I would object in the sense that that would be too specific, because communications includes more than education and outreach. I would be just as happy keeping it wonderfully vague and then being more specific in the strategies as was suggested earlier.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

University of North Texas. I agree, John.

Suzanne

SEARS:

MS.

mean, I like keeping them short and broad, trying to make sure that everybody buys in. Perhaps if had objectives we underneath the goal, and the objectives as communications or education communications for outreach. MR. SHULER: That would work. MS. SINCLAIR: Stephanie. MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, Louisiana State University.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Just put my two cent's worth, since the prior to goals have that broad overarching concept, I think it's more appropriate to stay with that and keep it, quote, unquote, "a little fuzzy."

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So it sounds pretty much like we have consensus, that we want the goal to simply be develop new communication programs, period.

Okay. We have three goals. that enough?

It's enough for the SHULER: pyramid.

1	MS. SINCLAIR: Well,
2	congratulations. It seemed like we were not
3	going to get here. So, now that we have our
4	three goals, shall we move onto the
5	strategies?
6	MR. HAYES: Are you going to ask
7	the audience if that's enough? Steve Hayes,
8	Notre Dame.
9	MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Is that
10	enough?
11	MR. HAYES: No. Steve Hayes, Notre
12	Dame.
13	A goal you need to put in front of
14	that right now, in my opinion, and I've
15	expressed to some is: You need to reestablish
16	the balance and the cost benefit of being
17	within the program.
18	I think that's the overriding issue
19	that we have right now before you can even go
20	to the models of service, the models
21	communication, the models of collections.

You have to solve the disconnect that I'm hearing from directors, et cetera, as

to -- it used to be obvious, you know, we got tangibles, therefore, I'm willing to do the service.

Half the balance is now -- does not appear to be readily available to or obvious to and we're still searching for that and we're trying to justify maintaining the program by doing these new models to keep us going.

I think there's your first goal, is to really need to think about how do we reestablish and communicate and, you know, identify those that keep the balance so that we no longer have the major issue of "Is there going to be anybody in the program to begin with to do collection or to do service, or even to do communication?"

P.P. Ballinger -- our leadership says, "You're out of here. I don't care what wonderful model you have, it's not within the program. I can do that within my library, to have those exact same collections or services to meet, keeping American informed and for

permanent public access, but I can do that independent of a program. I can do that goal that Dan, articulated for us."

So, there's your first goal, in my opinion.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

Several of my colleagues over the last few days have kept talking about the New Deal, and so maybe we want one that says to articulate the new deal. I mean, what is the deal? How do you sell to whoever that you should be or want to be or want to say a depository.

So, I agree that there's probably that. We kind of made an assumption, and maybe we do need to actually articulate that for folks.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
Dame, and you can put it in your pattern, you
know, develop new models or develop the New
Deal Models.

MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State. That might be a major strategy under the develop new communication programs. It speaks to that.

I short of hate to elevate that cluster of concepts to a major five-year goal because I'm not sure -- I know that there are pressures throughout the program, but do they rise to the level of it being a strategic goal in and of itself.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think one way of MS. SINCLAIR: looking at it is to look at the top of the pyramid and collaboration is the word that's the Ιf ignore the word at top. you "flexibility" which we don't like, you know, I think what Steve is talking about is strengthening the collaboration between FDLP and the depositories.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois Chicago.

I would argue that what Steve is seeking is going to depend on how well we craft the strategies to support services,

collections and communications.

So, what you are seeking will depend on how well we craft the strategies to achieve those three goals. And to be explicit about it, I don't see necessarily brings any singular strength to our efforts.

MS. SINCLAIR: Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. In talking to library directors about this, I see the point where they're approaching it from a business perspective and not just a service perspective.

I think we've been looking at it at GPO in terms of incorporating this piece that Steve's talking about as an overall value proposition, you know, not just focused on services, but looking at it from a business standpoint where there is a true cost-benefit analysis as part of creating the New Deal model.

MS. SINCLAIR: Steve. Oh, go ahead.

MS. REHKOP: Oh, please let Steve -

- Steve first.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame, business librarian.

When I look at the graph of participation of individuals within the program to develop the new models, to treat them, to perfect them and everything else, the graph is in a downward trajectory.

