

# Capital Reporting Company

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY  
COUNCIL MEETING

OCTOBER 15, 2007

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

## COUNCIL MEMBERS

Geoffrey Swindells

Dr. Christopher Greer

Katrina Stierholz

Kathryn Lawhun

John Shuler

Marian Parker

Tim Byrne

Gwen Sinclair

Mark Sandler

Peter Hemphill

Torry Trotta

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

## A.M. SESSION SPEAKERS

Robert Tapella

Ric Davis

Ellen Herbst

Michael Walsh

Gil Baldwin

Lisa LaPlant

Matt Landgraf

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Preliminary Session Council. GPO. NTIS)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Can everybody take their seats so we can get started.

Okay. It looks like Council is all here. I want to welcome everyone to the 2007 Fall Federal Depository Library Council meeting. I now call this Council meeting to order.

I couldn't wait to do that, that's a lot of fun. You know, it's, I have two of these wonderful gavels that were given to me by Bill Suttis, so I'm not sure what the other one is for, I think that may be for Council or something.

Anyway, I'm going to be very brief. I'm not going to do a lot of introductory remarks because I think this is a very important occasion. We've, we have not been leaderless in the Federal Depository Library Program, but our leader hasn't been official and we now have the stamp of approval of the President of the United States and I, without further ado, I just want to welcome to the podium the Public Printer of the United States, Robert Tapella.

(Applause)

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

ROBERT TAPELLA: Good morning.

(Good morning).

ROBERT TAPELLA: It's really a pleasure to be here today. This is my first appearance as Public Printer of the United States. It's been kind of an interesting process to first be selected by the President, then go through a confirmation process before the United States Senate and then to finally have the President sign the Commission and be sworn into office.

My thoughts on it were that there would be this great pomp and circumstance and, you know, pretty exciting. After all, there have only been 25 of these guys. And as several of the people here in this room know, the process, we have no control over and I see Sally Holterhof here and I'll call it the front row although she's actually in the second row. She was asked to come speak before the Senate Rules of Administration Committee and of course they canceled the meeting at 9:09 the night before the hearing and that was after they told us that if we had, you know, five or ten minutes to speak and then I guess it was ten minutes to speak and then it became five minutes and then capsulize your remarks

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

down to two minutes and oh, by the way, thanks for flying out here, we'll give you a tour of the Capitol, but we're not having the hearing.

So, Sally, thank you for the effort that you put in. I really appreciate it.

You know, the actual swearing in, we are going to do a formal swearing in on Tuesday, November 6th, on the afternoon, but the President signed the Commission last Wednesday and I was in New York on a business trip with some of our, some of our brightest leaders at GPO and it turns out that the Government has a form, a form, Standard Form 61 that's called an oath of office.

All that's required is for the appointee to swear the oath or affirm the oath and it needs to be notarized. Well I'm in New York, I was staying at the Hotel Michaelangelo in Midtown and I needed a Notary Public. So I was officially sworn in as Public Printer of the United States by the back office clerk of the Hotel Michaelangelo.

What's funny about it is her boss called her out and they didn't know what the form was. I guess they presumed it was just, you know, a standard business document because it is a business

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

hotel and I was explaining to her that I think I have to read this and I think I have to, you know, say it out loud. She's like oh, yeah, whatever.

And then I can see she starts reading this oath of office that had been prepared and she looks up at me and back down and up at me and back down and up at me and back down, she's like oh, this isn't what I usually do.

I said well you better do it right because I think it's a Federal offense if you do it wrong. But I will be inviting her to November 6th so she can see the formal version of it.

Well, welcome, Council. You know, it's pretty cool being Public Printer, I have my own Council now. This is Geoff's first meeting as chair. So far you're off to an illustrious start. You on Council as well as you in the audience, please be nice to him, I want him to have a good tenure as chair.

Now, where is Gwen, Gwen Sinclair, she is new to the Council and she is our first Pacific rimmer to serve on Depository Library Council and she comes to us from Hawaii.

(Applause)

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

I am very much looking forward to working with all of you here today as well as all of our partners in the library community as we continue to provide free, open and permanent public access to the documents of our democracy through the Federal Depository Library Program.

I'm guessing that a number of you might have questions about me and my views on the FDLP. Let me spend just a couple of minutes outlining my views at a high level. If you want details, see Ric.

I want a healthy, productive partnership with the library community. We'll get there by increasing effective communications, raising our level of services and enabling more transparency in GPO's work with the community.

During my tenure as Public Printer, GPO will not operate unilaterally. We will engage all aspects of the library community, the associations and member constituencies. We may not always achieve complete consensus, but we, but we will do what we can to ensure that all voices are heard and all issues are fully considered before we take actions to move forward with the program.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

That is my commitment. My vision for our future partnership is to retain the best aspects of the current system while incorporating new technologies and services to provide an ever-expanding range of access to Government information by the public.

Through GPO's soon to be launched future digital system, we will enable a more flexible program to meet the specific institutional missions of our library partners. Strategically I know some libraries consider ownership of digital content vital, others do not. GPO needs to implement a balanced program that will provide for the needs of both types of institutions as well as others while ensuring that FDL P principles are maintained.

I believe that the diversity and capability among GPO's library partners is important. It provides the public with a multitude of entry points to Government information products and that comes from the library, the classroom, laboratory, office or home.

GPO can and should act as an aggregator and facilitator to enhance these capabilities while respecting our library partners' role to determine

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

how best these services should be supplied to their patrons at the local level.

GPO will continue working with the information content originators in Government, take steps necessary to ensure that the information we make available will be official and authentic throughout the information lifecycle and with our library partners, preserve access to information, particularly digital materials that would be either edited or deleted from Federal Websites without notice.

I hope this helps to answer at least some of your questions. Now I'd like to talk about a couple of specific issues.

First thing I want to talk about which actually isn't on my list is the health of GPO. And that is GPO just finished another fiscal year in the black. That is four straight years.

(Applause)

And that is due in large part to the talented managers and employees that we have. Everybody has worked together and we took an Agency that people were afraid wasn't going to survive and we've turned it around and now we get a move ahead

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

and it's a pretty exciting time for me to be Public Printer since I was very heavily responsible for the developing of the strategic vision, now I have the responsibility of the implementation as well.

And I just want to thank everybody at GPO who's here in the room for what you've done over the last couple of years to turn the Agency around and we've got our best years yet ahead.

The first specific item I'd like to talk about is GPO Express. At the Seattle Council meeting I introduced the concept of GPO Express and I was pretty excited about it. I believed that it would not only provide convenient printing for our Agency customers, but it could also help capture fugitive documents. I'm happy to report that GPO Express is working and working well.

During the past year, nearly 5,000 files have been reviewed by the acquisitions staff and over 800 have been harvested into the program. Now I'd like to commend in particular Stephanie Daniel, Stephanie here? She isn't here, too bad.

Stephanie, she's had a key role in capturing these otherwise fugitive documents. I'd also like to recognize her manager, Jeff Horbinski,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

for the leadership that he's shown and it's been pretty remarkable and the results I think speak for themselves.

Second, the publication and information sales program. We're losing money in the sales program. We thought we could outsource the program but that didn't work. I believe that the sales program is important and that we need to figure out how to make the program successful in today's business environment. We brought in new leadership and are conducting a top to bottom review of the program.

Now I'm not sure how many of you have had a chance to meet Bill Kurtz, I think Bill is here, right? Stand up, Bill, and keep standing. Face the crowd.

BILL KURTZ: You just called us a losing department.

ROBERT TAPELLA: Bill comes to GPO most recently from the Hill where he serves as the Chief of Staff to a member of the United States Senate. Prior to his public service he's held senior executive positions including CEO, CFO, general manager and all these different sales and marketing

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

type jobs as well in his illustrious career. We've put the program in his hands and I hope that he will soon be reporting to us that we are meeting customer needs in an economically viable manner. Will you be doing that, Bill?

BILL KURTZ: I promise.

ROBERT TAPELLA: See, we got it.

BILL KURTZ: That was not notarized, however.

ROBERT TAPELLA: Third, GPO's digitization efforts. Our digitization efforts are both strategic and important. You know my view, and I'll talk about this next, which is FDsys. FDsys is only good if we actually have things in it for people to access and a cross-functional team of nearly 40 people involving library and content services staff, customer services staff and people from the Chief Technical Officer's department planned and executed a demonstration project to create a comprehensive digitized collection of Federal publications.

There's a summary report on GPO Access with a proposed path forward. I encourage each of you to read the report, it's only three pages so

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

it's an easy read and provide comments by  
November 2nd.

Now I'd like to recognize Cindy Etkin  
and James Mauldin. Cindy, I thought I saw Cindy  
here this morning. Oh, hey, Cindy. They wrote the  
report, I think they've done a great job. Thank you  
Cindy.

Fourth, FDsys. Later today Mike Walsh  
and his team will be presenting the beta module to  
you. I had a sneak peak a couple weeks ago, it's  
pretty impressive. I particularly like the search  
capabilities. Even a dummy like me can figure out  
how to find things. It is incredible.

Now one of the things that keeps coming  
up about FDsys is when are you going to name the  
darn thing. Well as Public Printer, one of the  
perks of the job that I've learned in my five days  
on the job is that I get to make the big  
announcements. Well, ladies and gentlemen, we have  
a name, but I'm not going to tell you.

You need to wait for Mike Walsh's  
presentation, Mike, are you here yet? He's on next,  
has he walked through the door. No Mike, because I  
actually think he deserves that honor. He has done

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

an incredible job to date, it's his baby and I think he ought to be the one that presents you with its name.

What I will say is that deciding on a name was no easy task. Carrie Gibb on Mike's staff was the lead person on naming. She can tell you all about it. By the time public relations and the lawyers got involved along with the Patent and Trademark Office and GSA who controls the Government Web domains, I'm guessing that the naming process has probably been more difficult than building release 1B.

Now finally, I understand that at least a couple of you are interested in who's going to be the next SuDocs, any interest in that?

(Yes)

ROBERT TAPPELLA: Well the Senate Rules and Administration Committee was interested as well, so let me tell you what I told them. One of the first appointments the next Public Printer will need to make is Superintendent of Documents, a position with statutory antecedence dating back to 1859, that was made GPO's responsibility by the Printing Act of 1895. Public Printer Benedict found it necessary as

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

he made the first appointment to secure a person possessing superior practical ability and literary attainments. Today the job requires considerably more.

The next SuDocs will be faced with a Government information environment that is increasingly electronic from the manner in which information is originally produced, maintained and made accessible. This makes it essential that the person selected to be SuDocs understands not only where the processes stand today but where they're going in the future and is able to translate that into a vision for moving GPO's information dissemination programs forward.

Perhaps more importantly the next SuDocs must be someone who will work openly and collaboratively with the library community, understanding the historic partnership we have together to ensure the continued success of the Federal Depository Library Program.

Now when the President nominated me last May, I thought long and hard about who should be SuDocs. There was only one name on my list. I approached that person and he said no. Last Friday,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

after I became Public Printer, my list still contained only one name.

Again, I asked him and here was his response, it's a great honor to me that you'd consider me for this position. I have thoroughly enjoyed serving in an acting capacity the past six months. That journey has also given me insights into my own strengths and how I can best serve GPO and support you.

With these things in mind, I'd like to continue as head of the library unit and work with you to search for a person to serve as the next SuDocs who can partner with us. That said, I'm pleased to continue in the acting role for as long as you need me. Well, since Ric Davis won't take the job, he's going to have to help me find his next boss.

I am going to be seeking community input on the next SuDocs, okay. I'm not looking for specific names, okay. What I would like is for any of you as individuals to send Ric Davis an E-mail, rdavis@gpo.gov and tell us what are the qualities that the next SuDocs must possess.

You know, I give a couple of items to

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

the Senate in terms of what I thought was important, but I would really like to hear from the community about what you think is important, so, please, send E-mails to Ric, explaining what the qualities are. If you have a specific name in mind, don't send me the name, think about that person and write down why you think they would be the best candidate for the job. Please do that by November 2nd.

We're not particularly in a rush for doing this, I want to do it right but I would like to have SuDocs in place hopefully by January.

And that pretty much concludes my remarks at this point. I'm thrilled to be here and I hope this is a very productive meeting.

Thank you.

(Applause)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I'd now like to invite to the podium a man who turned down the SuDocs position, Ric Davis.

ROBERT TAPELLA: Twice.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Twice.

RIC DAVIS: Good morning everyone, it's a pleasure to be here with you at the Depository Library Conference and Council meeting.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

Throughout this conference I want to make the same recommendation to you that I make at all the conferences, particularly for the new folks, and those three words are network, network, network. Not only with yourselves here, but Federal Agency staff and GPO staff.

We're here for you and we're going to be around on breaks, we're going to be around after sessions. I know it's a great challenge to try to attend every session and a lot of times you have very, you know, a number of competing sessions and you want to go to everything, but please make the time to network especially when you have some down time to do it.

Before I start talking about a couple of important items going on at GPO, I really want to give credit to the people who are here who make my job really easy every day.

You probably look up here on stage and you see these GPO folks and you think oh, my gosh, there are going to be about 50 speeches this morning. Well the good news is I made a deal with them and the deal is unlike in Denver, I'm going to give the only speech for GPO, so I hope my voice

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

holds up and I might reach for water once in a while. And the other side of the deal is when you have the really, really tough questions, they're going to take them.

But before we go on, I'd like to ask the GPO people who are here in the audience to please stand up if you would so you can see who they are and put some faces.

(Applause)

I can sincerely say that the staff that I work with every day in the library unit is the greatest staff I've ever worked with at GPO and as Bob mentioned, it's a real honor to be considered for SuDocs, but I just simply don't want to give up this opportunity and we will be well served by the next SuDocs who comes in and we look forward to working with that person, but I'm very, very happy to remain as your director of the library unit.

I want to take a moment to pay tribute to Mr. Carl A. LaBarre, Former Superintendent of Documents at GPO, who was laid to rest October 4th at Arlington National Cemetery. From his post as SuDocs, Mr. LaBarre directed a nationwide network involving warehouse-based mail operations, 25 book

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

stores and he was also instrumental in creating the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer that serves us so well to this day.

Mr. LaBarre will be remembered with honor and respect and we remain very thankful for all that he did for GPO and the FDLP.

I also want to take a moment to recognize another very sad loss to the community. Mr. Rolbert Oakley, professor and law librarian at Georgetown University Law Center, who passed away recently. As many of you know, he served on the Executive Board of the American Association of Law Libraries as its President from 2000 to 2001. He performed work and showed unfaltering dedication to the Association and also on behalf of GPO for 18 years for his endless dedication to the field and his kindhearted ways in life, he will be greatly missed.

And finally I want to offer an immense thank you to Mr. Tad Downing, is Tad here in the audience with us. Tad, could you please stand up. Tad is going to be retiring from GPO in November after 31 years of service at GPO. If we could all give him a round of applause.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

(Applause)

Tad during that time period has spent his entire career working in the Superintendent of Documents organization, both in the sales program and in the library services operation and to many of us in the program, we know him as the father of the monthly catalog on U.S. Government publications on CD Rom and that's a title he will not soon, not soon forget. That is the, that was the first electronic iteration of the MOCAT and a huge accomplishment among many others and Tad we wish you the very best.

As Bob mentioned, we have a number of new faces here on Council. You probably saw a lot of empty chairs in Denver and we had a number of appointments to go through. We're very happy that Ms. Gwen Sinclair, Ms. Torry Trotta, Dr. Christopher Greer, Ms. Kathryn Lawhun, John Shuler and Mr. Kendall Wiggin were able to join us for the Depository Library Council and serve on this important advisory board to the Public Printer.

Regrettably, Mr. Wiggin and Denise Davis and Denise Stevens were not able to be with us for this Council, but I'd like you to join me in giving a round of applause to our new Council members.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

(Applause)

I also want to take a moment to welcome our newest depository library into the program, the Appalachian School of Law in Grundy, Virginia. Ms. Barbie Selby was very instrumental from the University of Virginia in working with the library to join the program and we greatly appreciate her efforts in doing so.

Next, in 2007, many of you may see in your packets that it's been a significant year in the history of the Federal Depository Library Program. It marked the 100th anniversary of the largest group of libraries ever to enter on a single year.

On March 1st, 1907, 43 land grant colleges entered the FDLP. To commemorate the significant milestone, GPO sent these libraries crystal plaques to honor their Century-long participation in this important public service program. It's my pleasure to congratulate these libraries and again there's a complete listing in your programs.

Moving on to some, some more issues here. One of the questions that I've received

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

particularly since Denver is what happens to the Federal Depository Library Program when the future digital system is implemented, will the FDLP go away. Well I'm here to say certainly not. As you know, the FDLP is a Congressionally-mandated program. We are looking forward to the implementation of the future digital system and the releases associated with it to complement all of the work that we're doing in the library program on both the electronic and the print side.

We're looking forward to better search capabilities, as Bob mentioned, to more version control, to more authentication and to be able to better manage information throughout its lifecycle. You're going to hear more about this program this morning and see some of the real tangible results that have been produced by the team working on that under Mike Walsh's area.

I next want to speak to our budget situation at GPO, particularly as it relates to the FY '08 budget for the salaries and expenses appropriation.

For 2008, GPO requested 45.6 million dollars for S and E. The House has recommended that

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

we receive 35.4 and the Senate 38.2. At this point we're still operating under the same continuing resolution that we operated under last year and we're looking forward to seeing what our budget ultimately is. In the meantime there's going to be no lack of effort to give you programs and to perform the operational work that we're continuing to do.

I'd like to speak next to an issue that has come up recently, particularly since Denver, that I've been seeing on some of the list serves and that has to do with our distribution backlog.

I want to inform you of some steps that we're taking in the library unit to improve the distribution shipments out to all libraries, particularly under the leadership of Robin Haun-Mohamed and Janet McCaskill who's the chief of that area.

By the end of this week when you get back home, the new FDLP desktop will have a new depository distribution Web page. This Web page is going to be updated on a weekly basis and it's going to have information to reflect box numbers and shipping lists distributed to depositories,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

information on distribution operations, timelines to expect shipments and responses to claims along with additional contact information will be on that page.

Additionally, in the last two weeks, I added seven additional staff members to the distribution operation to help improve shipment of services. Additionally, as in other duties as assigned, I have taken over personally management of our customer relationship management system and what that means is that every day multiple times throughout the day I go into the CRM, I look at the questions that you're sending in, I make sure they get to the right people and I'm going to make sure they get responded to.

As always, if you ever feel that you're not getting a response from GPO, you can always E-mail me directly at rdavis@gpo.gov and I will make sure you get taken care of.

Next I'd like to talk about our biennial survey. As you can see in your packet of information, the biennial survey is now available from FDLP.gov. This will be available through

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

October 31st, 2007, and all Federal depository libraries have a legal obligation to participate in the survey. One of the key take-aways that we want to get from the survey this year in particular is more information about what was formerly called our inspection program that we're now calling public access assessments. Kathy Brazee is going to be holding a session here at conference, much like she did in Denver, to talk more about some of the actions that we're taking in regards to assessments and a lot of the work from the biennial survey is going to build upon that, so I hope all of you get a chance to go to her session during conference.