I do not see it now, and I would have to look at -- to GPO for more data is the downward trajectory leveling off in terms of how we lost the motion and now we're in a steady state of an even line.

The data for me is, you know, until I can stop this downward trend, I don't have sufficient resources and individuals and everything else, to truly work on the innovative services, collections and communications that are there.

So -- and I don't know, it may very well be where do you put it, and maybe if I'm hearing Ric correctly, the strategic plan automatically, before we can even proceed on a

strategic plan, we've got to solve that.

That's our first goal of which the strategic plan is contributing to. I don't know, but I'm still concerned in the, you know, the wonderful ideas. I like the goals and everything else, but if you can't stop the hemorrhaging, you know, you've got no patient to do services or anything else.

So, I don't know where you want to put it, and it will be interesting for counsel to try and place it in the context, and give it the priority that I think it deserves. That's the first priority I think your actions really have to take towards, is rebalancing.

If you don't work for -- you want five years, good idea, but who's left in the program to even implement it.

MS. REHKOP: Barbara Rehkop,
Washington University in St. Louis. I'm so
glad that Steve speaks up and speaks so
articulately for me.

I say that the thing you need to worry about for the next five years is very

much the thing that he said a few moments ago about the FDLP program and where we want to be in five years and how we balance -- I believe your word was "balance," all of these other things.

This chart is lovely and beautiful and wonderful, but I could take it back to my librarian and it would mean the same thing. I could take it to my church and it would mean - you know, it would work there, too.

So, we're talking mom and apple pie, as once again, I borrow from Steve, with the sorts of things that we are discussing here, wherein we, in fact, have quite a serious problem with, say, survival.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. If we go back and look at the assumptions, some of what is being said here or there and you could even make -- you know, we put the assumptions that we feel are the most important at the top of something like that, but we have collaboration and cooperation are essential in the assumptions.

We have partnerships between the government and the private sector will continue to develop and increase, and we have GPO must promote the depositories and their resources outside the FDLP.

So, we could even maybe put in another assumption if we feel we need to about, you know, promoting the value of the FDLP or, you know, staying -- why stay in the program.

But I do think that some of those assumptions address some of the issues.

MS. SINCLAIR: John.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois at Chicago.

I think what the last two speakers are speaking to is not necessarily a strategy but a tactical issue. Yes, we are bleeding. Yes, our departments are being depopulated, our collections being abandoned.

However, if we don't have, quote, unquote, the New Deal, to come back into our organizations and say, "Here is something

better. Here is something to stop the bleeding or at least deliver what I thought would be assumptions and the mission and the values of the program we're supposed to be in this new environment, instead of tactical decisions to stop the bleeding, we have a much greater systemic failure of purpose than just what is happening in each of our individual institutions.

And I thought the purpose of developing these goals was to reanimate the mission and the values of the program that can then lead into specific strategies to survive and work against the challenges that exist at each of our institutions.

I may be wrong about thinking of strategy and tactics in that way, but it's not to say that those tactics and the threat is not very real. It is very real, and I said it before and I'll say it again.

I'm living it. I'm living that nightmare right now. No question. I want this as badly as anybody, but I know what's

going to turn the trick with my director is not going to be a new band-aid. It's going to be a new form of life, and I think that's what we're shaping here.

And for what it's worth, she ain't going to turn her head unless I offer her a totally new deal, and that deal's got to be based on a foundation.

I think that Ken is beginning to speak to some basic goals that are common throughout all our institutions.

MS. SINCLAIR: Denise.

MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. Because I'm having a philosophical battle in my brain around this, and we're entering a long and protracted economic decline in this country.

And having a fairly strong collection development background myself, I struggle with something that's fairly obvious from a cost value proposition for libraries, and that is that you get free content and lots of it, and what the library hones up is

expertise, and not even space anymore.

Terabytes is all they have to give now.

So, if I were a library administrator I could argue much more effectively for supporting a collection that's paid for taxpayer dollars, than argue for a collection that I have to pay for in real tangible ways.

And I guess I want to hear from people about just that basic philosophy of the program, that it's a quid pro quo, if you will, and I don't understand how a director would -- could argue effectively for spending twice for something, rather than simply making resource, labor and terabytes available to sustain this access.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

I guess, in moving forward with the strategic plan, though, we have to recognize that it's the strategic plan for GPO, but we need to inform it by saying, whatever they do has to present a value statement or a business

model that -- that will help libraries, I guess, buy into whatever program we come out there with.