The other session that I really want to promote is the one on the FDLP desktop. We have received tremendous feedback not only from Council but from the library community about the work that Karen Sieger has done in re-launching the desktop.

Part of our effort in making this available is not only to migrate older content and information from FDLP Web pages to a new look and feel, it is to make the environment more interactive. One of the things that you're going to be able to do is to log in and interact more with

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

each other, interact more with the Government Printing Office, get more information on promotional items and get them out to your libraries. So if you haven't had a chance to look at the new desktop, please come to Karen's session, it's going to be an interactive session where you'll have a chance to really look at it in a bit more detail.

Speaking of promotions, as part of, as part of our outreach during this conference as a promotional item, we have presented a 512 megabyte flashdrive with the new FDLP.gov logo that all of you should have picked up when you came in this morning. Additionally we have these nice new lapel pins for the FDLP and I hope you'll get a copy of -- get one of those as well.

On to some very specific issues. For those of you who monitor FDLP, you may have seen in a late-breaking announcement come through last night in which we launched something that we're calling FDLP Express. I'm pleased to tell you about, a little bit about this new service. One of the comments that I've had over the years is that it's very hard to keep up with all of the E-mail on govdoct, FDLP and all the various list serves that

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

we all subscribe to that fill up our in boxes.

The FDLP Express is an idea that grew out of a conversation that I had with Bob Tapella several months ago and we're looking at ways to better communicate with the library community to enable you to sign up to get the information that you want to receive alerts on sent to your in boxes and it's very customizable according to what you want to do.

This will also set up a situation where you will not always have to come to the GPO Access Web page to check on new content and new information that we're making available. It can be pushed to you based on your options.

During the FDLP.gov demonstration session, you'll be able to see some more information on this during Karen's presentation.

Bob talked a little bit about digitization and where we're headed with that. I want to mention some of the specifics based on feedback that we've had from the library community in terms of a proposed path forward for the Government Printing Office on digitization. These are some of the high-level bullets that we have

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

heard.

Make sure that GPO establishes partnerships with other Federal agencies, particularly the National Archives and the Library of Congress and don't duplicate efforts. Also, make sure that as you're digitizing materials in-house you pay particular attention to fragile materials, maps and microfiche.

Most importantly, make sure that any digitization effort, whether you do it yourself or its done by a library or other partner is done according to your standards. And those standards for us at the Government Printing Office are both making sure that we have an access level file available as we do today on GPO Access, but most importantly making sure that any digitization effort is scanned according to preservation level standards so we have long-term permanent access.

At present there is a summary report of the digitization effort up on our Website and as Bob mentioned, we're looking forward to your comments so that we can share those back with JCP. The deadline on that is November 2nd.

Next I'd like to talk a little bit about

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

our new Federal Depository Library Handbook. Last week we released a final draft of this handbook. This has been one of the most collaborative efforts that I've ever seen with the Federal Depository Library Program and a lot of that goes to the leadership of Janet Scheitle on staff who led that effort for us in library planning.

We're calling it a final draft at this point because one of the objectives of this handbook is to consolidate into a single publication instructions to depository libraries and also the depository manual. We think we've got it right, but we want to go back and take another review with some objective eyes to make sure that we have everything covered and we're asking, asking all of you to join us in doing the same.

Before we can say that the instructions and the manual are superseded, we want to make sure that not only the spirit but all of the operational aspects of those publications are captured in the new handbook.

Next, my favorite topic, and I'll tell you why, shared regionals. During the now approaching 16 years that I've been at GPO, I've

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

never seen an issue that's generated so much feedback and that was very, very good.

One of the comments that I -- was made to me by a non-librarian in this past year was, you know, we often hear it, why do we need an FDLP, does anyone even care anymore. Well I can tell you based on the comments that I received and that Cindy Etkin received on the shared regional issue, a lot of people do care.

As many of you know, in May of this year we released draft guidelines on shared regionals for Inter-State regional situations and we received over, about 300 or so comments either through E-mails or formal letters and by doing so it made us better, it made the draft guidelines better as final guidelines and we subsequently issued those in August.

As a result of that, GPO is currently awaiting JCP approval on the Kansas Nebraska shared regional proposal. In the meantime, GPO looks forward to other creative ideas that you may have in terms of re-shaping this program where appropriate.

One of the comments that you read back in the strategic vision document from GPO in 2004

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

and also in the Council vision document was for GPO to work with the library community to develop new flexible models for the future, not forgetting the past and that's one of the things that we're doing and we take it very seriously.

The other thing I'd like to announce at this meeting if you haven't heard is PACER, the traditional conference approved the pilot project to provide Federal Depository Libraries access to PACER or Public Access to Court Electronic Records, a service of the administrative office of the U.S. Courts.

The PACER system can provide remote access to case and docket information from the Federal Courts via the Internet. The PACER pilot project will provide new Government content to participating libraries. The goal of this pilot is to determine if Federal depository library access to PACER expands usage particularly to those who currently do not have it available to them or those who would be inhibited in terms of going into a Courthouse to get access to PACER information.

The PACER pilot participants have now been chosen and selections represent a variety of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

library types and sizes in different geographical areas. I'd like to thank Cindy Etkin in particular for her leadership on that and my predecessor, Judy Russell, for her leadership in terms of meeting with the office of the -- the administrative office of the U.S. Courts and getting this project going.

Next the integrated library system.

Laurie likes to tell me that at this point on the ILS there are a lot of internal things going on that are going to make your lives better. A lot of those are outlined in detail in your packets in terms of the GPO update handout so I'm going to talk about some of these at a higher level.

GPO is currently working with Ex Libris and PTFS to upgrade our Aleph software from version 1602 that we started with up to 18. This is going to have a number of enhancements for the library community.

Particularly in terms of Z39.50, we're close to release on a phased approach. We propose that to the Z39.50 maintenance Agency the creation of the item number as an attribute to facilitate searching. Testing has already been done by a group of depository volunteers and a number of testers in

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

particular expressed desire for this capability.

Additionally development of the new Federal Depository Library directory as a service of the catalog of U.S. Government publications is complete and this will replace the library directory on GPO Access. In particular, I'd like to thank Linda Resler, Patricia Duplantis and An Liu for their work with Laurie in making all of this happen.

The other exciting project that we updated you on in Denver is what we call metadata extraction. GPO recently signed an inter-Agency agreement with the Defense Technical Information Service and also Old Dominion University based in Virginia and this begins a two-year contract to use automated metadata extraction software to help us in the metadata creation.

We're going to have a kick-off meeting in mid-October, actually October 18th, Thursday, this week, with all of, all of the partners and we will keep you apprised as we go forward.

Some of the things that we want to do as part of this effort are to evaluate alternatives to creating metadata, investigate the staff and other implications of doing so through automated tools and

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

look at developing some more detailed requirements for how this can be used with the future digital system.

We've been very busy as well in the area of partnerships. It's been a very busy Summer, we've renewed partnership agreements with Oklahoma State University for browse topics and also with Louisiana State University for the list of Federal Agency Internet sites.

We've also renewed, almost completed the renewal of the partnership with the University of Illinois Chicago for DOS FAN.

Another very excited -- inciting one that is just on the horizon and I think we should have it complete within the next month is a partnership with the Naval Postgraduate School for Homeland Security Digital Library. This is a database containing U.S. Policy documents, Presidential directives and national strategy documents.

I want to thank Suzanne Ebanues in particular who is our partnership person at GPO who facilitates all of these and makes them happen. We've really stepped up in terms of developing more

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

partnerships with, with agencies and partnerships as well with the depository community. I also want to thank Katrina Stierholz who during a recent conference call made the very good suggestion that as part of our FDL.gov redesign, we should make it easier for people to understand how to enter a partnership with GPO.

As a result of that, we've put up new templates, samples of memorandums of understanding that we've entered into in the past and also some frequently asked questions particularly relating to content partnerships and service partnerships and how you can enter into these with the Government Printing Office.

As you can tell and as Bob mentioned, outreach is key to our success, not only now, but going forward. We value the collaboration that we've had and that we're going to have going forward with the depository community.

One way we want to do this is to continue online training sessions as well as doing training sessions and having other site visits with you in the library community. We've received a resounding applause when we announced last Fall that

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

we were going to select OPAL for online training. We've already had several training events using this interactive online tool and in the coming months we're going to add additional ones on authentication, E Gov, the library directory and others. We are also going to open up the opportunity for you as members of the library community to present your own OPAL training sessions using the tools that we make available and we look forward to partnering with you on those activities for anyone who is interested in doing so.

In closing, I want to thank you, Lance Cummins, along with his staff members, Bridget Govan, Marian MacGilvray, Nick Ellis, Yvonne Ellis and Michelle Hawkins who always do their usual wonderful job putting this conference together and they've done so again. I'm sure they're not in here because they're out, outside working, but if we could, let's please give them a round of applause.

(Applause)

I also want to thank each and every one of you again for your time and your continued dedication to Government documents. Your efforts make a difference each day and GPO staff look

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

forward to continuing our partnership with you to improve free public access to Government information. And with that I'm going to turn it over to Ellen Herbst, the Director of the National Technical Information Service, who is going to talk about our partnership with them.

Thank you all and I look forward to working with you during conference.

(Applause)

ELLEN HERBST: Good morning, everyone.

(Good morning.)

ELLEN HERBST: Ric's a little taller.

It's a pleasure to be here at the Federal Depository Library Conference and Council meeting. I want to thank the FDLP and GPO for giving us this time this morning to update you on our pilot program and thank Ric and Cindy and all the other members of the GPO team who have worked with us so diligently to make the pilot a real success.

Finally, before I start, I want to congratulate Bob on your appointment as Public Printer. Congratulations.

Last year at this forum I announced that NTIS wanted to explore how it could participate more

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

in the Federal Depository Library Program by providing access to our online content and today I'm going to update you on the pilot project and share with you some of the directions in which NTIS is moving.

As a reminder, the goal of the NTIS, GPO pilot program is to provide the Federal depositories access to scientific and technical reports in the NTIS collection.

The first step in achieving this goal was to provide no fee access to the database of online content with 240,000 reports dating between 1964 and the year 2000.

In February of this year, 30 depository libraries participated in the beta testing of the Website that was developed to provide access. Those 30 libraries provided feedback on usability, navigation and findability, and I must say that they were not shy about providing comments. And we really appreciated it because it made the product much better. We received many good suggestions and implemented most of them in the Website that was then rolled out to be available to all Federal depository libraries.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

The service was named DARTS, Depository Access to Reports Technical and Scientific. We had to really work to get an acronym there, and it was open to all depository libraries at the end of February.

To date, there are almost 360 depositories registered for DARTS and libraries continue to register and I want to encourage you if you have a scientific or technical collection and have not yet registered, please do so and give it a look.

Usage data from February 2007 to the end of the Federal fiscal year, which was just this September 30th, show the following: We've had 3,835 visits with an average of 16 per day. 2,185 one-time visitors. Google.com is the third most frequent refer to the FDLP log-in and that's behind direct traffic to the site and behind references from NTIS' Website. The most usage by State is California, Texas, Michigan, New York and Missouri, and the most usage by city is from Washington, D.C. I wonder if GPO and NTIS are skewing those results.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And GAO.

ELLEN HERBST: And GAO, yes. Davis,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

California, Columbia, Missouri, Pocatello, Idaho, and North Ridge, California. Thank you to all of you. Yeah, wow.

Like many other Federal agencies, NTIS is focusing on more online access to its content. To do this, we are digitizing from our collection to create more online content, but only as resources allow. So it's a bit of a slow process for us.

However, we have recently launched Website enhancements which should significantly increase search capabilities, findability and the precision of results.

What we have launched just in the last month is opening up the search capability to the database which contains the bibliographic record so that you can now search the entire collection from 1964 forward on the bibliographic records.

Depository libraries that use DARTS will benefit from these improvements as a user of the NTIS Website would. We continue to seek suggestions for improving our Web-based services and in increasing the usage of DARTS and as a next step in conjunction with this conference, we're conducting a focus group later today with some representative

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

members of the Federal Depository Library community specifically seeking input on what happens next.

And I'd like to ask Don Hagen to stand. Don transferred this year from GPO to NTIS, another collaborative project, and Don will be leading the focus group later today and I also want to give a special thank you to Tim Byrne for helping us organize the focus group.

Now those of you who were here last year may remember that it was stated that NTIS and GPO both expected that the pilot would validate our assumption that NTIS can participate in providing content to the Federal Depository Library Program without suffering an economic loss which would be in violation of its legal requirements.

For those of you who weren't here last year, NTIS receives no Congressional appropriated funding. All funding for NTIS is generated through usage fees, so it was a concern but we all assumed going into the pilot that it would not negatively impact NTIS' funding.

And, indeed, eight months into the pilot we are finding our assumption is indeed correct. I'm very happy to report, and assuming in the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

remaining four months of the year-long pilot we stay on this course, DARTS will move out of pilot and continue to be a regular item selection for the depository libraries and I can tell you in anticipation of our assumption that this financial situation will continue, we've actually begun work on the Website to ensure that it has all the functionality that we are adding to the NTIS home Website.

We look forward to working with the GPO again on many other projects that will increase access to our Government's information. And in conclusion I just want to let you know that Don and I will both be here all morning and into the afternoon if you have any questions.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I have a tendency to always ignore my own notes, so we're, I want to next move to some question and answers, but first I'd like for members of Council to introduce themselves and their institutions and we can start with Katrina.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Hi, I'm Katrina

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

Stierholz and I'm with the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

KATHRYN LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public Library.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Me, okay. Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri at Columbia.

MARIAN PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake Forrest Law School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: Chris Greer with the Office of Cyber Infrastructure at the National Science Foundation.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, for the next two weeks the University of Colorado at Boulder, starting in November I'll be with the Department of Energy, Office of Scientific and Technical Information.

GWEN SINCLAIR: I'm Gwen Sinclair with the University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.

MARK SANDLER: And Mark Sandler from the Committee on Institutional Cooperation.

PETER HEMPHILL: Peter Hemphill of Hemphill and Associates, an IT consulting firm.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

TORRY TROTTA: Torry Trotta, Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law, Arizona State University.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Great, what I'd like first is to open up questions from Council, if Council has any questions to GPO or NTIS.

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, I have a question for Mr. Tapella.

One of the things that Bruce James harped upon was the need for GPO to move into a new building. Is that now dead?

ROBERT TAPELLA: No. It's actually something that I testified before the House Appropriations Committee on earlier this year. It is in our strategic vision. We were unsuccessful with our first plan and a lot of that had to do even though it wasn't going to cost any money, there was a Congressional budget office score of 400 million dollars because apparently by saving money Congress can then spend the money so we get a hit against us, which is interesting to say the least.

We still have the desire. We are spending, in my way wasting, about 35 million dollars a year above what we should be spending for our right-sized facility to meet GPO's needs. I

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

will make it a priority to revisit the issue with our oversight committees as well as our Appropriations Committee to see if maybe there is a different way to skin the cat and see if we can get right-sized facilities to the benefit of our employees.

And it's not going to be easy, but it is a priority.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, I see no questions from Council.

Questions from the floor? No questions, I'm going to have you do calisthenics.

LORI SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. I always have questions.

First off, I started looking at the manual and overall it looks fairly good, but on page 82 there's a note about during processing you should stamp documents with the shipping list number and, you know, the processing date so that you can identify later those documents that can be withdrawn in five days.

I think that's probably an error.

RIC DAVIS: I'm glad it doesn't say final on it.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

LORI SMITH: Well it actually does say final real big across the page. And there was also one chapter that wouldn't come up at all, Chapter 5 I couldn't get into ever, the times I tried, Chapter 5. But that's not my question.

My question is actually about NTIS. I think the DARTS database is wonderful, but our tech gurus on campus have not been able to come up with any way other than having people physically come to the documents department where we enter the user name and password for them and nobody wants to do that, they all want to get into this database from their office, like all of our databases.

Is there any way we could have access with IP recognition rather than with a user name and password because that works much better with our security protocols and all.

ELLEN HERBST: The request for IP authentication is the number one request we have for a change. We had it in the speech and I took it out deliberately because I wanted to wait until after the focus group to announce it. It is something technically that we can do and it is probably something we will do but we want to understand how

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

to do it most appropriately.

JOHN STEPHENSON: John Stephenson, University of Delaware library. I also had a question about DARTS and NTIS. In the talk it was stated that I guess it's bib records should be searchable back to 1964. One of the things that we've noticed when people search the Web, generally, and find a citation to a Government publication that is probably in NTIS' database, what we find is that we're pulling up the D tech site and the D tech site says if you're military, come on in and if you are not military, then you can come over to NTIS and they'll sell it to you, which is fine, but when we get to the NTIS site, we can't search back far enough to retrieve the item which is being sought as a free search and I wondered if that was being addressed.

ELLEN HERBST: This is a 1980 alumni of the fight and Blue Hens who won Saturday's football game, go Blue Hens, we did just launch, Don, what, two weeks ago, about a month ago, okay, we did just launch about a month ago the new Website which

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

allows for searching the bib records back to '64.

If it is an unclassified D tech report, we should have it and if you are searching and can't find it, that's a question for our customer service group to help you find it because you should be able to now.

JOHN STEPHENSON: Thank you.

ELLEN HERBST: Thanks.

KRIS McLONIS: Kris McLonis, University of Detroit Mercy in Detroit, Michigan. Our institutions trying to become more of an electronic depository. We've been doing massive weeding of our tangibles and we tried to update our profile as well in June and July.

What I discovered is that item numbers more often than not will refer to both the print as well as the electronic, in other words, I found it next to impossible to be able to say I want only the electronic, I don't want to also keep getting the print.

Is there an ongoing move to create item numbers for only the electronic versions?

LAURIE HALL: The only problem is our item, the system that uses, creates and manages and

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

stores your item number is very old and we're in the process of doing a system migration study to see where we want to go, how we want to do it.

There's also, the way the item number system works right now is if we're not sure that the electronic version is an exact replication of the tangible, we will keep them together.

If we know for certain that the electronic version can stand on its own, if it's a serial, there's significant, you know, holdings on that Website, it's fairly stable, we can archive it, then we'll start breaking them out. But, and that just, we do that on a title by title, a series by series basis.

So if you have some big ones that you're interested in, you can send them to me or Valerie Martins, we kind of, the two of us manage that part of the system, but it's a very big process to go through in our system. Like I said, it's older and we can't overburden it, it would be wonderful to have a one-to-one correspondence, but there are some -- it's the way the SuDocs system is set up, you know, general pubs categories and things like that. It's not at a title-by-title or

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

piece-by-piece system. Is that an adequate answer?

We can give you a lot more information on where we are with that if you see one of us.

KRIS McLONIS: Okay, actually, maybe I'll check with you later, thank you.