So, I mean, we are seeing a loss of some libraries, and I don't know what the percentage is, we still have 1200 or so depositories, but this is not a strategic plan for those institutions.

It's a strategic plan -- no, I'm sorry. I'm saying I think all of these comments should greatly inform us and we should make sure the assumptions have that in there, that there are these pressures at libraries.

But whatever we do, we've got to make this so that people really are going to want to again be a depository.

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

I just want to ask Robin for a point of clarification. I know it's not in the same numbers. I know that we are losing depositories, I'm not denying that situation,

but we are gaining some, too.

There are libraries that are coming forward and becoming new depositories. I know for a fact in Oklahoma they just added one last year, so, you know, there are some libraries out there that do see the value.

So I don't want to have this idea that everybody is dropping and nobody's, you know, staying, or being added.

MS. SINCLAIR: Robin.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO.

You're right, Suzanne, we have picked up a couple, and we have one or two that are on a waiting list to move from this designation to this designation, which will open up a congressional designation so that there is still some of that going on, and that's attribute to the folks in the regions, and the regionals that are working to promote the idea of public access and taxpayer expense.

On the other hand, we are talking

with lots of folks about why I should stay in the program so that cost-benefit analysis or the value of the FDLP at that point, colleagues are lining up behind me to talk about, is so important.

We are at -- I think it's actually here, 12:47, so we're down a couple, but we do have a couple waiting in line, too.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. We have a comment from the audience that I'd like to take next.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. SMITH: I hesitate to comment in front of them, though, but I'll do it anyway.

Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. Just a sample of what a goal, it sounds like we're talking about, would be to envision and redefine the responsibilities and rewards of all stakeholders in the Federal Depository Library Program.

Because, I think we did know the old deal, GPO got something out this, the libraries got something out of this, the

public got something out of this.

And I think that's what we need to figure out is, who's getting what out of the deal now and, you know, how do we balance out that everybody gets some benefit, everybody has responsibilities, so that it still works for everybody, because I think it is out of balance because we are, you know, having complaints and problems from library directors.

And so, I suggest that as the goal.

And I think, going ahead to redefine it, I
think what we get is this: We get training.

The library gets a local expert who can come to Washington and get access to GPO and ask questions, and who knows how to find this stuff that's on line because, yes, it's on line, and people can find it theoretically for themselves, but in actuality, they need help. They need us.

So, I think we're the new GPO collection. We need the training and the expertise to send back, and that's what the

library gets. They get us.

MS. SINCLAIR: Can you repeat your -- could you please repeat your goal that you stated.

MS. SMITH: Envision and redefine the responsibilities and rewards of all stakeholders in the FDLP.

MS. SINCLAIR: Sally, I think you were waiting to say something.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I was just going to say that I'm not -- I'm still thinking about what Denise said before, but I really -- and I don't know quite everything that would back up what she said, but I liked the way you said that, Denise, about -- it's like were you looking at, you know, in these bad economic times, this is the, you know, the government program that works, that does things for libraries, so if we can find a way to make that true, what you said, or to defend it with details, I really like that.

I mean, I think that would be a new deal, you know.

MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just wanted to give you some specific numbers, since that was asked.

Since we were mandated to move the transition to an online environment, we're down 119 libraries from fiscal year '97, but also during that same time period, we've added 30 libraries, 11 of which have been in the last two years.

MS. SINCLAIR: Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Cindy and I have been working together too long, so she said what I was going to say.

But, you know, going back to the 1996 study report that we did, I think the concern at that time was when Congress requested that we look to migrate this program to a predominantly electronic or more electronic-based program.

Our concern at the time was that, you know, we may even drop to 500 libraries by now, but we are adding libraries. We added

seven tribals. Kent State came on board, Elon College of Law just came on board a week ago, so additional libraries are being added.

I think the point that was made over there a second ago about defining the definitional framework about what it means, what is the value of communicating that is the key.

There's also been a paradigm shift at the Government Printing Office, you know, sort of an unfunded mandate for us is that permanent access, according to the law says permanent access is for the regionals.

Since 1993 we've got this electronic collection and when Congress passed the GPO access legislation they didn't really provide additional money with that collection, so I think part of it is define the framework and continue to communicate roles and responsibilities.