MARIAN PARKER: And this is Marian Parker on Council, just following up on that. Do we have -- is this part of FDsys so that when it's fully launched we can count on them being able to have more individual item numbers so that we can do exactly what she was just talking about or is this just separate and apart?

LAURIE HALL: I think for most of the, like the ILS and a lot of our legacy database applications, we're working with the FDsys group to figure out where we can integrate and what won't integrate, they may have a little bit more information, but that's about where we are looking at each system. We're also looking at that data system with our whole Oracle enterprise, the thing that's going on at GPO as using that, those applications to migrate some of those legacy things, so thereon, those are big, it's a big, those are all big projects, so, but they're always on our minds

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

and we're working on various systems at a time.

Does that answer? They can maybe address it a little bit more, but we've had several meetings with the FDsys folks about DDYS looking at what the requirements are, what the current system is, one of my staff, Joe McLean, has done an entire investigation of all of the reports, all of the applications in DDYS so we're preparing for a migration.

MARIAN PARKER: Okay, yeah, it's just such a barrier to being a digital library if you've got to keep getting the paper anyway because you don't, you can't select the digital and I know you know that.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Walt.

WALT WARNICK: Yeah, my name is Walt Warnick, I'm with the Department of Energy Office of Scientific and Technical Information.

I was on Council until -- this is my first year as Council member Emeritus and of course one of the concerns we've had at Council from previous years was the health of the Federal Depository Library Program.

We're always looking for metrics to try

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

to gauge that health. One obvious metric might be the attendance at this meeting. Can somebody from GPO help us out with numbers of attendances, attendees at this meeting in comparison to our recent meetings.

Thank you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well I can't tell you, I can't give you comparative numbers but I can tell you that we have 465 people registered for this meeting.

RIC DAVIS: This is Ric Davis, according, for metrics for past conferences, our all time and/or record is 535, so we're at 465 which is a very good comparable number.

WALT WARNICK: Thank you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Ric, did you want to ask a question?

RIC DAVIS: Yeah, while we have a pause here and I also want to mention as many of you know who have attended this before, this is not your only opportunity as an audience to ask questions.

One of the things that we find as you go through conference, you know, things come up that you want to ask and we're going to have a, you know,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

an open session with GPO as well later in the conference, but I wanted to ask by a show of hands how many of you are currently waiting on a response from GPO in terms of customer service right now? Okay.

I would like those of you who are waiting to catch me and let's talk because I want to know some details about what you're waiting on. Thanks.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Thanks, Ric. Okay. Calisthenics -- oh, we have a question, see, I knew this would be --

LORI SMITH: I'll be happy. Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. While you know we're automating everything and, you know, customizing, what would be nice is every time I do the selection update I find that a lot of item numbers for strange things have been added to our profile because we select something else.

If you could somehow send me based on our profile, you know, these have been added to your selection profile this week because you selected this so I could drop those right away, that would be nice.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

And then my question and/or complaint, we've been getting a lot of microfiche lately that seems to be a correction but the call number does not indicate that it's a correction. It doesn't have the /CORR, so we're running out to the microfiche readers a lot to see is this a duplicate or is this an updated edition, so I'm not sure how that is happening that the CORR is not getting on the call number, but that's getting kind of annoying because it's happening a lot, so. Just to bring that to your attention.

RIC DAVIS: Does anybody want to comment on that. Okay, thank you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, well it looks like calisthenics.

You've all done the drill before, most of you have, could those of you from academic libraries please stand. Wow. Okay, thank you, you may sit.

Will attendees from public libraries please stand.

(Applause)

Special libraries such as State libraries, Agency libraries.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



# Capital Reporting Company

(Applause)

Okay. Libraries -- oh, I am so sorry, I, I have a feeling that I'm going to get a talking to. Law libraries.

(Applause)

Okay. Libraries east of the Mississippi.

(Applause)

Libraries west of the Mississippi.

(Applause)

Remain standing if you are west of San Francisco. There we go.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about western San Francisco?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, that will do it.

Okay, actually, this is the part that I'm always most interested in, this shows some real dedication. How many of you are attending this conference with full funding from your institutions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wow.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Wow. That's very good.

Partial funding from your institutions.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

(Applause)

For those of you freighting your own way, please stand.

(Applause)

And I will mention something about this at the next break, but could regional libraries please stand.

(Applause)

On Council, as well.

Thank you. Questions? We had some very interesting comments. There must be some questions.

Oh, there's a question.

KERRY GIBSON: Hi, my name is Kerry Gibson from Ursinus College in Pennsylvania. I'm a first-time attendee and new Government documents librarian, although I'm not new as a librarian.

In my first year that I've been here the issue has been raised about dropping out of the program and I have been, I feel that I've been on, on the defense quite a bit. Our library has only been a depository since 1963, we only collect about 20 percent of the collection and I've had to justify certainly with our collection development as to why we are staying in the program.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

I feel my administration might not quite be with me on staying in the program and I wanted to address that issue to the Council, as well I'm looking in your Website, I've certainly used the research from the cases of the libraries who have dropped out and I was wondering if you would first update it as well because I really haven't seen anything current maybe since in the last five years or so or have tried the Website and sometimes the documents aren't there.

And I just, I just was wondering what other cases you have or studies or anything that I can bring back to my administration for staying in this program.

Thank you.

RIC DAVIS: Thank you for that comment. The question of remaining a depository is one that, you know, as I mentioned during my speech we at GPO hear quite often and I think back to some of the bullets that were discussed in the shared regional model and you're also going to hear about during assessments and that is, you know, the focus on access, the focus on collections and the focus on service.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

When you look at those opportunities, whether we're in a print age or a digital age, those things still hold true. We have information that if, if you can see me right after we get off stage here, we have information that we can make available again through Ted Priebe's area and Janet Scheitle's area in library planning, along with studies we've done and I also wanted to get the URL you were referencing on the Website.

I'm not sure if you were referencing the one that talks about the total number of libraries in the program, if that's it, I'll look at that and see if that needs updating.

The one thing that I do want to mention is as we talked about in Denver, we've actually had a number of new libraries, particularly tribal libraries, the law school I mentioned during the speech who have joined the program and as of last year our numbers were actually up.

Whenever you have administrators who have concerns about being a depository, we at GPO are very happy to sit down and talk to them, we can either do it over the phone or we'll talk about coming out for a visit.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: That question also reminds me to add, do one further calisthenic, a very important one.

How many of you are first-time attendees?

(Applause).

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Big round of applause.

If there are no further questions, we can break early.

I guess I shouldn't have phrased it that way.

.. Okay, we'll see you back here at, what, 10:30.

(Short recess taken)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS okay, I have a couple announcements. Today is take your regional to lunch day -- oh, no, I mean today is a day for selectives to meet with their regionals and go to lunch and I have a couple of announcements related to that. There's also a bulletin board near the registration desk where you can look to see if folks have posted where different delegations might be meeting.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

I do have a couple of them here.

Virginia librarians meet for lunch in front of the hotel registration desk on the lobby level.

Missouri librarians meet for lunch in front of the registration desk on the lobby level. Texas depository librarians and friends will go out to lunch today at the Hamlet Restaurant, meet in the main lobby across from the front desk and walk over at noon.

Okay. What we now want to do is move into sort of the unnamed system and perhaps find out its name. We can at least call it now FDsys and we'll soon learn what else it's called.

MICHAEL WALSH: In a positive --

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I'm not sure I ever say things the way I intend them, but they always come out funny, yes, unintentionally so, yes. I would like to introduce Mike Walsh who is Chief Information Officer and what else, information technology and systems facilitator; is that it? No.

MICHAEL WALSH: Sounds okay.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: That sounds okay, okay. Mike Walsh.

(Applause).

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

MICHAEL WALSH: Good morning, everyone, and welcome new Council members.

What I'd like to do is provide a bit of an introductory into the rest of the session this morning where you're going to get a chance to see FDsys.

We have our first beta which we're really calling a proof of concept. It's operational and we'll be able to show you aspects of that and I think you'll, you'll enjoy what you see and it will be a look at what more features will be coming along as FDsys continues to be developed.

And without further ado, with the build-up that Mr. Tapella gave about the name, there was a lot of work that was done in thinking about the name for this system and we've talked about it at occasions at Council meetings in the past and the difficulty that we've had in coming up with a name. My favorite, which was turned down, was Tapellasphere, I still really like that one, but apparently it wasn't approved by the general Council, but there was no other trademark against Tapellasphere, so it had one thing going for it.

What we've decided to do is actually

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

keep the name FDsys. I know, excitement, right.

(Applause)

We've called it future digital system and now it really is becoming the Federal digital system, GPO's Federal digital system. We didn't intend for FDsys to be a self-made brand when we started coining that name three years ago as we finished up with our concept of operations, but we needed to call it something and FDsys worked for us and I think it still very much carries a good connotation of what GPO is trying to do.

We're developing a Federal digital system for Federal publications and it will work pretty well, so it's not glamorous, it's not, you know, sizzley, but I think it really tells a good story and we're going to continue with that.

So, this morning we're going to do a brief overview and status of FDsys. Carrie is going to, Carrie Gibb is going to talk about the communications update and as you can imagine, we've had continued outreach, we're doing more outreach and discussions all the time and she can give you an update on that.

We're then going to do a development

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

update, Gil Baldwin will be doing that and then the proof of concept demonstration, which is the release that was completed a couple months ago and has been under test now and is serving as a demonstration vehicle for us for this system will be demonstrated by Lisa LaPlant and Matt Landgraf and then we'll have some time for questions and answers.

A little bit about what's going on with the program office and particularly some organizational changes within GPO. Geoff mentioned I'm now the Chief Information Officer, that's a change. If you recall, a couple years ago when this program was started, the FDsys program was, was separate from the CIO organization and that was intentional. What we wanted was a development organization that could focus on technology management and actually program management for this complex thing we now call FDsys.

So it was a very focused team working specifically on FDsys. As we approach a roll-out of FDsys and other system initiatives within the GPO, the closer we can integrate with the information technology and systems area which is responsible for enterprise architecture, day-to-day operations of IT

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

systems and project management and the difference between a program management and project management is really different where programs focus on Agency business needs, if you will, and the outreach to our partners in the library community, agencies, et cetera, where project management really focuses on delivering technical projects within the Agency that link to programs with outreach.

So, as we started rolling closer and closer toward our roll-out of FDsys and other system initiatives at the Agency, it seemed timely and it made perfect sense to merge these organizations. So now the new CIO group has program responsibility, technology selection responsibility which was formerly the FDsys program office, right alongside the IT operational activities with project management and IT security.

So, the complete package is now in place and, oh, boy -- that IT stuff, it just, it haunts me, it really does.

So the IT organization is now altogether and of course we have some VPN problems.

Strategic systems initiatives, talk a little bit about that. I mentioned a couple of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

times on the last slide about other information systems and strategic initiatives. Within GPO there are three system initiatives at a very high level that are underway. The one on the left is business systems. Business information systems. Laurie Hall mentioned a little bit earlier in response to a question Oracle. Oracle is our backbone for business information systems. It's being integrated across the Agency for database activities associated with business information like finance, like human resources, human capital. It's a, it's an enterprise type of program, so that's part of that, that system that's on the left.

In the center is the content management systems. This is where FDsys resides. It's where the integrated library system resides, our activities associated with composition replacement. One of the things that GPO has used for years is a digital system to help compose Congressional publications. It's an old, obsolete application that needs to be replaced and in order for us to continue to serve Congress and other agencies in the composition for printing and publishing services. So, composition replacement is directly aligned with

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

content of Federal publications. So it's a middle, part of that middle system called content management systems.

And then on the right-hand side is digital production systems, things associated with our plant operations and our production operations. We have as examples manufacturing systems for print on demand and work flow systems, ERP types of things that you would see in a manufacturing operation. All of those are the major systems activities within GPO that are supported by IT infrastructure and operations.

So as we move forward within the Agency, we now have a very comprehensive look at digital systems as we continue on our journey with transformation within the Agency. FDsys is a huge part of it. It's a central part that is critical for us to be able to receive information from Federal agencies and Congress and also make it available digitally and also support printing operations.

So it's, it's purposely drawn in the center of that, of that drawing.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

So now if you think back of, of now the combination of our program office and technology selection with IT operations and project and security, in the context of the strategic system initiatives you can probably see where it all plugs together.

There's a lot of planning activities that are going on and it's a lot of execution that needs to be done in order to pull this off, but we're committed to, to do that sort of thing and we have active programs within our business information systems today with Oracle and as you all know and will see, there's a very active program within FDsys and the integration with our integrated library systems which are, the dim of it you will see in a few minutes.

And now on to FDsys and in particular the rest of the day, or the rest of the morning, rather, actually the rest of our lives, probably. FDsys, as many of you know, and I was, appreciated the earlier calisthenics of the new members here or new attendees, we've been on a journey for over three years now of trying to develop a concept for FDsys, detailed requirements for what FDsys needs to

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

do and then into an implementation phase which is where we are now. FDsys is intended to be a world-class information management system for Federal publications, to make those available in perpetuity. So for us to do that there's a lot of information technology and information systems associated with that and a lot of hard work in order to create a system that will allow us to actually meet the goals associated with a Federal digital system for GPO.

We, about a year ago, year and three months or so ago we awarded a contract to Harris Corporation and they've been working closely with us since then on the development, design and deployment of systems and what you will see today, provided the IT systems with VPN works, is a view of actually a live system for FDsys that will show how the system is actually capable of providing those services.

So with that, I will now turn it over to Carrie to give you an update on communications and then Gil to talk a little bit about status and then on to the demo.

Thank you.

(Applause).

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

CARRIE GIBB: Thanks, Mike. Well, since the last Council meeting in April we've continued to expand on our previous outreach efforts. We held a focus group which assisted us in developing the search features and user interfaces that you'll see shortly from Lisa and Matt in our proof of concept demo.

As we move forward with the development, we will continue to host similar events and if you're interested in participating in these events and giving us your feedback, please let us know by sending an E-mail to PMO@GPO.gov. When you stop by, we're going to have a table so you can stop by there.

The program management office has also established working groups with the Office of the Clerk of the House and the Office of the Secretary of the Senate. These working groups have given us invaluable insight into their workflows and have driven the development for submission for Congressional information into FDsys. We continue to host meetings of the Inter-Agency Council on Digital Content Submission, also known as ICDCS, and the Council is made up of publishing specialists

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

from a number of Federal agencies. This Council allows us to openly exchange ideas with our Agency customers to develop FDsys. We also recently concluded a nationwide initiative to engage agencies in coordination with GPO's national account managers, the PMO hosted events in Seattle, San Francisco, Denver, Dallas, Philadelphia, Chicago, Hampton, Virginia, Columbus, Ohio, and Atlanta.

These events were attended by over 30 Federal agencies and the response was extraordinarily positive. Federal agencies are excited about the benefits of FDsys, not only the submission aspect but also authentication and preservation as well. Our most recent outreach efforts have centered around the proof of concept demonstrations and the purpose of these demos is to showcase and elicit feedback on the core functionality of FDsys.

These demos began in September and will continue into November and they've been currently viewed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the Office of the Clerk of the House -- I should be moving slides, shouldn't I, there we go. Office of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



# Capital Reporting Company

the Clerk of the House, the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, D.C. area librarians, the Congressional Research Service, the Office of the Federal Register and the Inter-Agency Council on Digital Content Submission.

The response to the demos has been overwhelmingly positive and has also assisted us in developing ways to further improve the user interface and system functionality.

Beta testing for release 1B is divided into user groups. The library community concluded beta testing last Wednesday and we'd like to thank everyone that participated in that beta testing. Feedback concluded that over 90 percent of the users found FDsys easy to navigate and easy to find what they were looking for.

We'd also like to invite you to give us your feedback as well during the conference. We'll have a table set up in the vendor area right outside with access to FDsys and it will be, will be staffed starting at 1:30 today through 1:30 on Wednesday, with the exception of the open Council forum tomorrow.

We will also begin internal and Federal

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Agency beta testing in late November. As you see here, and you can stay tuned to our Web page, the FDsys Web page for more information on this testing and the feedback that we receive from these groups.

I'm now going to turn it over to Gil Baldwin who will talk to you about the latest development updates.

GIL BALDWIN: Okay, thanks, Carrie, and good morning everybody. I'm going to be talking with you a little bit today about the status of our 1C developments and release 1C is what we call the first public release of FDsys. It builds on the foundational elements that were established for release 1B which is the proof of concept that you'll be seeing a little later.

Some of these foundation elements include our software acquisition decisions, adherence to the open archival information systems reference model, basic content submission, how packaging is done for content and metadata together, content search and delivery and other features.

As Mike said, GPO and Harris Corporation have been working carefully to plan the sequence of 1C releases and, in fact, we are holding a key

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

development event which is the LC systems requirement review and system design review next month. And these reviews will ensure that GPO and Harris design and development share a complete and common understanding of the work to be done over the coming months.

Now the public release will be rolled out in stages or increments, also sometimes called mini releases. Each of these increments will introduce additional system functionality.

I wanted to tell you some of the planning milestones that have already been accomplished. This list begins in January of this year with a system requirements review which is an opportunity for the entire development team and some of the business unit people to get together and make sure that the requirements are completely understood and meet the needs of the business units in accomplishing what they want to do.

An outcome of doing that is a requirements document, so our requirements document 3.1, it's been up on our Website most of this year for anybody to take a look at who wishes to. We also this Spring had our first system design review.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Once again -- which takes a high look at, a high level look at the system design, make sure the architecture is understood.

In May we began working with a feature sets approach to development, which is to, has divided the requirements up into a number of different feature sets and an outcome of that was to begin requirements work groups which did a lot of finetuning and further cleaning of the requirements.

The requirements are never fully locked down. As new needs emerge and our understanding gets better, we continue to work on them and finetune them.

Now here are some things that are coming up. The development process that's used by Harris and GPO for FDsys requires reviews at a number of different milestones. The delta systems requirement review, the delta SRR will ensure there's a complete understanding of any changes also known as deltas in engineering speak which have occurred since the first review last Winter. One outcome of the delta SRR will be to establish the baseline for all release 1C requirements and these will be documented in another requirements document, or RD 3.2, and

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

again we'll publish that on our Website when it's available.

Any changes to that baseline will be managed through a change management process. Once the requirements are nailed down, then our next step is a delta system design review, or SDR, and this is another opportunity to validate any changes which may have occurred based on new learning since our initial SDR back in May and this includes new learning that's come out of the release 1B demonstrations and reviews.

One outcome of the SDR will be to finalize the baseline for system architecture.

Okay, you're probably wondering what's in these feature sets anyway and what's the schedule? Let me talk a little bit about that. We have roughly eight high level feature sets which include varying numbers of the requirements and this gives us a way to work on things in an incremental fashion and this first cluster is sort of the foundation of the whole thing, so as you can imagine that any system requires its infrastructure in order to function.

Package management, which is putting

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

information, content and metadata together into the information packages which have been presented to you at previous sessions and, again, adherence to the open archival information system reference model which we feel is essential to support our preservation efforts in the future.

We're also going to be working with Agency content submissions starting first with Congressional content submission and of course access and delivery because as Mr. Tapella pointed out, we can have a great system but if it doesn't deliver content to you, we've missed the mark.

It's not coming up. There we go. Other feature sets include our Congressional content submissions, and we're going to work, as Carrie pointed out, we're working with our Congressional Office of the Secretary, Office of the Clerk of the House to make sure that their needs are met. Our persistent name application, which as you'll be hearing later in the conference, is focused on handles. Agency content submission, access and delivery, okay.

Here's what the schedule looks like as we're aiming for our first public release in 2008.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Additional releases will occur in 2009 by adding system functionality. The release 1B demo system is expected to be used throughout the development of the next release to gather comments and feedback.

This pilot allows us to verify and refine our understanding of the requirements and its information that will allow us to deliver a high quality system that meets the needs of Congress, our Agency customers, our library partners, the general public and the GPO business units.

Without further ado, I'm going to turn this over to Matt Landgraf for the first portion of the proof of concept demonstration.

MATT LANDGRAF: Good morning, everyone. I need to re-establish my VPN connection real quick, so bear with me.

Sorry about this. Okay, here we go.

Okay, while that's loading up, good morning again everyone, sorry about the delay, just had to get our VPN connection back. It has nothing to do with FDsys, by the way.

So as Gil said, what I'm going to do is I'm going to, I'm going to take you through the proof of concept for content submission through

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

FDsys. So what, what you're going to see, I'm going to be acting on, as, basically a content originator, what we're calling a content originator. I'll be, in this case I'll be a member of the Environmental Protection Agency submitting a piece of content to GPO, submitting a job to GPO and then it will go through the entire process.

So, what you're going to see is the first look at interfaces. What we've tried to do is combine a lot of the standard forms that are currently, that are currently used for observations who submit content and jobs to GPO, so there's the standard one, the standard form 1, there's a 952 form, there's a 2511 form for print, for print orders on term contracts, so there's all these different forms that are used.

What I've tried to do is to sort of standardize that interface and customize it so that it's all one seamless process so you'll see a tad-based approach that we've used for a submission of these jobs.

So, as I said, I'll be acting as a, as a content originator. Just so you know, we also have a standard work flow in place for GPO users to

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

actually go in and use the system after a job has been submitted by the content originator.

So we'll, for example, we'll have a cataloging technician that will have the capability to enter into additional metadata about a publication once it's been submitted. We'll also have the opportunity for our customer services organization to add in job information and add in any kind of information that's needed to process the job.

So, there's a few more roles that happen after this, but you're going to see me actually submit a job as a content originator. So what I've done is I've logged in as a Federal Agency content originator and this is the home page, the proof of concept for the home page that we see.

Just to give you a little bit of information on, you know, just to give you a little bit of a tour around the page, we have a getting started link for first time users of FDsys. We see this functionality being, being beefed up in the next release of the system, but this is a place where you can go to, you can go have a snapshot of what functionality is available and a good idea of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

where to start in submitting jobs.

We'll also have, we'll also have some, some links here that are grayed out, we'll have an opportunity for Federal agencies and Congressional users to submit content to GPO without actually submitting a job. So let's say EPA would like to submit something for GPO to preserve and to provide access to in perpetuity but don't necessarily need to order any kind of GPO product for service, they don't need to have it printed, they don't need to have it -- any other, any other product or service associated with it. This is just for the, for the purposes of providing access and delivery.

We'll also have a link to upload Bills, as well. We're working very closely, as Carrie said, we have working groups with both the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate to, to further, you know, get the requirements for how Congressional Bills are submitted, so look for that functionality to be more beefed up in the next release as well.

So I'm going to go on and just introduce home page here. What you see is basically a listing of jobs that have either been entered in by myself

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

or other people within the PMO organization. So you'll see title, you'll see which Agency submitted it. You'll see whether files have been uploaded. You're also going to see a couple different statuses.

So the first status here, submission status, remember I told you about the different roles within GPO that, that a job will need to go through before it's actually submitted and which is available through the search which you'll see Lisa do later, this just gives you a little bit of information about, about where that job is within that, so we have a job that's ready for a cataloging technician, have the job ready for a requisition specialist, so that's just a little bit of insight as to where the job is within GPO.

Once I click on status, this is a proof of concept for a -- for the status of the job within GPO. And whether the contract has been written for it, whether specs have been in development, so look for this, we're going to work pretty closely with Federal agencies and our Congressional users to further figure out what the requirements are for these, for these, for this job tracking capability.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

So now what I'm going to do is I'll quickly run through an entire job through the process of FDsys, so I'm going to go ahead and click on create a new job and I'm taken to the page where I can enter the most basic information about the job that I want to enter.

So the publishing Agency, as I said, I'm going to be acting as a member of the Environmental Protection Agency, there they are, and my publication title is cross connection control. Okay. Once I click save, my job will actually be, be saved as a work in progress and my job is actually created now within FDsys and this is the main interface that we, that we have right now as a proof of concept.

As you can see, we've used a tad-based approach that follows the logical progression of how someone would enter information in about a job. So we have eight tabs here and I'll go through them pretty quickly.

We have the general tab first, this is where all the general information about the job is entered in, including contract type, we're going to let GPO decide that, and then we're going to put in

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

some information about how we're going to pay for the job.

So let's charge our billing address codes, it's an internal number for agencies and the appropriation number as well. And I'll say that my document is unclassified.

So once I click save, all my information is, is saved here. As you notice there's, there's very, very mandatory fields for Federal agencies and as I said, there's, there's other GPO people that need to see these jobs before they can actually be submitted, especially cataloging technicians that can add additional metadata.

So going on to publication, this is where I can add in some basic metadata about the job and about the publication that I'm submitting. So as you can see, my, my title and Agency have already been pre-populated. I'm going to go, I'm going to go ahead and enter in the date issued for this particular publication. The date issued was September 1st, 2007, and as I said, I know a catalog technician is going to go in and enter in some additional metadata and some additional metadata will be available through the search, so I'm just

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

going to go ahead and click save.

I'm going to skip over intent to publish right now, that's functionality that we see happening in the next release. This is the form that Federal agencies use to, to notify GPO that they're about to publish a certain publication and GPO can make decisions on whether, on whether they would like to order copies for the FDLP for the sales program, so that functionality will be available in future releases.

So file info, this is where I can actually enter in the information, actually enter in, upload the actual file that I'm going to use. So if I go to upload files, take it to a place where I can browse my desktop and I will submit my file. Once I click on add file, I'll see my, my file come up here. I'll see the file size and I'll also have a chance to delete it at this point.

Right now the file has been uploaded to our CMS and is held as a work in progress at this point. And if I clicked on it I would actually be pulling it straight from the content management system in, within FDsys. You can also add a little bit more information about, about the file that I

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

just submitted. I can say whether it's in a native format, whether it's been press optimized, print optimized, some good, some good additional metadata to have about a publication. So I'll just leave those at the default.

Okay. The next couple of tabs have had more to do with ordering print. We have the product tab where you basically can add in information about whether, you know, what, what your, what your book is, whether it's a book, whether it's a pamphlet or you can add in information about, about finishing and ink and paper.

I'm not going to go through a lot of that stuff here, but that's where that functionality lies.

Same thing with proofs and delivery, you can add in information about whether you'd like proofs for a certain job and what kinds of proofs and you can add in information about where the proofs can be delivered.

Same thing with delivery information, you can add in your, your address and how many copies you'd like to have shipped, so let's say we'll ship 5,000 of these and we want it by next

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Friday. And of course we can enter in our address, as well.

So once we've saved that and once we've entered in all the information on all the tabs, we can get a summarized view of what we entered through the summary tab and I can go ahead and expand each one of these and get information about what information I entered in through each one of the tabs.

This is also the place where I can actually also submit the job and it can go to the next phase of the, the next phase of the process.

But let's say I don't want to submit this yet, let's say I need a little bit more information or I need additional approval, I can go ahead and click on home and see that my job has been saved on the home page, it's the last one here, cross connection control and it's been saved and it's actually a work in progress at this point. And it will be saved until the point that I'm ready to submit it.

I can also delete the job from here as well. So if I want to go back in and actually submit the job, I'll go back to my summary tab, and

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

once I click on submit I'll get a confirmation that it's been, that the job has been received and a little bit of information about the job. Once I click okay, I'll go back to the home page and see that my job status has been changed to submitted to GPO.

Now as I told you, there's a lot of different roles and a lot of, there's a few different people that need to see a job before it can actually be ingested into FDSys and be made available through the search, so this job would go through those processes and then once the final, the final role within GPO clicks a bit, that's when the publication would be available through the search. And that is where Lisa LaPlant comes in. Thank you.

(Applause).

LISA LaPLANT: Thank you. I'm Lisa LaPlant and I'm on the access and delivery team working on the future digital system.

So up until this point in the demonstration Matt has taken you through the submission of content into the system and my part of the demonstration picks up when someone has said this is the final published version, good to go,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

make it available to the public.

So FDsys uses a search engine to make final published versions of content available to the public. For the 1B proof of concept, development really centered around building the search infrastructure and I'm happy to report that FDsys uses the fast search engine instead of the wavy search engine which is currently used on GPO Access.

So in addition to developing the search infrastructure, we created a simple search feature. And we've also started to build our advanced search functionality through our concept of simple search, advanced results. So what do we mean by this.

We use a single search box to submit queries and provide navigational elements to help users hone in on their desired documents.

For 1C we will be developing our advanced and fielded search capabilities and we will also be expanding our concept of advanced results. So for this demonstration you won't see the advanced and fielded search, you'll see the, where we started with our simple search, but we have those requirements for the 1C for the first public release.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

So as you can see, it's in a little bit of a different look and feel. The search page is actually in a proposed new look and feel for a GPO.gov redesign. The links on the left-hand side and on the top and on the bottom are not part of this demonstration, but we wanted to just give you an idea of what the search features would look like within the context of the GPO.gov site.

As we move forward we will continue to work with our public relations department and also other stakeholders, both internal and externally, to make sure that the links on our left navigation are pertinent to the content that folks are searching.

In addition to that, we will be continuing to solicit feedback from our stakeholders, both internally and externally, to make sure that the content and the site is usable. It's a, we want to make sure that both the navigation of the site, the layout, the design, really it's something that folks can use and get to the content available on FDsys.

Okay. So with that, a little bit about what's available for search for the proof of concept. Right now we have the 2006 Federal

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Register in the system. This is around a little over 25,000 Federal Register individual documents. We have Congressional Bills from the 109th Congress and that comes to a little over 17,000 Congressional Bills. And we also have a little over a dozen Agency publications available for search and those are publications that have been submitted through the ingest process that Matt just walked you through.

Okay, as far as file formats available for search, right now we have the pdf version of content available in the system. For the first public release we will have additional file formats available so you will have the text, the html, the standard access file formats. But for the first release we wanted to really center on a, on the pdf files.

Okay. So with that, let's do our first search. Okay. Before I click submit, a little bit of background information on the search, you'll notice that you don't have to use quotation marks, it is a, it will pick up that this is a phrase. If you would like to use quotation marks, the system

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

will also recognize that and you'll get more accurate results. Boolean operators are enabled, so if you'd like to use and, or, not, those are available. They don't have to be, they don't have to be capitalized. We also support the ability for wild card searches and all of those types of search tip informations are available off of the search tips link. It's currently a pdf file and we see this for the first public release being much more robust.

So if you miss some of the tips and tricks that I talk about during this demonstration, check it out in the search tips.

Okay, so we'll do our search. I'm going to do a search for railroad retirement. My dad worked for the railroad for a number of years and if he were to come in and use the system, this is what he would search for, so it's one of my favorites.

Okay. And with that, let's, the way I'm going to structure the demo, we're going to start at the top and just walk all the way down through the page and I'll explain what we're looking at.

Okay, at the top of the page we have breadcrumbs that show where a searcher is within the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

context of the GPO.gov Website. So our first link is for GPO.gov, the second one is for FDsys home and the third one, since we just performed our search for railroad retirement, you'll notice that the search results contain our query term.

Now keep an eye on this section as we continue to narrow and filter our search because you'll notice that our search filters will be added to the breadcrumbs at the top and it will give us a way to step back through our search results.

Okay. Underneath that we have our search box, search button, search tips, okay. Now let's step over to the right side. You'll see we have what we're calling our narrow by navigators.

The first one is a narrow by key word navigator and the second one is a narrow by resource. So I'll start at the bottom first. Under narrow by resource, you can see that we have this search produced 1,236 Federal Register documents, a little over 1,000 Congressional Bills and a dozen Agency publications.

So if I were to click on Federal Register, this provides a way for us to narrow our search by Federal Register documents. I'll back out

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

of that and let's click on Congressional Bills. And you'll notice this provides a way for us to narrow by only Congressional Bills. You'll also notice that on the right-hand side our navigators have changed, we are now a second level down, so we've selected that we only want to see search results from Congressional Bills so we're given additional navigators. We can now narrow by Bill version, narrow by the date issued, narrow by Bill number and narrow by Congress.

And we want to continue to work with the community to make sure that we're providing the right navigators for the right collections, so we have flexibility to be able to change this on a collection-by-collection basis and this is something that we want to really continue to, to get your feedback on to make sure that we're providing the right way to narrow down a collection.

So for this let's narrow it by Bills from the 109th Congress. Okay. So now you can see we're down to a little over 1,000 and let's say we only want to see Bills from HR 5074, so go down to my narrow by Bill number, click on HR 5074 and we're now down to six search results that are from

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

HR 5074.

At this point we can, if we'd like to narrow by date issued or say narrow by Bill version and we're down to a single search result. In our breadcrumbs at the top we can step back to at any point in the process, so we'll go back to our Congressional Bills and walk through our additional search features.

Okay. So in addition to being able to narrow our search results, meaning throw out or narrow down to the content that we're looking for, we can also sort our search results and when we sort it's just reorganizing, so our default sort is by relevance. We can also sort by resource, so if we only wanted to show, it would rearrange the search results, you would have Agency publications at the top and then Congressional Bills and Federal Register, can sort by date issue and then sort by alphabetical title.

In the first public release these sorts are all bidirectional. Right now they are unidirectional so it will sort the date issued, the newest at the top and A is at the top with alphabetical by title.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

Okay, underneath that we show the number of results displayed. We're now looking at 1 through 10 out of 1,086, it's also available at the bottom of the screen and we have a way to page through and navigate through our results.

Okay. With that let's jump down into our, I'm going to back out a step and let's talk about the metadata in the search results. Okay.

Now back on to our original railroad retirement search, you'll notice that in our search results we have the title, we have the ability to view the file directly from the search result -- oops.

There we go. And our search result metadata. For Congressional Bills we show that it's from the Congressional Bills collection, we have the date issued, the publisher, the Bill version, the Bill number and the size. And this is to show that within our search for individual search results on a collection-by-collection basis, we can display different amounts of search result metadata. So this is another place where we have quite a bit of freedom and we want to get your feedback on what, in fact, you would like to see within the search

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

results to make it most useful.

So I'll scroll down near the bottom and you'll see here's a Federal Register document that shows a little bit of a different bit of information, so this is actually from the Railroad Retirement Board and you can see that it's a Federal Register document.

Okay. Now let's go into, click on the title. Now clicking on the title brings up what we're calling our content detail screen. The content detail screen is a place for us to provide not only a link to the content, but a link to the descriptive metadata, the preservation metadata and the entire content package.

In addition to that, we can provide access to additional metadata that we, that has been actually parsed out of the content. So metadata actually gets into FDsys four different ways, the first way it can be entered in through the user interface, so as Matt showed you in his first part of the demo, it can be parsed out of content, meaning the search engine reads through the full text of the publication and pulls out key elements which are then saved into metadata. It can be

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

entered in as part of the content submission package and it can also be received through an interaction and interface with GPO's ILS.

So as you can see for, for the proof of concept we have captured the Bill title, short title, Congressional session number, version and quite a bit of other information about this.

The FDsys search engine searches both full text of the content and it also searches available metadata. Okay. We'll click on the descriptive metadata link. This is an example of a mods xml file where we would be storing our descriptive metadata. This is an example of a premise xml file which is where we would be storing our preservation metadata. And then the entire content package, which is available as a, a zip file that you can either open up or download on to your desktop.

Okay, with that, let's go into a different search. So FDsys provides the ability to, as I showed on the left -- or the right navigation, the ability to narrow down a search result. So here's an example, say we want to do a search for unions and we're looking at this and there's a lot

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

of searches, there's a lot of search results related to credit unions and that's not really what we're looking for, let's say we want to do a search for unions not credit, so we currently have with this search 377 results and now we're down to 90 results.

Well let's, let's narrow this a little bit more and let's do, let's go back to our original search for railroad and now we're down to two search results and, let's see, we don't want Federal Register documents, so let's do not Federal Register.

And this gets us down to a single search result for the work schedules and sleep patterns of railroad maintenance or way workers and this is from the Department of Transportation, it's an Agency publication and just a little bit of information in the content detail which you can see that this one has an abstract with it, so the content detail is another place where we can provide as much or as little information in the first display as folks feel is necessary.

Okay. Let's do one more search, let's pull up some content from the Federal Register. So let's do a search for airworthiness directives.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Okay. We have our airworthiness directives search, so I'll jump back to this narrow by key word at the top, I know this has come up a couple times and I'll explain what this is, within our search engine we have the capability to analyze the content and pull out key words that are related to a particular document or in this case Federal Register notice.

So what this is showing us is airworthiness, our search was for airworthiness directives, so these are key words that are related to our search for airworthiness directives. So you'll see that there are 427 Federal Register notices that have to do with airworthiness directives and service bulletins.

Now we haven't really done a lot of customization with this feature, but wanted to show this and get some additional feedback from the community to see if this is, if this is something useful, if this is something that, that folks are interested in.

So this is a, as you stop by the, the booth outside, then let us know what you think about this feature. Okay. So our narrow by resource, I'm going to click on Federal Register and you'll notice

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

that the, we are now on our second level down of navigators for the Federal Register. We have our narrow by key word still, narrow by date issued, we can narrow by section, by Agency and by sub Agency.

So let's say for this one we just want airworthiness directives that are service bulletins and we're now down to 427. And maybe we only want it for unsafe conditions, now down to 122.

So let's, let's do a narrow by date issued in here. We're only looking for really recent information, so we'll narrow it by after October 4th and let's narrow this down again, after December 24th.

Okay, and you can see that we are now down to four search results and let's say we're only interested in the, in the final rule and regulation. You can see that we have now narrowed our search down to a single search result. And our narrow by key words serve another function here, it provides a summary about the document, so we know it's about the valve opening and closing, about the hydraulic pump and unsafe conditions and Raytheon aircraft.

So, let's pull this document up and you'll see that it takes us to the exact occurrence

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

of the notice within the Federal Register.