In talking with directors, a lot of them are looking at Title 44 and they are still thinking that is not only the here and

now with print collections, but the future.

And I think we do need these communication pieces to get out there and help define the future for them.

MS. SINCLAIR: James.

MR. JACOBS: Hi. James Jacobs, Stanford University.

In hearing all of these comments, it makes me think that rather than us shifting from a collections-based to a services-based model or concept in our minds, that instead what we should be doing is stressing digital collections, digital infrastructures, because that's where the value is to library administrators.

We're the canary in the coal mine in terms of library content. Lots of library content besides government documents is starting to move into the digital realm.

So if we provide the prototypes, the pilots for building digital collections, digital infrastructures, that's where library administrators are going to say, "Wow, it's

really a great value to be in the FDLP because those infrastructures can be used for other parts of the library."

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So we have a couple of different proposals for another goal. Ken.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

I guess I would just argue that a lot of what's been suggested is important for us to hear, and articulate somewhere in our documents, but I even think that under simple four words about coming up with new models, service, that we would try to envision and redefine the responsibilities and rewards.

I mean, that should be part of whatever these models have to have all of that in them. They have to be able to articulate, you know, okay, here's the model, but here's the benefit to the library, here's the benefit to the public.

So, I think those are all important. I'm not sure if we start creating

too many additional goal statements. We're going to -- we may get into that overlap issue again where, well, that kind of fits that.

I would argue against having too many more.

MS. SINCLAIR: Other thoughts from Council?

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois Chicago.

I would agree with Ken for different reasons, but I think, too, keeping the goals simple and bringing life to the goals through specific deliberative clear -- clearly-spoke strategies is really what's going to turn the trick in terms of whether or not we're going to pull off the new deal.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: And Sally. And I'm not sure how it fits into the communication one, but in the new service models and the new collections models, there need to be responsibilities and rewards.

That's the balance. The new model has to have both of those or it's not going to

be a new model and it's not going to work.

So, maybe that's an assumption or an overall,

overarching value.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
University of Illinois at Chicago.

Let me express to the audience, at least as one Council Member. None of what I am discussing or what I suggest implies that I am -- that what is happening to the depository system is not understood, not easily grasped if not lived every day.

And everything that I am suggesting is aiming towards trying to find a way out of that cul-de-sac of trying to fix one institution at a time while the other institutions are collapsing around us.

So, I think what the Council, if I could speak on behalf of the Council for a moment, is trying to do is reenergize a vision for the system.

And we will -- I think we will confidently say that we can get to the specifics of the situations through the

strategies and through the other parts of the strategic documents.

If other Members of the Council want to say anything to that, please do, but that -- speaking as one Council Member, I hate to quote a former president, but I feel your pain.

It's clearly, I'm experiencing your pain at my institution. It is without a doubt I can match anybody's horror story with my own horror story. I don't like it. It's one reason why I got involved. I want to change it. I'm there with you. It's that simple.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So my sense is that Council is willing to just stick with the three goals, is that right? Do I understand that correctly? Okay. Now that I've flipped away from that page.

MS. SEARS: Gwen, can I say something while you're looking for that? Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas.

I'm fine with the three goals. I just really like the statement that she read,

and I want to make sure that that is somewhere in our assumptions or that -- you know, because it does fit all three of those goals, and it does fit in communications as well, because what Ken had said in a previous meeting about the rewards being on a FAQ sheet for the directors, so I do think it fits all three and should definitely be part of the document somewhere.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So the three goals are, develop new service models, develop new collection models and develop new communication programs.

Maybe we should all chant them together so that -- okay. Now that we've got our three goals, shall we move on to strategies in our last half-hour? Is that agreeable?

Okay. So, we have a bunch of strategies in our notebooks. I can't display them all at one time, but maybe what we could do is start with the first goal and look at which strategies either fit under there or new

ones that we want to put under there.

So, our first goal is to develop new service models.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: There's one slide
-- could you go back to the slide before.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Yes. So, what strategies should go under "Develop new service models"?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Shears,
University of North Texas. On the sheet of
paper I have they are actually numbered under
Goal A, which is the one you have up, six,
"Identify new models for user-centric service,
delivery and management of shared digital
resources."