Oops. And in our content detail page, a little bit of information that we've been able to parse out of this document, so we know the Agency is Department of Transportation, the sub Agency is the Federal Aviation Administration, we know the volume, the issue number, the page number range, the section, CFR citation, action, so a number of pieces of information for it. Show our descriptive metadata and our preservation metadata and we'll save down the content package and if I use Win Zip to open it up, it would have a content folder and a metadata folder where we have our mods and premise and then the binding mets file. So this is the file that holds all of the content and metadata together.

And that's what this looks like. Okay, and with that, that's the end of my demonstration, so we'll open it up to questions.

(Applause)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Questions from Council.

PETER HEMPHILL: Hi, this is Peter Hemphill. I don't have -- kind of have a little bit of a list of questions here, so bear with me.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

Matt, when you were mentioning the submission of content, a lot of time content is related together by groupings or associations such as you may have a file folder that has a document in it that refers to a spreadsheet which is related to that document.

To what aspect are you addressing situations where there are inter-relationships between those submissions?

LISA LaPLANT: We addressed that through our concept of content packages, so when content enters into the system, it's packaged as a submission information package and as we showed the binding mets file in addition to the mods and the premise file, that provides a way for us to link together the bits and pieces of content that are submitted into the system.

PETER HEMPHILL: Okay, good.

The, a lot of the search engines have issues finding people, i.e., biographic information, so if you were to do a search on George Washington, for example, you may have difficulty finding that information.

To what degree is the search engine

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

capable of finding that kind of information? Also, we found in our products that a lot of people either don't know what they're looking for at all and are trying to find it or they know specifically what they want and want to go to it, particularly by a document number or some identifier such as 14 CFR part 39.

How have you addressed those situations in the searching?

LISA LaPLANT: Okay, let me take the biographical information first. Actually, you know what, they're both kind of related. So the search for a specific piece of information for the first public release we will have the advancer fielded search capability and you'd be able to limit that to just searching within metadata, so that if that information is captured you can limit your search to say just a CFR citation or you could limit it to a Bill number from the 109th Congress, so we will have that capability with the first public release.

As far as the biographical information, it's something that, it's something that we could capture as part of the metadata. I'll have to check into that with our search engine capability to parse

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

out that information. I know it has the capability to recognize names and that's something I'd like to continue to look into.

PETER HEMPHILL: Yes, if I want to find Mr. Tapella's swearing in form, I'd like to be able to put his name in and also are the results relevancy ranked?

LISA LaPLANT: Yes, they are.

PETER HEMPHILL: Okay. And as far as subscribing to the metadata or syndicating the metadata, is that possible?

LISA LaPLANT: We have requirements for alert services and notification services. They are in, not within the first public release, but a release soon after, yes.

PETER HEMPHILL: Very good, thank you, and it looks very nice.

LISA LaPLANT: Thanks.

JOHN SHULER: Speaking of the screen that's on, up there now, who was the audience that you had in mind or that that was designed for?

LISA LaPLANT: The audience on this one was just to show the FDsys search within the context of the GPO.gov site, so we didn't really do any kind

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

of, it's not supposed to be a home page, although it could be. The audience on this was the, a person who would search for Government information and not really know what they were looking for.

We have our requirements to have the advance and the fielded search for folks who know that they want to, say, just search in the Federal Register to just search in the Congressional Bills, but this was aimed at someone who would come to the site, not know what they're looking for and have a place to start to search across the entire collection.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: Chris Greer from NSF. A couple of questions with respect to the intended openness of the system. Is there any intention of providing an API interface so that at my Agency I can build programs that will use your system?

LISA LaPLANT: Absolutely. We have requirements to provide a search API into the search, public search here. This is, it's not something that's within the first release, but it's in a release that's soon after that. It's actually a question, it came up in, I want to say our ALA

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

presentation over the Summer and have talked to quite a number of folks in the depository community to provide, to get more information about exactly what folks were looking for within a search API.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: And I mean not just the search system, but the entire system.

MATT LANDGRAF: I mean as far as access on the submission side, we, we plan to have, you know, enough, enough roles and enough log-ins for our content originators to be able to log into the system and to be able to submit things through the system, but we also have requirements in later releases of the system for interfaces with external submission systems that, that actually exist right now within, within Federal agencies, things like the Department of Treasury's tip system and a few other systems, we've also talked to DAPs about integrating with their system in the future, so, yes, those requirements are in there and probably will be handled on more of a case-by-case basis.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: All right, maybe we can talk about this a little more later.

Another aspect of open system, is there any intention for providing functionality for

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

community-based annotation, not just the annotation that you're gathering, but the kind of annotation that people in this group could add in terms of functionality?

LISA LaPLANT: There is and that's something that we see as, we're calling it a, an advanced reference tool so the capability to provide that annotation, the ability to get more community feedback on Government publications and those are, are right now tagged on the second public release.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Katrina.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Will a document in here be available for search by other search engines besides the FDsys, so, you know, if I'm in Google, I'm going to find it?

LISA LaPLANT: Yes.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Being new on Council, I'll take the opportunity to ask what might be a dumb question, if, if this is, system is based on whatever is submitted to it, then I assume that it will be ingesting some documents that will be considered out of scope of the FDLP, so we actually will end up with a content that isn't currently being captured in the FDLP.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

I'm thinking of a specific example of a type of document that I, I would hope would somehow get captured by this and this is these draft recovery plans and the final recovery plans for endangered species that are issued by the Fish and Wildlife Service. We used to get them in the FDLR and I think maybe we still get a few of them, but we certainly don't get all of them because they're issued by regional offices and they're not issued by the national office.

So I'm trying to visualize how that type of document would get ingested into FDSys if that Agency, that local office of that Agency isn't submitting this as a print request, they'd have to be submitting it just to submit the content to FDSys and how would that take place?

MATT LANDGRAF: That's a good question. I guess I'll just talk a little bit about the different kinds of content we see in the system.

So we have, we have three types of content that we see coming into the system. We have deposited content, which is what you saw the demonstration of today. It's a Federal Agency or somebody from Congress submitting, submitting things

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

directly to, to GPO.

We also have converted content, so these are, this is, you know, scanned publications, you heard of Mr. Tapella talk a little bit about some of the efforts that we're doing there.

We also have harvested content and this is a, this is a concept where we'll actually go out and harvest content from Federal Agency Websites that for one reason or another didn't make it into the FDLR program.

So we have those three types of, we have those, have those three types of content and really it's going to be, you know, sort of a learning curve at first I think with the focus of the system initially is going to be on deposited content and actually, you know, in going out and talking to agencies and talking to Congress and letting them know that this, that this system is out there for permanent preservation and for access is, you know, hopefully that will entice them to actually submit things directly to GPO in the future.

So we have things like harvested content and converted content to sort of bridge that gap between, you know, things that have been missed over

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

time but really we see, we see deposited content as, you know, the future of FDSys.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Ric.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis. Gwen, the other thing I want to mention on that is as you know, the cataloging and indexing program has a broader mandate than just the scope of the FDLP, so in Laurie's area, she's cataloging content that includes content beyond what we make available in terms of the FDLP and we're going to continue doing that under FDSys as well. At the same time we're going to continue to make those scope determinations for content that falls under Title 44 for public interest, educational value, et cetera.

But I just wanted to mention the cataloging piece will continue to have the broad scope that it has now.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Actually I had another question.

Is there a limit to the file formats that would be accepted?

MATT LANDGRAF: We've, we've made the requirements so that there really shouldn't be a limit to file formats that are accepted by the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

system. There will probably be different capabilities on what we can do with those file formats once they come in. But the system, the requirements for the system are flexible enough that they can handle pretty much any file format coming in.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay, and I have one more question, sorry.

How, how is this going to work with the Fed Ex Kinkos, do they have a submission system like this that would need to be interfaced with?

MATT LANDGRAF: Yeah, they actually do and Carrie could probably jump in a little bit on this as well. They do have a submission system through the Fed Ex Kinkos service, but we also, we have requirements for later releases of the system to be able to integrate with the Fed Ex Kinkos system and things that are within scope for the, for the program, scope determinations will be made and we'll be able to accept that content into the system.

So, yes, we do see a lot of integration with that in future releases of the system. Probably not in the first release, but future

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

releases of the system.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Thank you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Mark.

MARK SANDLER: Thanks, Mark Sandler, Committee on Institutional Cooperation. I guess I, I have a kind of theoretical question just about scale and whether or not you can envision a point or a time where the architecture would really need to evolve significantly to keep up with scale, so I, you know, I just, I don't know how many documents or pages or images or text files or whatever you're sort of optimizing the system for at this point, but, you know, presumably re-indexing and, you know, to allow for cross searching is, you know, would be a challenge, seem to be challenging given the volume you're dealing with, potentially.

MICHAEL WALSH: This is Mike. It's going to be challenging, we completely agree with you there. What we've done so far is we've developed models to help us understand what the size of the system will need to be over a number of years so that we can anticipate the scale, because we've looked at, as Matt said, we're looking at harvested documents and there's a lot of that that's out there

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

on the Web today.

We're also trying to anticipate the availability of more and more converted content that is in tangible form today and that is going into a digital form.

The way that the architecture of the system has been developed has been package based and it, we're leveraging heavily what's been done in OASIS in the development of that so that in a package-based structure, the theory is that scalability is going to be more easy, more easily accommodated and we'll have to test that along the way. What we're looking at right now is a system that we believe is going to grow to about five pedabytes of managed storage and that's just over, you know, a course of time that will allow us to bring in documents that need to be harvested and a substantial amount of converted content and it only includes the type of formats that we are accustomed to today.

If, if we move to more of a rich type of media, video and audio, the size and the growth of the system will, will grow substantially from there.

So I haven't given you a perfect answer

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

I'm sure, Mark, you know, but what we've done is we've looked at architecture based on packaging, xml types of structure, so some of the best practices in the industry today to allow us to have confidence that scale is going to be manageable.

Re-indexing is going to always be a challenge. We know that the technology of -- the technology change and the refresh of technology is going to be another one of our battles, if you will, that the rate of change of technology in areas like search is very dramatic, storage is very dramatic. Even in the content management system we're using documentum as our content management system and we're, we are integrating with NAS and SAN type of storage to be able to accommodate the type of storage and scale that we need and we know that within five or ten years we will have to re-look at all of those things, some of the things that the team has been very adamant about is making sure that we're true to our belief in packaging so that we aren't tied to a content management system or a search tool.

It will be difficult to change those

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

things, but we know that there's going to be a point in time where we may have to consider a different type of search engine or a different type of content management system.

And if, if the theory of the packaging approach for architecture and design is correct, it will be painful but it won't be impossible. So, you know, we're riding on that one pretty heavily.

PETER HEMPHILL: Mike, this is Peter Hemphill, I, just to follow up on that a little bit, to what extent has future budgeting for maintenance of these types of technological changes taken place and are the people up above aware of what could potentially happen with regards to those budgets when technology does change at that pace?

MICHAEL WALSH: Oh, great question. People up above, Tapella's here.

No, we've been -- kind of a long answer to your question, but as a part of the work that we have been involved in is technology management and creating more of a long-term plan for the Agency so that we aren't constantly making changes in technology, something that, frankly, GPO has not been good at in the past.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

If you look at some of the, the aging legacy systems that we are dealing with and in my role as a CIO now and my daily headaches, but what we've done is we've started to look at five-year plans to understand what the technology refreshment rate will need to be and what the costs will be for those. So we don't have a perfect answer yet, but what we've started to do is really create a horizon type of budgeting process so that we can stay current with our technologies for FDsys, in particular we still are on a very keen development path to get to our first public release and the sequential releases after that that have been referenced.

But we do know that, you know, in the foreseeable future, not too far off, we're going to have to do some research and we've started budgeting for that in our operating plans going forward.

PETER HEMPHILL: All right, my main concern is I've seen large systems like this take place and there is this notion particularly at higher executive levels that once it's complete, it's finished and there's nothing else that needs to be done.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

MICHAEL WALSH: I've noticed that, too. And, you know, we try to dispel that rumor and, you know, the reality check has come and the realization of this is what it's going to cost to maintain this Agency in a digital information world and it's starting to sink in. It takes, you know, several opportunities to remind, but we've gone through several of those already, but you're right, we, when -- we can't assume that we're going to be done and it's just let it run for a while. We have some of those types of systems at GPO today that we're still trying to fix.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I think we have time for one more question, John.

JOHN SHULER: Yeah, I want to bring it back to something that Marian's raised in the first part of the morning and that is we've seen now the architecture and design for the public, for the content providers, maybe even the librarians, I think the librarians are buried in there somewhere, but I was thinking now that we are on a path of knowledge here, wouldn't it be about time to start linking the other aspects of the depository system into this process, including the item numbers?

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

I'm trying to imagine showing this system as it exists now to the people back home that are responsible for processing the material that comes into the depository library system that energizes so much of what we do and frankly, I don't see it, I don't know, maybe the folks out in the audience would have a better idea, I don't see it happening yet and it isn't that it's complicated, it isn't that it's from Mars, so to speak, it's just no relevance yet to what the daily life blood of most depositories are.

GIL BALDWIN: Okay, John, one of my tasks is to work very closely with the library services business unit to figure out what their requirements are and we have a number of different working groups going on behind the scenes that will address questions such as you have. I think in the short-term is see that the item number and some of the other Superintendent of Document specific numbers that we all know and love are accommodated within the metadata structure and so they are searchable and be available that way.

In the longer term we're figuring out what are the needs that are going to be accommodated

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

by the system in the future. The, you know, not everything is inside of the scope of FDsys, so there are other systems that will continue to operate and with which we need to interface. Our work flow development activity is charting a lot of these different behind the scenes activities, so you at this point in this proof of concept have seen, I don't know, the very beginning of how content gets into the system, you see what the end result is, that it makes it accessible to the public, but you're not seeing the, you know, all of the behind the scenes snips of the workflow in between.

JOHN SHULER: So we could imagine a time in this system just as the creators of tabs that there would be tabs for librarians on items that they selected, claims that they could make, changes to cataloging records if they choose.

GIL BALDWIN: Well we certainly have anticipated the need for specific interfaces for different types of users.

JOHN SHULER: Okay, and is it conceivable that within the next year or so that specific dates and milestones could be attached to these kinds of interests as opposed to just saying

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

it's a legacy system, one day it will get there, trust us. Now that you've become obviously fully engaged with this system, all that, you should be able to turn this considerable energy to the needs of the librarians in being able to give us specific dates, specific milestones on when we would become part of this community.

GIL BALDWIN: We'll include that in our planning process. We're getting to the level of granularity slowly that you're talking about. There's a lot of detail that needs to be worked through before we get to the point where we can specifically state a month and date when a particular feature is going to roll out, so.

JOHN SHULER: Okay.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I think, Mike, you wanted to say a couple words.

MICHAEL WALSH: Yeah, I guess just a couple things. I hope everybody realizes that, you know, FDsys is becoming real and you've been able to see some aspects of it. There are also aspects that are certainly not here yet, as have been pointed out.

Human factors is, is a key, you know,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

there was a question about what the screens look like in, in the demo in this proof of concept, it's really been an interest to be able to show what we see as the early stages of a very complex package management type of system.

Human factors is an element that's going to be focused on as we really head toward the public release, so the activities of your feedback to the team are critical so that we can understand the types of human factors, for example, that would, would best benefit this community as well as some of the other communities, and even some of the features that you want to see.

Think of FDsys today as like the tip of the iceberg. There's, and Gil referred to it, there's a tremendous amount of detail that's below the surface that is running today that you can't necessarily see.

What you're seeing is the visible piece that gives you a snapshot of some of the search tools that we have and a snapshot of the package, packaging technology and metadata tagging that is being used to put information into FDsys, though the OAIS infrastructure and the storage and the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

activities associated with managing this data are what's invisible and there's a lot of work that's gone into that such that when we start to receive additional input, the theory, again, it's a theory that will have to be tested, the theory is that being able to incorporate that will be a planning activity and it won't be a redesign or a re-engineering activity.

We haven't shown anything associated with preservation. One of the things that, that is very clear of the four key attributes of this system, preservation is one of them. That's a future release as well. Lisa showed the premise metadata and those are captures of descriptive information that will help us do preservation processing. I think, again, what we want to be able to do is capture enough information so that when we start to do preservation processing so that we can make information available into perpetuity, we will have the information available to do that.

Authentication has not been demonstrated either, another one of the four principles of what we're trying to do. GPO today is doing a lot of work, ground-breaking work I believe in the field of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

authentication. There's a session on Wednesday morning specifically dedicated to that.

The aspects of FDsys to incorporate authentication, not demonstrated today, but it's, again, part of the fundamental aspects of what this system is all about so that we can deliver digitally signed information, receive digitally signed information and have the chain of custody capable of being demonstrated in the final releases of the system.

And again, you know, the emphasis that I think you've probably been able to see it that we've been focusing very heavily on packaging of information and the OAIS type of construct and we believe that that's going to be, you know, a key part of how this system will be scaleable and extensible and manageable through multiple technology refreshes.

We're really pleased with our progress, I hope you all feel that we've made good progress as well on FDsys. It's been a, a lot of work over the three years that we've been on this journey, but we have quite a ways to go yet.

So, hang in there and we'll be showing

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

you more stuff as time goes on.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well this is a continuing conversation and we've had this conversation and we will continue to have it and I want to thank Mike and his team for always making themselves available to keep us up to date.

(Applause)

We will reconvene at 1:30.

(Lunch recess taken)

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

## AFTERNOON SESSION SPEAKERS

James Mauldin

Katrina Stierholz

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

(GPO and persistent identification.)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, I think we're going to get going. Welcome back. I hope you all had a good lunch and were able to get back on time. I see lots of people who are enjoying the sunshine, or at other sessions. Oh, there isn't another session, so -- that's right.

Okay. The subject for this session is GPO and persistent identification. This is a very important topic that a lot of us I know are very interested in and making the presentation is going to be James Mauldin, the archival manager in collection management and preservation for GPO.

(Applause)

JAMES MAULDIN: Thank you, thank you. I hope you all had a nice lunch and thank you for joining us on the session on GPO and persistent identifiers.

A number of years ago the Government Printing Office at the behest of the depository library community began investigating persistent naming alternatives in order to provide a consistent and reliable name to the Internet resources.

Several persistent naming systems were

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

reviewed by GPO and GPO ultimately adopted PURLs. The PURLs system was actually created by and developed by OCLC. The original or the initial PURL that was created and entered into our catalog was dated March 26, 1998, and actually created by my colleague here, Mike Clark.

(Applause)

PURL served GPO and the depository community well for a number of years, however the strains of time have caught up with the software and GPO was compelled to review alternatives. Much research went into the decision and inclusion of the requirements for the FDSys which drew us to adopt CNRIs Handles as the persistent naming system for the FDSys.

You might ask what are Handles. Handles are a persistent naming system created originally by the Defense Advance Research Project Agency and further developed by the Corporation for National Research Initiatives, CNRI.

The Handle system has been around for approximately 10 years, but has been routinely monitored and updated and also upgraded over the years, unlike that of the PURL system.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

A short definition is that Handles is an assigned name for a resource with an association to a URL for an electronic file. A Handle is a permanent name for a potential resource and allows the maintainer to keep the resource persistently available to the users.

In order to create Handles and maintain a Handle server, registration is required with CNRI as a resolution service provider.

After the Handle software is installed and configured, information about the Handle server is submitted to CNRI and assigned a prefix and that's actually called the site bundle. When you're doing the configuration and setup of that device, you create a site bundle that is then FDP'd or transferred via E-mail to CNRI and then they E-mail you back a prefix.

It is after that that the resolution of the unique name of the Handle, the part that identifies the publication takes place and basically if you had a string of a Handle, generally you will start out like 10200, which is GPO's prefix, after that slash which is the suffix would be the URL address, for example, LPS 1 which is similar to what

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

we do with our PURLs currently.

It is important to bear in mind that the Handle system is a java-based program, so if you're familiar with our PURL page, it's totally different. You won't be able to come through your browser and look and modify or search a particular Handle if we decide to go that way unless there's some type of interface done.

That means that, well being that it's java, that means that it's not a hyper text transfer protocol, consequently, the Handles does not have an HTTP but is a string of numbers followed by the slash. This is the suffix, after the slash is the segment that is associated with the URL of the document.

As the Handle software is based upon hyper text transfer, Handles must be resolved through a proxy server. The CNRI offers a proxy server for those institutions that, that hope to use or does not want to establish their own proxy server.

For our beta test internally within GPO for the library service and content management, we chose to use CNRIs proxy server instead of standing

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

up our own proxy server but we did stand up our own Handle server.

How do Handles differ from PURLs?

Handles is java based that allows an administrator to assign the system or associate a given URL to a handle. Like PURLs, the Handles once associated with the URL remains unchanged although the URL, the URL can change through the instance -- for instance, for a routine server maintenance, moving from one server to another server.

Handles are different from PURLs in that PURL software install it directly on Unix servers and resides there along with the PURL, creation components of the PURLs. And the PURL database is also lodged there on that one device.

Handles as explained above is a java-based application which requires a proxy server for users who expect to use the Handles as a way of resource. Also Handles runs on a variety of platforms including Windows, Macintosh and Lenox.

The Handles software requires a registration as a resolution service provider and an annual fee whereas the PURL software is essentially free. The PURL software you pretty much can

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

download it and set it up on your system without any cost associated with doing, employing that.

The registration as a local Handle service requires certain service commitments stated in the Handle service agreement. These are quite generic requirements including such items as ensuring smooth interaction between the resolution service provider and the global Handle registry, consistency and reliability of service, proper system maintenance and tracking, non-interrupted service to the global Handle registry and ensuring system security.

Handles in the future digital system, or FDsys as it's called, the primary consideration for the selection of Handles as the persistent naming system is that it includes the features required by GPO's FDsys. It has been the objective of the library services of content management business unit to prepare the way for the FDsys to include Handles technology and to the FDsys by reviewing the Handle software and providing user information to the FDsys team in order to help them complete the requirements for the FDsys.

At the conclusion of our beta test, the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

observations and comments will be reviewed and compiled and submitted to the program management office and the FDsys team, with our recommendation from the library service business unit.

As GPO staff members explore the utility of Handle software, it is evident that there are many technological challenges and policy changes that must be addressed internally in terms of our current work processes and how things are actually done within the library services business unit.

Also while visiting the Library of Congress, they have a Handles operation and they were able to discuss their uses and gave us a real good insight on how they deployed Handles and gave us some things really to think about in terms of when we stand up our Handle server or going to our Handles environment.

Full-scale implementation of Handles is really dependent upon FDsys and their timetable. Currently we don't have a set timetable when we're actually going to deploy Handle, that's going to be really directly related to the FDsys and their components.

New Handles and old PURLs. GPO expects

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

that it will be possible to render the older PURLs that have been created, resolvable through the Handle server. We have approximately 90,000 PURLs to date that we've created and one of the goals of this beta test was that to create a proof of concept that we, through the Handles server we can resolve those PURLs and I think we were successful in actually doing that.

I'm actually going to save you guys the presentation or the visuals that we were going to provide. At our last working group we started talking configuration files and coding and DNS and one of the colleagues from the group was you're not going to show them that, so that's why we don't have the video to show you because we thought it was a little too much technical information for you.

But, it all, it is also important to understand that in order for the PURLs to resolve through the Handle server, all PURLs are going to have to be recreated in the Handles database, in other words, all 90,000 PURLs are going to have to be handled -- entered into the Handle database. I think there are some ways we can do that as a batch process, but I don't think that that would be a big

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

issue. But we'll see.

The alpha test, some results from our alpha internal tests were that, one, Handle system is far more sophisticated software than the PURL system. Pretty much with the PURL system, pretty much what you saw, you could modify, create and delete pretty much is what you could do with PURLs.

With Handles, there's an array of different functions that's in that software, I mean it's open text software so it can be customized to your liking, so I think you're going to see some real good things with the Handles server.

Secondly, Handles are more complicated to create for each associated URLs, where I'm not sure if anyone's actually ever used our PURL application, but pretty much you put in a URL address and the system spits out a PURL. With the java-based application, it's much, much less intuitive, let's put it that way.

Hand-keyed Handles are substantially prone to error than those that are system generated and basically what that means is that with the PURL system, once you create a PURL, you put in a URL address, the system automatically generates that

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



# Capital Reporting Company

PURL number for you.

With Handles we can create the name to be whatever we want it to be, so there, it can be some problems there associated with the creation of those and during our tests we have experienced those.

Complexity of the software, including the administrative value of the creator of the Handle creates difficulty in modifying the Handle after it has been assigned. And one of the things we've learned from LC was that they have several different offices and several different prefixes and for example one office that creates a Handle, another office may not be able to modify it.

Under our current PURL environment, anyone who's an authorized GPO user can go in there and modify and provide maintenance to our PURLs, so that's one thing to keep in mind.

Although it is possible to assign more than one URL to a Handle, the Handle must be manually modified if the primary URL is unavailable. And oversimplified, what that means is with PURL, in relationship to PURLs, a PURL was a one-to-one correlation where you had one PURL for one URL.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

With Handles you can have one URL and multiple URLs, but the thing that's, what, that we found in our beta testing was that it does not automatically redirect once the first primary URL goes away. So it has to be manually triggered to actually go to that alternative address.

The first important lesson is as mentioned above that there appears to be a viable methodology to resolve the existing PURLs to Handles in a manner seamless to the user and the library community, however this has been done only as a concept and cannot be done within the scope of the beta testing being inaugurated today.

In order to get the library community involved in discussions about GPO's use of Handles and the FDsys, we have prepared a Web page with 30 titles which have been catalogued for which PURLs have been assigned. In addition, 25 of the titles have Handles assigned demonstrating various naming methodologies.

The methods that were used are, including a segment in the Handle for the format, some information of the title of the item, we also used the ILS system number and the Superintendent of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

Documents number.

Some file name extensions such as pdf were also used.

GPO seeks your comments on the Handles. You can access the Handles Web page and provide comments. The Web page can be located at [www.FDLP.gov/Handles/index](http://www.FDLP.gov/Handles/index). The deadline for comments is November 26.

That pretty much concludes my presentation. I would like to open it up to Council for any questions.

JOHN SHULER: The question, John Shuler from UIC, the question of whether it's PURLs or Handles has nothing to do with where the document is stashed, correct?

JAMES MAULDIN: Correct.

JOHN SHULER: These 90,000 documents you talked about are stashed on some GPO server somewhere?

JAMES MAULDIN: Correct.

JOHN SHULER: Does the Handles -- does the Handles make it any easier to find permanent documents that aren't on GPO servers?

JAMES MAULDIN: No. No. We're in the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

process of ensuring that anything that we create a Handle to we also have an electronic copy on a GPO server so we would have that redundancy and provide primary public access.

JOHN SHULER: Okay.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri. It sounds to me that one of the virtues here is that you can associate a Handle with both a document as it exists on an Agency site and the document as it exists at GPO in the electronic archive.

But you said it doesn't automatically resolve and I'm wondering about how the workload at GPO compares for that process as the PURL server where you just went in and put in the new URL, I mean you can redirect it, things like that, so how do they compare in terms of workload?

JAMES MAULDIN: Okay, well one of the problems with the PURL server was that it wasn't built to scale. What we experience with the PURL server is that once we got above 20,000 PURLs, validation of our PURL server actually stopped. We actually use other methods to actually validate our PURL rather than the PURL validation system and

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

basically what that means is with Handles, running any type of link check or software, you could identify your broken links. The work that GPO would have to do in terms of validating those will probably remain unchanged.

One of the things that Handles does provide, if you go to Handles.Net and put in the Handle, you can actually see the list of all of the associated URLs, whereas if the first one doesn't work, then subsequently you can select the second if you chose to resolve it from that way. But I believe we are still going to have to do maintenance of those Handles.

PETER HEMPHILL: Peter Hemphill, Hemphill and Associates. Is there going to be an API for translation to go to those PURLs, I assume, from the Handles?

JAMES MAULDIN: That, again, what we set up was a small beta test and without getting too technical we were able to have those PURLs resolve using the Handle server and we didn't do it through an API, we did it using aliases and redirect scripts to main lines.

PETER HEMPHILL: Okay.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

JOHN SHULER: How does, John Shuler, UIC, how does any of the technical talk you just give appear to our users, does it make any difference to them?

JAMES MAULDIN: It would be seamless to our users. Our users, this is all done behind the scene, they would click on a PURL that's in their 856 field of their cataloging record and it would go directly to the resource. Instead of going to the PURL server first for the redirect, it would go to our Handle server for the redirect, so it would basically be invisible to our users.

JOHN SHULER: So there's nothing in the java script that would enable our users to access or organize or distribute the Handles in their lives in a different, in a distributive way?

I'm just thinking about the variety of java script that could be written on both the user's side and the producer's side and I was wondering if there's a connection.

JAMES MAULDIN: At this point that's beyond the scope of our initial pilot. That would probably -- that could be developed with our program management office.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

At this point ours was a small-scale project or the proof of concept that we can resolve our PURLs through the Handles environment.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: Can you say a little bit about what your long-term plan is for legacy PURL systems since there's quite a bit of movement away from PURL --

JAMES MAULDIN: Long, long-term plan, actually that would be more of a FDsys component. I believe that is 1C, if I'm not mistaken, if Mr. Baldwin or someone from the program manager office is available, but I believe that's in the works for the FDsys.

Ours was more of a proof of concept that we can resolve our PURLs, long-range goal would be done under the scope of the FDsys.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, University of Missouri.

Let me, this is sort of related to Chris' question and now if I heard you correctly, you've found a way to resolve existing PURLs against the Handle server, right?

JAMES MAULDIN: Correct.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: So you don't see

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

any maintenance at the local library catalog level that's going to have to occur --

JAMES MAULDIN: Correct.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: -- with given -- okay, I just wanted to make sure of that.

JAMES MAULDIN: Correct.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. That's, that answered my question.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, University of Colorado.

Is there any chance that any future enhancements to the PURL software would allow for automatic resolution to a second URL?

JAMES MAULDIN: PURL software, probably not.

TIM BYRNE: I meant Handle software.

JAMES MAULDIN: That is something that we've been in touch with CNRI. I, from the literature that I've read, they said that it can do it and again we're probably only four months into our Handles testing, but I think there's some type of scripting that can be done to automatically resolve those.

We haven't, for the sake of our beta

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

test, we haven't gone down that route yet, but I think it is doable.

PETER HEMPHILL: Peter Hemphill, have you tested the scalability of that?

JAMES MAULDIN: Of Handle?

PETER HEMPHILL: Yes.

JAMES MAULDIN: No, small scale. We've actually created approximately 300 Handles and so that was the limit of our, our beta test was 300 Handles, but we only actually provided access to about 30 of those. We were actually really concerned about the naming conventions and ensuring that they actually resolved, that we can get our PURLs to resolve.

PETER HEMPHILL: Well you should probably also check the naming conventions when it starts to scale because underlying file systems may not handle the naming conventions in mind.

JAMES MAULDIN: Okay.

PETER HEMPHILL: So you may need to generate a large scale amount of Handles to see how it goes.

JAMES MAULDIN: Well one of the other benefits, I will mention this as well, was that the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

PURL server was actually one server which equates to one box where the Handles environment can be a distributed network, you can have multiple servers for load balancing, I think you will see an improved performance once we migrate to Handles.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: Chris Greer from NSF. I wonder if any of the organizations represented in the audience are running PURL servers now or considering a move to Handles? Are there any hands out there from anyone who's doing this?

MARK SANDLER: I'm not in the audience, but I slept through many meetings, many discussions with PURLs and Handles when I was at the University of Michigan, but ultimately Michigan switched to Handles to, to, for their hosting of Google content and they did that in conjunction with Google and as Geoff's question suggested, Michigan is actually sending people both to their own stored copy of Google works or of Google digitized content or sending them to Google to see it, so they're able to use one Handle apparently to do that.

So, currently Michigan has probably a million items online and is intending to scale to 5 plus million with it, so at least, you know, at

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

least it scales substantially up to a million and they at least, they and Google both believe that it will scale beyond, so.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: Does the Handle system, Chris Greer again, does the Handle system have an implication for authentication and validation with multiple resolution capacity?

JAMES MAULDIN: Again, I think that would be outside the scope of our particular beta test. I think again that would be addressed by the FDSys and the PMO. Good question, though.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Any more questions from Council?

JAMES MAULDIN: Any other questions from Council?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Do we have any other questions from the audience?

KATI JOBE: Kati Jobe, University of Colorado at Boulder, do you know if the Handle system is opened more often (inaudible).

JAMES MAULDIN: You're going to have to do that with the use of a proxy server. Now if you have your own individual proxy server, that will, would be able to resolve that, if you're going to a

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

proxy, yes.

Again, this is java based so it would need the use of a proxy server in order to do those resolutions.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: John.

JOHN STEPHENSON: John Stephenson, University of Delaware. I'm curious (inaudible) but has your test actually dealt at all with the statistics sharing -- (inaudible) statistic so that we know how many people are using the Handle that's in our catalog or Web page?

The PURL referral statistics are very useful when you show your director that you got 300 uses a month for whatever it may happen to be and GPO has been very good in compiling statistics for, you know, our directors to see how useful the electronic environment can be.

JAMES MAULDIN: Well, actually that, again, is outside of the scope of this particular pilot that we've done through the library service and content management unit, but one of the functionalities of the application, itself, it does have some type of metrics reporting, I believe that's in the administrative GUI of the java

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

application itself.

We haven't really tested that but I think again that's outside of the scope and I assume that the program management office and FDsys will.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Cindy, did you want --

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah, where did John go. One of the things that we'd like for you to comment on on the survey for Handles is just that kind of thing, what kind of feature do you want to have, let us know, because as James stated earlier, all the feedback from this survey and your comments is going to be packaged in a report with requirements that goes to the FDsys folks, so if it's something that you want to see, put it in a comment. The list serve announcements about that went out Friday, so.

ELLEN SWEET: Ellen Sweet, Department of Justice. I think I heard you say that the PURL software was free but that the Handles was going to have to be paid for.

JAMES MAULDIN: Yes.

ELLEN SWEET: How are you going to pay for it and does the contractual arrangement, is it a one-time deal or is it going to cost more if the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

volume increases?

JAMES MAULDIN: It's an annual fee and the fee is very nominal.

ELLEN SWEET: Okay.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One thing I wanted to clarify on that is that the fee is not a fee that will be borne by the users, this is a fee that we'll bear at GPO.

JAMES MAULDIN: Oh, yes. And then the fee primarily provided us with the prefix which probably would equate to Handles.GPO.gov, just the use of that domain name.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Besides Mark, is there any, any other Council members going to Handles in their institution and nobody in the audience volunteered, okay. I mean we're going to Handles when we go there, but we're not.

MARIAN PARKER: The question I have is as I heard you talking about this is it sounded to me like it's significantly more labor intensive than the current PURL process and for me there's a question, number one, is that accurate, number two, if it is, that's just lots of room for error.

JAMES MAULDIN: Yes and no.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

MARIAN PARKER: Okay.

JAMES MAULDIN: It depends on the way we actually deploy it.

MARIAN PARKER: Okay.

JAMES MAULDIN: Again, if we decide to go with intelligent to non-intelligent Handles, if we're going to get a system-generated Handle, it will probably be as intuitive as the PURL involvement. If we decide to go with a more intelligent naming convention, I can see where it can be more problematic.

MARIAN PARKER: Okay.

MARK SANDLER: Yes, just a comment on this and I really don't know how much more difficult it is to implement Handles than it is to implement PURL, so, you know, I think you probably have to have smarter programmers around to manage that initially, but long-term, given the maintenance that, you know, that we've all in -- the frustration we've all experienced with PURLs, you know, as we think about our resources scaling over time becoming more and more electronic, yeah, I mean you can all envision the potential for either chaos or, you know, 40 catalogers doing nothing but correcting

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

changed URLs, so Handles gives some real stability long-term which I think is why for large systems it's seen as desirable.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Barbie.

BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Selby from the University of Virginia.

I guess my question was similar to Marian's, I couldn't understand why you would do anything that required people to actually type something. I mean it just makes sense to me that it would be a system-generated thing and that it wouldn't make any sense as no URL does anymore but we know it's there and we know it, the computer did it so it must be right, so.

JAMES MAULDIN: Actually it's just a functionality of the software itself. We have that option, not necessarily that we're opting to choose to do it that way, but it is an option.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Any more questions?  
No.

DEBORAH MONGEAU: Debra Mongeau from the University of Rhode Island. Forgive me if I sound ignorant, but from my understanding, there's about 90,000 PURLs that you're going to transfer into

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



# Capital Reporting Company

Handles.

Now for those of us who have all these records with PURLs on them in our OPACS, how is that going to effect, are we going to have to re-export all those records once we --

JAMES MAULDIN: Absolutely not. It should be invisible to the end users, your 856 fields with those PURLs in them would remain unchanged. The biggest difference that you'll see, actually there will be no difference, but basically what's happening instead of resolving through our PURL server, you'll be redirected by the use of our Handle server, so to you you would see no results or difference, probably a better response time.

DEBORAH MONGEAU: Thanks.

PHILLIP YANNARELLA: Phillip Yannarella, Northern Kentucky University. What's going to happen with the PURLs which are currently incorrect in terms of where they lead you?

JAMES MAULDIN: Before migration takes place, PURL maintenance will be completed.

(Applause)

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I want to reiterate something that James mentioned at the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

beginning of the presentation.

When we found out several months back that the team working on FDsys selected Handles as the persistent identifier of choice, part of the reason we're standing up this beta in the library unit is that we want to give you a flavor now so that we can get feedback on these types of questions and these are exactly the types of questions that we want to ask to make sure that as the requirements are being developed for FDsys before they implement it, we want to make sure it's done the right way.

So with the beta page that we have up now on GPO Access, as you go back to your, your respective homes and offices, we'd appreciate it if you'd take a look at it and send in more feedback electronically so we can share as part of the overall development.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Barbie.

BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. I guess is there any advantage in Handles like vis-a-vis like something like serial solutions or another, you know, I mean is there any extra bang for the buck that we would get with Handles as opposed to the PURLs? Question from

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

ignorance.

JAMES MAULDIN: Bang for the buck, without being overly technical, I think being that it's a distributed network, the response times is going to be a great win for the Handles environment.

I'm not sure if you, if you actually notice any reduction in speed and resolution of our PURL servers, like on Monday mornings or like between 1 and 3:00 on Mondays seemed to be where our PURL server starts to pretty much go at a snail's pace sometimes, it's based because it's that one box with the use of Handles, again, it's a distributed network and response time should improve, dramatically.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I think I have somewhat of an answer to Barbie's question. I believe that the open URL standard has a place in it for Handles and that will be better than some of the alternatives which might be essentially a title search in some of those, so, I mean that might be one advantage.

ARLENE WEIBLE: Hi, Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library. I'm curious how, I mean how Handles would, would handle a serial publication

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

where you have multiple files associated with a given entity.

I, this is something I'm struggling with at the State level in doing this kind of management, so do any of your examples that you've already done, are any of those serial titles with multiple issues?

JAMES MAULDIN: Let me defer that to Mike.

MIKE CLARK: The current beta test is not -- excuse me, I'm sorry, Mike Clark, GPO. The current beta test alpha testing --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MIKE CLARK: Am I off? That could be good. Thank you.

Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MIKE CLARK: Okay, Mike Clark, GPO, the current beta test does not include any serials, we initially prepared a list that did include some but we decided to keep it as simple as we possibly could for the purpose of this initial demonstration. This demonstration is just that, really, it's more of a demonstration than it is a beta test because we just

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

want to show you what, what the possibilities are in terms of assigning Handles and also that we do have a proof of concept and only a proof of concept that PURLs will resolve to Handle.

So we do have, I think they're all pdf documents, so there are no serials included in that.

ARLENE WEIBLE: Well I would say you don't really have a proof of concept until you test it with serials because that's a very large portion of the material that is of interest to the documents community.

MIKE CLARK: We'll look for that in your comments and thank you for the comment.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. Thank you very much.

JAMES MAULDIN: Thank you.

(Applause).

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: The next portion of today's program is a very important one and that's the library of the year award recognition and I'm going to welcome back to the dais of the Public Printer of the United States.

ROBERT TAPELLA: Good afternoon.

(Good afternoon).

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

ROBERT TAPELLA: Are you guys having fun today?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

ROBERT TAPELLA: It's been a good day, we like being here? Well that's really good.

This afternoon I get to actually do something else that's fun, I get to give out an award and this is the Federal Depository Library of the year award.

Now this year's winner is from the State of Missouri. Now I have to ask a question, though, Geoff, we have a new Council chair from the State of Missouri and the library of the year is also from your State?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Nothing to do with it.

ROBERT TAPELLA: You had nothing to do with it. Ric, are you trying to get in good graces with the --

RIC DAVIS: Strange coincidence.

ROBERT TAPELLA: Strange coincidence, okay, just checking. I've got to tell you, this library has done some interesting things and 12 years ago the library created an online forum for

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

public access to Government information and one of the pieces of it is called Uncle Sam For Kids. And it is really pretty cool and I don't know if any of you have had an opportunity to see it but hopefully we have some network computers here with the Internet where you could actually go take a look at it and I've got to tell you when I looked at it, I thought it was really, really cool.

So I guess I get to have the honor of inviting Betty Murr up and Betty is the Deputy Director of the Middenberg -- Middendorf-Kredell Branch of the St. Charles City County Library in Missouri.

Betty, come on up.

(Applause)

Now it's kind of cool, Betty, because you get -- so now I guess we get to do it officially, now that we've sort of done it unofficially. Betty, come on up and on behalf of the Government Printing Office and on behalf of the Federal Depository Library Program, congratulations on being named the library of the year.

BETTY MURR: Well thank you very much, thank you, thank you.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

(Applause).

ROBERT TAPELLA: Perfect. Would you like to say a few things?

BETTY MURR: I would love to say something. Well, let me tell you that this is quite an honor for the St. Charles City County Library District.

We're located in St. Charles, Missouri, and that is in the eastern part of Missouri adjacent to St. Louis County. We have the I guess unique classification that we are bordered on one side by the Missouri River, one side by the Mississippi River, so now you know where we are, we're where the confluence of the two rivers.

I really apologize that Anna Sylvan who is really responsible for this could not be here today. I found out Wednesday that she has a no travel order from her physician and we do respect that, but I was so looking forward to being here with her because she is such a joy.

Many of you know her, you know the work that she does and the fact that she is responsible for her own Government documents Web page for our library district and that is only the beginning of

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

what Anna has done. She is also starting into a new subject area along with Government documents, she is going to become an expert in consumer health information and of course we know there's many Government documents related to that subject area.

Over the past 10, 11, 12 years I have known Anna. She has really done tremendous work with Government documents for us, proud to say that we now have over 18,000 catalog records for Government documents that are in our OPACS and we're only about a 15 to 20 percent selected depository, so she has just really done wonders and she does not work on Government documents 40 hours a week. That's a part of her job and she does have an assistant which there is no way she could do it all by herself.

But as I sit here listening to many things today, I definitely felt like I was the duck out of water. Whew, I thought public libraries had acronyms and I know librarians do in general, but, you know, I think my acronyms go as far as what is the URL and it took me years to learn what a uniform record locator was and then they started talking about the PURLs. Do you know what a Handle is to

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

me? It's the CB name, does that tell you where I'm from? Yeah. A lot of truck drivers in the Midwest and I just happen to be related to a few of those, so every time you talk about Handles, wow.

I think that I do need to say, though, that how proud all of us should be that we have Government documents for our publics. In our case we covered an entire Congressional District and it means you do not have to have a library card from our library to use those documents, but it's free access to everyone and by having the records in our OPAC, we now have them available remotely to anyone with one of our library cards.

This has opened up a new world to people. In fact, one of Anna's statements, a couple weeks ago we were giving a presentation to a group of leaders in St. Charles County and she kept trying to hammer into them, it's free, folks, it's free, and I cannot do her accent and I can't do it justice, that gives you the idea, it is free.

I think we take for granted many of the freedoms that we have, freedom of press, the freedom of speech, the freedom to gather. Everything may not be free, but it is, it speaks just wonders for

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

the land that we live in here where we have the opportunity to have access to our Government documents.

Those documents are not hidden from the general public and it is a great statement for the Government Printing Office to make those documents available to us and I can't say enough for the wonders of librarians such as Anna who can help me find that document that I really want, because without her and her expertise in finding those documents, I might as well be on Google, right, or Yahoo.

It takes people who really know the documents to be able to get to what you really want. Well after today and tomorrow and Wednesday, I will definitely have a different appreciation for Government documents librarians.

I said it was like a duck out of water, it's a second language, but I know that you all know what it is that you're talking about and some day I will know what it is, but that's why I have people like Anna and other library directors have their Government documents librarians so we don't have to know all of that.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

So I would just like to say that the library district in St. Charles County is very honored to be selected library of the year. I have no idea what went into that selection. I tell you there was nothing different about it being in Missouri just because Mr. Swindells is from Missouri, I had not met him before, but I am proud to accept the honor on behalf of the library district and especially for Anna who does just tremendous work and for all of you who know what you're talking about here and know what the speakers are talking about, I give it to you. It is definitely a different world.

I would like to also just tell you that I, I really hope that each and every one of you take pride in the role that you're playing with Government documents because without you, no amount of freedom of press and speech would make these things available for the public.

So I also give it to you as far as thank you very much, continue doing a great job. Thank you.

(Applause)

RIC DAVIS: Thank you very much, Betty.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

I'd like to also read a couple of letters that came in from representatives of Congress acknowledging this wonderful award.

The first one is from Mr. Kenny Hulshof, Ninth District of Missouri. I'm honored to congratulate St. Charles City County Library District Middendorf-Kredell branch on earning the Federal Depository Library of the year award.

This is an incredible achievement and really illustrates one of the main components of a free society which is access to Government information.

The library's leadership has gone above and beyond to make this information easily attainable by patrons of all ages. Your service and dedication to the community has been recognized, a distinction you most assuredly deserve. I am certainly proud to present a portion -- to represent a portion of the library district in our nation's capital.

Again, congratulations on a job well done.

Our second letter is from Mr. W. Todd Aiken, he's from the Second District of Missouri.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

It is with a deep sense of pride and satisfaction that I convey congratulations to you and the staff of the Middendorf-Kredell Branch Library in Ophalon upon its selection by the Government Printing Office as the recipient of the 2007 library of the year award.

It is notable to mention that your library was selected from among 1,300 Federal depository library sites for the award, criteria employed to determine the recipient included outstanding service in meeting the needs of users for Federal information, creativity and innovation in developing specific community programs for the use of this information and increasing your community's use of Federal information, along with this leadership.

Although the Federal Government document collection is extensive and covers a broad range of topics, your staff made it accessible through a unique user friendly Web portal, understandable to almost anyone seeking desired information.

One of the more unique features your staff developed was a special collection of Internet sites called Uncle Sam For Kids that helps young

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

people obtain Federal information for homework assignments. Anna Sylvan your information resource manager played a significant role in creating these tools.

A well-informed electorate is indispensable to the American form of Government. You and your staff have established a standard of excellence that will not soon be eclipsed and in doing so you have strengthened the very foundation of the freedoms that we now enjoy. Congratulations on your fine work.

If we could, I'd like to give a round of applause again and then we're going to break for coffee and cake to further honor the library out in the lobby.

(Applause)

RIC DAVIS: By the way, we are having more sessions this afternoon. We will be returning at 3:30.

(Short recess taken)

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

(Guidelines for the depository library system. An update)

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, welcome back. The discussion this afternoon is on the guidelines for the Federal Depository Library Program and copies of the current guidelines should be in everyone's packet.

Okay. I won't bore folks with the background of the guidelines, but they were developed to set out performance and program goals for the Federal Depository Library Program and they were originally adopted in '76 and revised in '87.

The question before us today is whether these guidelines are sufficient for a substantially electronic Federal Depository Library Program, whether we need guidelines for a substantially electronic Federal Depository Library Program and if we do, how would they have to be different than these current guidelines, not simply in terms of their approach, necessarily, or what they, what they cover, but also their function in a Federal depository -- in the future Federal depository library system.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

They're rather extensive, as you can tell. Oh, I think all these have to be made live.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Oh, okay. In light of the, all the changes that have been made now with, it's the new manual and all that, I'm not sure how much duplication there is. I mean when I look at this, there looks like a lot of duplication. Does it serve a separate purpose?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well I think that's, that's one of the questions, I mean it, it, it did serve a purpose in bringing together from a variety of sources some of the standards for a Federal depository library, so it may have had a place in being one place you could look to get a brief sense of what was required.

But that is an open question. Now that we have the new handbook/manual, I always get it confused.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Whatever it's called.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yeah, that, I mean that's one of the questions that I'd like us to address, is whether they think we need it.

Now this does, the guidelines have had a

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

place in the past in, in the assessment, library assessments, on-site inspections, et cetera, et cetera, and they were often used by inspectors to help guide and often, and pointed out to libraries anticipating inspections, so.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: I mean it almost seems like an executive summary.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: That's a good point.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: When I look at it and maybe that's what we need.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well, I mean there's other possibilities. It could be an executive summary or it could be something quite different.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: It could actually provide some performance standards, which it doesn't at the moment, really. I mean there's some in there. I'd have to look through it and find one, but.

Any other thoughts, especially from folks who have worked with these a lot in the past. Tim?

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

TIM BYRNE: I thought the, well the discussion when we worked on producing the new handbook, it was, the intent was to replace the guidelines and the manual and the instructions and just have everything in one, so are you saying now there might be something else that we want to create to take the place of these guidelines?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well that's, that's an open question. I mean they, they could be part of the handbook. Right now they, they essentially go away.

So the question is do we need something like this or do we need something different.

TIM BYRNE: My initial reaction is that we haven't had enough time to, working with the handbook to know what it doesn't do for us and it, it might be a little premature to try to create something else so quickly after the handbook has been finished.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I'd be interested from the other regionals on whether you have used this in this form to help guide, sort of your assessments or --

GWEN SINCLAIR: I don't think we've ever

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

used the guidelines, this is Gwen Sinclair. I'm just wondering do the people at GPO use the guidelines or do you all know it and don't need to refer to them?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I've been informed that they do. Does anyone from GPO want to speak to that? I mean I've been told that the inspectors, in fact, do use these. Or about --

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Kathy?

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi, Kathy Brazee, GPO. I was using the guidelines as a resource in a way like an executive summary because the handbook was in process and the guidelines are at a higher, higher level than the operational level that the handbook has and the handbook includes best practices as well as operational level suggestions, guidance and policies, rules and regulations, and the handbook is more, more of a performance level.

It's a much higher level than the granular level of the instructions even to depository libraries in the handbook so that was kind of the basis for thinking about the public access assessments and the new focus of the inspection program and it is a one-stop shop in

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

terms of a resource that is not in, in the handbook as a separate entity as an executive summary kind of thing.

And obviously the guidelines were written in 1996, so they are obviously outdated, although a lot of them apply to all formats if you take a look at how they're worded, but they're obviously still outdated.

Does that help answer the question?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yeah, no, that helps me and I guess there's a couple questions there. Do we need an executive summary or do we need these to do something else?

John.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, UIC. It also begs the question that if these are used by inspectors, does that mean inspectors are coming back into our lives?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: This is Robin Haun-Mohamed. No, we're not going to call them inspectors, John, but we're going to come and visit you.

JOHN SHULER: I want to see you, I want to see you, yes.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Assessment

specialists trying to re-develop and establish once again the in law mandate to make firsthand investigation of conditions in libraries, but the focus is very different and the handbook, it shows that focus as being different.

One of the things as you look through the guidelines that you have now, it closely resembles the instructions and the manual as they existed, manual 1993, the instructions issued 2000, yeah, Cindy was intimately involved in that, but collections, access, service, those are our focus. What's in law and how does best practices fit into this overall assessment program.

The idea of the consultants located across the country, 10, 12, 14 of them, never funded, so that's not going to happen so what can we do more effectively is the project Kathy's working on utilizing the staff that we have, utilizing the resources and also utilizing changes in the way we communicate among and within ourselves.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well, and also, this is Geoff Swindells, assessment is a broader concept than inspection and assessment is just as

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

much self-assessment and so can link back to the sort of self studies as a, at least a way of thinking a little bit, that approach.

And so we could ask ourselves do we need instruments to help move assessment in all its forms forward, both self-assessment and the by law assessment that Robin was talking about.

And if we do need an instrument, I mean that begs the question of whether we do or not if we do, is this the type of instrument that we actually need. Does this provide us with those tools.

Personally I'm not, I'm not sure it does. I mean I've always found them useful as the executive summary and occasionally this tells me what I should do, for instance, bibliographic control number 4-5 is the one that I know best because I used it as a kudjal win in my library, whenever possible documents should be available for public use within 10 days after receipt. They should be retrievable even if cataloging information is not yet available. They don't all have that character, but that may be more the type of character that we're looking for, although we may not be looking for within 10 days X. We may be

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

looking for service to users as measured by Y, or as accomplished through some type of process.

MARIAN PARKER: I think this lays everything out just real clearly, real easy to read through, just as you all were saying that you have used it more like the executive summary which if, you know, as long as all of the points in here are still up to date, I would find that useful to hand to the new documents library, to the director when, you know, questions arise to people as part of your discussion about what resources do I need to do for this.

I, I mean clearly it could be subsumed as part of another publication, but it's a real, to me, a real straightforward, clear-cut document to help us do what we've agreed to do by, by being a depository, but then I don't, I don't deal with this on a day-to-day basis, that's why I'm saying, wow, for the director it's a really nice cheat sheet, as it were.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: And that's interesting, because right now this is a Council document, Council has ownership of this. Now there are other ways of thinking about this, if it was an

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

executive summary, that might simply be a recommendation for further iterations in the handbook, so.

JOHN SHULER: I think I slept through most of these meetings during the mid-1990s, but what I recall from green research was the reason why we came up with this document in particular was middleware. A handbook was too detailed and complicated to use either with our administrators or to foster a relationship between our administrators and the inspectors and other depository libraries, it was just too hands-on and the sense I got from the discussions from the late '80s through the early '90s, we needed a document that explained to, in a non-technical way what we were about so that if question, if push comes to shove, that famous question of why we're a depository library, these were direct authoritative answers to that question.

We are, we remain a depository library in the following manner that the library must support.

So they were really, it was really an arm's race of technical and administrative type that the handbook was no longer delivering, if I recall

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

its genesis.

It strikes me that we are now in a period of time that demands a comparable middleware, that administratively I could think of maybe a dozen people who no longer manage separate documents departments who have moved on up into the administration, that documents depository responsibilities are being treated like any other purchasing program or cataloging process and if I remember how deeply re-embedded this is in a separate documents department existence and I'm wondering if the document we're now trying to think of is speaking more to that life than the one 10, 12 years.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I like the term middleware. Cindy, did you --

CINDY ETKIN: No, Cindy Etkin, GPO. Excuse me, I just wanted to state that Katrina's right, when we compiled the instructions and the handbook and every effort was made to make all of those into one and then you heard Ric say yesterday or earlier today, was it just today, it seems like yesterday, that we're doing that final review.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Right.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

CINDY ETKIN: But the other thing I wanted to share with you all because you were talking about an executive summary and what we have in Chapter 2 in the final draft handbook is where we've pulled out the legal requirements and sort of made them an executive summary, well the original title of that chapter, correct me if I'm wrong, or it had the gist of legal requirements and guidelines so if you're talking about an executive summary and one place to find all this, it could be in that chapter and then it would be part of a living document that wouldn't take 11 years to update. Maybe.

TIM BYRNE: Well since you brought up Chapter 2 and I was the team leader on Chapter 2, what we maybe tried to do with that was put in the guidelines and have links to the handbook and evidently that was decided that wasn't what Chapter 2 should do.

CINDY ETKIN: Because the whole point of merging everything into -- Cindy Etkin, GPO -- the whole point of putting them altogether in one was to supersede the other so if you're putting in links to a superseded entity that's --

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

TIM BYRNE: Well these were links to the handbook, not to the guidelines.

CINDY ETKIN: The chapters within the handbook?

TIM BYRNE: Yeah.

MARIAN PARKER: Again, from a not frequent user, any time you can link to something, especially if, you know -- I'm sorry, Marian Parker, Wake Forrest Law School -- especially if you can link to the specific part of the handbook that's relevant to that rather than, you know, spending, you know, time sort of futzing around in it, anything that you can do to help people get to the information fast and by people, I am talking about the people who don't deal with it every single day, but the people who are exactly, Tim, what you're talking about, responsible for making the decisions but need to get to the information more quickly and as I said already about this particular document, is this, you know, this is that kind of thing for me and I could see links from this out to the specific chapters that gave you the full-blown responsibilities.