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Sally has suggested that the way we approach this is to go through all of the pages of strategies and just get rid of ones that we don't like first, and then we'll have a subset of them to work with and then we can also, you know, tweak them and add them and so on.

And people are leaving now. They

saw the goals, they left.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Does that work for everybody?

Okay. So, we're on the first page --

MS. ETKIN: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I was just going to suggest a similar approach that Sally suggested, that as we go through these, since we do have our three goals, for those that we decide to keep, we might identify if they go under service collection or communication at the same time.

MS. SINCLAIR: Good idea. Thank you.

Okay. So, revamp the disposition of materials process. Keep it, and that's a collection.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. What does this mean?

MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy's going to

tell us.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the things that was very clear from a lot of the comments that we've received through the strategic planning comments, as well as the regional report that was undertaken, was that -- and we've known this for a long time, I think. -- nobody likes the disposition process as it is.

The regionals don't like it. The selectives don't like it. It's all for different reasons, and so we need to just look at this whole process and try to make it as streamlined as possible, but maintaining the purpose for it, just making this process more efficient and effective for regionals and selectives.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, so what you mean is using -- using another quaint term, just the disposal of unwanted materials, is that what "disposition"

means there?

MS. ETKIN: Yes, basically. Cindy

Etkin, GPO. Yes, basically needs and offers. It's referred to as disposition of materials in Title 44.

MS. SINCLAIR: So maybe another word would be "streamline" rather than "revamp," although -- yes, whatever.

Yes, Ken.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I guess with some of these, to me they're the cart before the horse. I mean, we want to, I think, first begin to look at what are some new models and maybe the -- you know, the region -- there's a lot we don't know yet.

I mean, this goes back through what we know, and I'm not sure that we can answer all of that before we really know what we're putting forward as some new models.

I may be mistaken, but I just think some of those, like embark on phase two of an FDL handbook, we don't even know that the model's going to be that the handbook is going to address.

I think some of these are just too specific, and whether we should spend the time now to cherry-pick these, or think of some like broader strategies to move us from here to spring, or where does GPO want to go with this.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

The Public Printer laid down the charge at the beginning of this conference that he wanted to devote the spring conference to exactly this kind of issue.

May I suggest that, instead of spending the last half-hour beginning the cherry-picking or whatever we want to do, that the Council take it upon itself to organize these goals into these other interconnected strategies before the spring conference and prepare ourselves for a much richer discussion fresh, rather than at the tail end of two and a half very long days.

Obviously there's a lot of investment in the purpose and the future of

what we're going to do here, and I don't think we could do it justice in the last remaining 20, 25 minutes.

I think we should congratulate ourselves for getting at least some consensus on the three goals, work together as a Council to populate those goals with clear strategies, and interconnect the issues and come back in the spring ready to engage our community much more productively.

That would be my two cents.

MR. WIGGIN: I would second that.

MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Cindy Etkin, GPO. MS. ETKIN: Ι just also want to mention that this something, again, that's in Title 44 nobody likes, and there's -- but it process that need through we to go operationally until Title 44 changes, if it does.

And so, I think that you all need to think about what we can do operationally at the same time we're building these new models

so that there is some near-term relief.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
Connecticut State Library.

So, Cindy, what you're saying is that there may be some things in here that need to be addressed no matter what the future brings, and you would like some idea of what those priorities to address are, is that -- or could you just tell us those things that you think have to be changed?

MR. SHULER: Yes, save us some time.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I don't -- I didn't really put these in any kind of order. It was just sort of when I was brainstorming when things popped out.

And the disposition of materials has been on, I think, everybody's hit list for a long time, so I think that's one that we could look at operationally and start working on because it would benefit the selectives as well as the regionals.

Another one of those is embarking

on phase two of the handbook and for those of you who don't know what phase two is, phase one was the merging of the instructions manual into what is now the handbook, and now -- and a couple of new chapters were added, but there were no real changes made.

So now we need to look at any gaps for procedures or requirements for libraries that aren't there as well as looking at those that are now outmoded, outdated that need to be removed, and maybe that's part of what these new models are going to be.

But I think -- I don't really think there are too many operational kinds of things in there, but those -- those are two that stick out in my mind right now.

MS. SINCLAIR: Tory.

MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona State. I hate to wait for the spring to do this. It seems to me we have a Council structure that we could go back and maybe the subcommittee could work with this document and pull out the operational strategies, just for

conversation's sake, and some objectives, and repackage it and let Council take a look at it and talk about it at a conference call and then push it out to the community for comment, using the FDLP desktop community -- whatever, and go -- and just keep working on it.

I just hate for it to wait until the spring --

MR. SHULER: No, I didn't mean to imply that we wait till spring. I said we would work between now and the spring on it.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. I think John was just suggesting that we -- there's not much we can do today.

MR. SHULER: In the last 20 minutes of today.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. So you were suggesting that we just leave early?

MR. SHULER: There's a rainbow through every cloud, but I suppose -- but what I'm suggesting that, as Tory said, that the purpose of the Council is to work between meetings.

The Public Printer clearly gave us a charge that he wants us to talk about this sometime during the spring meeting. We have a lot of work to do between now and then.

We have the community tools to communicate with the community. Let's do it.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valpo Law. I would just ask Cindy: Are you
looking for a recommendation from Council to
revamp the -- to -- we think you should revamp
the disposition of materials process and
embark on phase two of the handbook, because
if you need that -- some okay from us, we
could talk about that real quick here and say
do it.

Some of the other things like allow designation of shared regionals, we can't authorize that today because -- for a variety of reasons, but some -- but those two things are in the others that fit in that category. I guess we could do that.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks for asking, Sally. Yes, there's some things on the list that we can't authorize, either, and those are things that we think we need, and we're going to be working towards.

And there are some things on here, on these strategies that we already are doing, like building partnerships, so some of the plan draft here for discussion is expanding some of those things.

So, some of these things we're already going to be working on and we're going to do, anyway. So, maybe you want to look through these and see if there's something glaringly missing that you think we ought to be looking at in ways of a strategy.

In the interest of time, you know, and I can go back and take this list and put them into the three categories of whatever, service, collection, communication, whatever is the best use of your time.

MS. SINCLAIR: Well -- Ken.

MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,

Connecticut State Library.

Cindy, this document that we got at the beginning, is that available somewhere so we could -- I think we should start working with it. Is it a Word document somewhere?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. It is on the FDLP desktop in the document repository, and after this conference I'll be working with the web content unit to put a comment form up on the desktop for others to make comments.

You all can use that form. You all can contact me directly. Those in the audience can use the form, and particularly for those who didn't have an opportunity to be here in Washington to be part of these discussions that allows them an opportunity.

But we'll be -- the document's already there on the desktop. The comment forms, forthcoming.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: But, could Council have it as a Word document, too, so we could work on that, add changes and work on it

ourselves?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. ETKIN: Yes.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Thank you.

MS. SINCLAIR: Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I stepped out for a second, and this might have already been stated, but the revamp of the disposition process is something that came up loud and clear from the results that led to the creation of the regional report.

So, things like that, in terms of differing from chaired regional models, we have lot of additional action items that came out of that report that we'd like to take back to GPO and work on with counsel that don't require JCP approval and there are things that we can do right now.

MS. SINCLAIR: Thanks.

My sense is that we are ready to adjourn, and Tim has his gavel out, so -- Any final? Okay.

Oh, Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I

have to make up for not being here this morning. I just want to than Council and everybody in the audience who has participated in this discussion.

It's been very, very helpful, and I think that over the last three days we've made lots of progress on this, and lots of things to think about, and look forward to working with Council and receiving comments from the community working on this.

MS. SINCLAIR: Thank you all very much.

CHAIR BYRNE: I think Council was extremely excited to see the presentation that Karen Sieger did on the FDLP desktop, and especially the FDLP community, and we are very anxious to actually start using the forum for our own discussions and then sharing our thoughts with the whole community.

So, that's something we will be going back and starting to work on, and I think that will really help in this whole process of what we're trying to do here.

was

So, it may be a whole new world, come spring. Hopefully. MR. SHULER: At least we'll be in Florida. CHAIR BYRNE: Yes. All right. Anyone have anything else you want at this point, last-minute, to add chance? I want to thank everyone sticking it out this long also, and I think it's been really an excellent meeting and we've had a lot of really great discussion. So, I look forward to a lot of interaction on Council between now and spring also. That being said, meeting adjourned. (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21