I like, I like this and I like this kind

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

of thing, so I think a lot of my colleagues out there would be grateful for this kind of service, whether it's the chapter in the book or, you know, a separate document that you, you know, just stick under somebody's nose when they need it.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Katrina.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz again, the only thing I would say and I hesitate telling GPO about publishing, but if it's going to be an executive summary, then I'd like to see it at the front of the document and called an executive summary instead of in Chapter 2 because I could imagine if I'm a director and I'm thinking about what I'm going to do with my depository status and I haven't talked to my librarian, which might happen, I'd like that person to find it in a logical place.

MARIAN PARKER: Yeah, and I think I mean you guys probably have more executive summaries than we have to deal with in academics, because we have multi-paged papers for everything, but my concept especially from working out in the corporate world was that executive summaries do come first, before anything else, and then you go from there, so.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Janet.

JANET SCHEITLE: Janet Scheitle, GPO. I was the team lead on the handbook. As to Chapter 2, our initial thrust was as Tim explained it, that as we started working with the chapter, we started looking -- we had guidance at the beginning of the project that the handbook would not include any policy and the handbook would build flexibility into the FDLP.

Given that, what we did was we subsumed the guidelines into the body of the text of the handbook and as I was saying to someone in retrospect, after we had finished the project and put it up as final draft because, you know, hindsight is always the best thing, right, I said, you know, if I had to do it again, I would have taken the time and I would have added another section because if you're familiar with the handbook, there's appendices at the end of the handbook that say for map librarians and for library administrators and what we did was we drew out from the handbook those sections that talked about map librarianship and we drew out from the handbook those sections that addressed library administrators

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

so you could go straight to those and say okay, this is what I need to let my library administrator know. And I thought if I had to do it over again, I would have an appendicee that would have probably drawn out the guidelines so they would be more visible to the community.

So that's my lessons learned.

MARIAN PARKER: And weren't we just told earlier that the handbook is a living document, that you've got the opportunity to continue to evolve it to be what we need to function appropriately.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I want to go back, Geoff Swindells, to John's point and maybe get him to expand on it a little bit.

Do, if we're looking at depository library coordinators who, in fact, wear many hats and with implementations, let's call them, of the Depository Library Program that look very different than the separate unit model in many cases, not all cases, and actually we'll see many different iterations in different libraries, what new kinds of instruments -- this instrument is sort of a looking backwards, what new kind of instruments do we need to perform the sort of performance and program

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

guidance function in the new environment? Is the handbook enough, do we need something like this but re-thought?

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, yadda, yadda.

Based on my experience, I think we're going to need something like this. I think that's about as close, as deep and as analytical I can get. I think there are enough changes going on within our institutions administratively that if the choice of not being a depository or being a depository, there's actually a third choice and that is merging your depository functions into other things, and I don't think that third choice is often explored, it's either/or often in our discussions, you're either going to be a depository or you're not.

But I think there's another almost half life being born by this experience that maybe since it is in a community that is familiar by our traditions, either by experience or by practice, then maybe drawing up a document that explains regardless of how the institution decides to manage its depository obligation somewhere within that organization there must exist this will to coordinate the resources in some fashion. And it's

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

easy to say the depository staff, the depository librarian, but in my growing experience those are becoming scarce things and often shared with other institutional purposes.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well, and if a -- Geoff Swindells, if a document is going to provide guidance, no matter how an institution chooses --

JOHN SHULER: Yes, but I don't --

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: -- then it's going to have to be a quite different document than this, don't you think?

JOHN SHULER: Yes, that's what I suggest.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Tim.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, I think John is showing a large academic library bias in his thinking here because most, or a large percentage of the smaller depositories have not had separate departments and --

JOHN SHULER: Guilty.

TIM BYRNE: -- so I think this, the guidelines serve those people, you know, in the past, too. I think it is more of a trend, as you say, and there are fewer documents, departments

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

today then there used to be. I'm not sure what we can put together, a document for that, though.

JOHN SHULER: Well there is one other aspect in this and that is this notion of a physical collection, because that was always the trump card, that somebody had to say at some point some responsible words about a physical collection.

Now with this issue of 89 -- 80, 90 percent of what we get electronic, that I think reduce -- it even changes that equation between the, my experience in large academics versus everybody else and I think we're all being reduced to this substance, this sort of basic element that is we no longer have these tools or traditions that have served us so well for the last 100 years and I think it's, I think documents like this bring that to the floor.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: It's interesting, though, if you look at this document, no matter where you look in it, it is collection focused, even where it's not talking about collections, so what would they look like? What would they be addressing if they're addressing a digital environment? I'm actually not asking you to write them right now,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

John, no, I'm just saying, I mean it seems to me that that's one of the challenges if we want, I mean if this is to be something other than an executive summary of the handbook, that's something we'll need to figure out.

I'd be very interested to hear from anybody in the audience who knows the guidelines, what they think should be done with them. If anyone has an opinion.

JEANETTE COX: Jeanette Cox from Florida A&M University from Florida.

Have you ever thought of it as a checklist of compliance, instead, because usually an executive summary summarizes all the contents of the actual full report and I think your handbook is more like a procedural manual, kind of step by step how to and this is not a step by step how to, it's simply saying if you're a depository library, this is what you've got to be, comply with, so I see it more as a checklist, a very useful checklist.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Should it include more performance measures? I mean how should it integrate with standard library performance measures. We don't have Denise here to help us out

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

with that portion of things, but.

BARBIE SELBY: Hey, Geoff.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Oh, sorry, Barbie.

BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. I mean just in looking through here, I was thinking, I mean I don't know, it just seems like a lot of this, like we should comply with ILL standards, I mean take out everything that isn't depository related.

I mean there's a lot of that, we should provide tables and chairs, we should supply readers and -- I mean it could be a checklist and it could certainly coordinate more with the, with the handbook and be a lot simpler if it didn't try to cover the universe because as John points out, you know, the universe isn't two universes anymore, it's kind of one universe in a sense for many of us, it's kind of evolving that way, so that might be another option.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Dan, were you coming up to the mic?

DAN BARKLEY: Yeah, I was going to say something but I'm not sure I want to embarrass myself in front of the Council.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

# Capital Reporting Company

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: We are a forgiving audience, Dan.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We warned them all already.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: You lost your place.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky, I'll give him a little time to protect himself.

I, I think, I agree with Marian, I think it's helpful, I've used it as a regional, I don't want to tell you how many years, both in-house and across the State and I do, however, agree that it has to be updated. I think it's got to address the electronic environment and give some guidance based on the handbook.

I like the linking to the handbook chapters, I mean as a team leader for one of the chapters, I would like to see those links in there so that it is easy for an administrator who doesn't do this every day to find it quickly because like our users, they want to do that very fast.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

So, updating would be great.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Dan.

DAN BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. Just so some people in this room have an idea how long Sandy has been a regional, I was 20, I was 20 years old, I was 6 foot 8, full head of hair and let me emphasize this, ruggedly good looking when I worked for her and you can see what I look like now.

That being said, you know, this, I think this was done in conjunction with the handbook and of course the handbook was started initially with kind of a dual sort of front being waged in the sense that, yeah, it was collection based as Council has recognized, but we also, and again I was one of the, I did another chapter on it in between fires and floods and things like that, but it was also looked at as an organic document that would certainly grow and change as the depository system changed, as GPO continued to migrate more toward an electronic environment and things like that and I think these guidelines are reflective of what was probably one of the initial drafts or some of the initial drafts of the, of the handbook itself and

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

may not accurately reflect all the changes that have occurred in the handbook.

That being said, I think it's a good checklist and I agree with some of my colleagues and contemporaries remarks that it's a good checklist, but I think there are other things that we do need to look at right now.

Certainly we're all looking at more and more electronic information, we are changing our public service modes. I think there are fewer and fewer libraries, at least on the academic side that have complete departments devoted to Government documents now.

We, unfortunately, have people that want to merge many collections into one roof and try to do many things for many people, not very well, and so we have to take that into consideration and again, I, we're facing the same thing that we faced several years ago when I was chair Council and as someone mentioned, you know, we're all going to our depositories and talking them off the ledge, in other words, we're trying to convince them to stay in the program and not jump out of the program. And I think there's some other factors there that need

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

to be looked at and dealt with pretty quickly because it's a lot easier today than it was several years ago when I was chair to drop out of the program now and I'm really concerned about that.

But at the same time those of us who have been around and also understand that we're dealing in a more electronic environment than we were several years ago in a tangible environment.

Thank you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I'm wondering if these would help or hinder keeping someone in the program, if I handed these to someone, I think they might run away.

DAN BARKLEY: Well I think (not speaking in microphone).

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Right. Well and that does get back to audience because we have, you know, who are they for, are they for directors, are they for practicing librarians, do they provide the kind of performance measures that we'd want, you know, do they help raise the bar, are they absolute minimums.

Arlene.

ARLENE WEIBLE: Arlene Weible, the

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

Oregon State Library. I think what they don't do and what is desperately needed is to define what it means to be an electronic only depository, because I, that question comes up all the time on gov.doc1, it comes up with discussions that we have with libraries who want to stay in the program but don't see the point.

I mean I think that if this were, again, get, get away from collections because, you know, collections are important to some libraries, but they're not to all and have this be based on services that are provided by depository libraries, I think we'd get the right emphasis of the program, the program is a service program now, not a collection-based program and I don't know, you know, how we're ever going to get that across to anybody until the documentation reflects that.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Right. Thank you.

ARIC AHRENS: Aric Ahrens, Illinois Institute of Technology, I wanted to follow up on that quick because I agree that the access issue is where the future's headed, but I still have 30 years worth of documents in my house and we still need to address the collections part.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

For instance, the microfiche which we're still trickling in, my administration wants to go hide that in the basement and in -- and we kind of have something in place to deal with it because we scan microfiche into pdf on demand for our patrons, but is that something legitimate, needs and offers holding on to stuff for five years which I mean all those sorts of collection things that have been around for so long are things, those are things that may have to be addressed to keep people in the program, et cetera, but it, we need a direction in the guidelines for the future but we have to revise and hold on to the physical collection stuff, too, because we still have to hold on to the collections and deal with them according to the rules that are in place.

So unless they change or, you know, we have to deal with that, so there's still a collections issue.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well if we see this I think as always a transitional document, then we will need to forefront the direction we're headed, but also recognize where we've been in the document, so finding a way to do that that doesn't send all

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

kinds of strange messages may be a little bit difficult, but.

Does Council see the update of this as an intrinsic Council function? We have ownership of it now, do we maintain ownership? Careful what you say.

KATHY LAKHUN: Kathy Lakhun, San Francisco Public. If we don't, where does it go, I mean because it is Cindy, Cindy said that it is somewhat incorporated in Chapter 2, but if there's no updating with all the stuff that people are saying about electronics, then we've dropped the ball somewhere and somebody's got to pick up what John's been saying and what we're all thinking that we've got to come up with some kind of synthesis between a print and an online collection and it might be definitely from the Council because we're representing all these people out here that are struggling every day and GPO has their hands full with doing some of the things that they're saying, but providing a complete future look with a day-to-day, our day-to-day experience is really, I think, up to the Council.

I agree this is, this is both too

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

detailed and too general, so I'm -- I'm looking -- it seems like some of you might be all going to performance measures, our City is going to performance measures so I'm getting much more comfortable with performance measures, but it does help you, really, when you put something down, you really have to figure out what you're trying to accomplish and what the measures might be to accomplish it, so it does serve a purpose to have some kind of performance measures in there and that could be how we get to the electronic part in saying next year we're going to do X to help people decide what to do with the electronics.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Geoff, this is Gwen Sinclair, it seems to me that a lot of what one might revise in this document would be dependent upon what is developed in terms of assessment and since that's still being worked on, I wonder if it would make sense to even work on that, on this until more of the assessments program has been fleshed out.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Ric.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. You took the words out of my mouth. I think that it would

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

be, it would really benefit everybody to hear Kathy's presentation tomorrow on assessments and I think that the point that Kathy brought up is very interesting because from my standpoint I think we need to do a bit of a gap analysis between this and the handbook to see what's missing but also as Robin mentioned, you're going to hear about, you know, a revitalized assessments program focused on access, collections and services and in order to move from the what level to the how, it's going to be performance measures based and to me a lot of what this document could become is part of that measurements basis to help Kathy with the assessments program.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi, Kathy Brazee, GPO, there is a blue handout that's called focus on access, collections and service and it kind of goes along with the guidelines if you want to take a look at them in conjunction.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Cindy.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just have a question, because I'm thinking about all these different things that we've been talking about, I was looking at Council's recommendation

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

from last Spring about assessments and pulling things into local performance and assessment practices and Geoff's and now Ric's bringing up performance and Kathy's bringing up performance measures for this and then thinking about oh, we don't have three scenarios anymore -- or two scenarios anymore, we have three, so I'm just sort of wondering how performance measures in the local level, when you're all merged, how does that work?

Are you doing them, John, or anybody else who's been in that merged thing?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Sandy.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky, I was, we're channeling each other, I was just thinking that one of the things this would be very useful for would be these larger institutions which are suddenly having to think like a small public library where that person who managed the depository collection also did all the cataloging or also did all the reference work and as we planned our mergers, this would give us a checklist of the things that everybody else who doesn't know anything about documents is now going to have to do.

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

That was one of the biggest struggles at Kentucky as we took our department apart was making everyone who was taking on some of this work understand what it was that they were going to have to do and so if you're kind of thinking about that third scenario, that would be a, this would be a very nice document to have and to that end, I think, as you go forward with this, if you do, including some of us non-Council, non-GPO people would be a good thing, not that I'm raising my hand, but --

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well I already have you on the list.

DAN BARKLEY: Can I follow up with that?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Sure.

DAN BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. Sandy and I were talking a minute ago and as to follow up with her, there are actually some large academic institutions that are being merged without a thought of forethought or foresight give and to that type of merger and I think this would be a useful document to be able to give to directors who were thinking about doing this, what other people need to incorporate as those departments get merged because there's, as Sandy

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

alluded to, there's more than just someone that does cataloging or someone that does more than processing or someone that does more than references, there's someone that does behind the curtain operations as well, so I think this would be a useful sort of document to give library directors as they, as they think about these things.

The other thing is and of course I do volunteer Sandy for this is that as we look at the assessment measure and Kathy, the presentation that Kathy is going to give later in the conference and we look at some of these other things, I think it's useful to continue to make progress on this initial document so that we don't lose the initiative of what we had and in the past Council has always worked closely with the community and I would think that you'd want to continue to do that and maybe solicit some help from the community from, again, a sectional sort of representation from all the different stakeholders to the small publics and large academics and everything in between to continue to work on this because I think you've got to keep the momentum going on this.

As we -- I mean we're not transitioning

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**



## Capital Reporting Company

into the electronic environment anymore, we're there. And I think we all need to recognize that and there's a lot of things we need to continue to do that does involve access, that as Arlene pointed out we are becoming a more service-based community and we need to recognize that just as much as we need to recognize we're still going to be doing some tangible processing for the time being.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: While I'm not going to answer, Geoff Swindells, Cindy's question, because that is the challenge, I think that one approach is to recognize that, I mean what this, to back up a little, what the guidelines largely do and what the instructions did and what all of the guidance documents did is in addition to laying out the public access requirements that are specific to the Federal depository library collections, they also were clear guidelines for a quality of treatment of materials.

And that's one of the reasons this seems to read like a brief on what libraries should do, at times, not just what depository libraries should do, and it was to ensure a quality of treatment of collections that would not necessarily be treated

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

equally.

But as we move in the electronic environment, it seems that in terms -- we're all, all of us are using, or many of us, I shouldn't say all, are going to performance-based measures and so I guess the question will be how do any instruments we create integrate with those. And again this, this sort of bleeds into, into assessment and all of those things and making sure that these are sort of ancillary supplementary to practices that are already occurring in many libraries and I'm not sure, I'm not sure that's enough for those libraries that are not doing sort of performance-based work already, so.

Well I propose a working group --

JOHN SHULER: Never saw that coming.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: -- made up of both Council and non-Council members and I don't think we have to decide on its, on its composition right now, but I do want to get a sense if, from Council, if they think that's worth pursuing, and again, I don't have a time line for this, I think a lot of it, I think we should be working closely with the assessment and seeing how these feed off each other,

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

## Capital Reporting Company

things like that, is that acceptable to everyone?

Okay.

So, Dan Barkley --

DAN BARKLEY: Dan's not here.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: And Sandy, together  
again.

Any other thoughts on this? We still  
have time. Okay. We can break early. Thanks very  
much.

(Whereupon at 4:23 p.m. the meeting  
concluded.)

**(866) 448.DEPO**

**[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)**

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY  
COUNCIL MEETING

OCTOBER 16, 2007

## COUNCIL MEMBERS

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS

DR. CHRISTOPHER GREER

KATRINA STIERHOLZ

JOHN SHULER

MARIAN PARKER

TIM BYRNE

GWEN SINCLAIR

MARK SANDLER

PETER HEMPHILL

TORRY TROTTA

COUNCIL SESSION: OFFERING SERVICES 24/7

MR. SWINDELLS: This morning's session we're going to be looking at offering services 24/7, and to begin the presentation will be Cynthia Etkin, the Senior Program Planning Specialist in the Office of the Superintendent of Documents. And we should have plenty of time for discussion on this topic. Cynthia?

MS. ETKIN: Good morning everyone. This presentation was borne out of a Council recommendation from the Denver meeting in April, and the recommendation was that GPO establish a registry of depository librarians who are expert in specific parts or functions of the U.S. Government. And the registry would provide a list of depository librarians with expertise in subject areas who could be consulted by other depository librarians.

We didn't answer this recommendation exactly with what they were asking. We're actually proposing an option in using the Federal Depository Library Directory where

we're going to add a field that depository coordinators can go in and designate certain collection strengths. And when we reviewed knowledge will forever govern the vision statement of the Depository Library Council, we decided to take a more holistic view of this, and that was because we knew that all the recommendations that came from the Denver meeting were a result of trying to make action items out of what was in their vision statement. So we went back to review that.

So to help us out -- timing's everything. So this year we had a biannual survey, just our luck, and so we added a question, and for those of you who have already done the biannual survey, you will recognize this. Question 26, where we ask you to indicate your depository library collection strengths or specializations in federal resources, and check all that apply, it looks like this, and for any of you who have looked at the new browse topics, you'll see that these subjects

and topics parallel those with the new browse topics.

Okay. So going back to the vision statement, the first scroll in that statement is to respond to or anticipate U.S. citizens need for government information, when and where it is needed by providing multiple access points to a network of experts. And further it stated into the text, after that goal, that the FDLR must devise a means for providing a combination of machine and human intermediate 24/7 assistance on the web. So with that in mind, we were taking a more holistic approach to answering Council's recommendation.

And we -- this is not a live web page; it's a mocked up page. Is Katy Davis here? No. I'd like to thank Katy Davis in the Web Content Management area who developed this page for me.

But, going back to knowledge will forever govern, we were looking at putting together a website that would have that mix of machine



and human intervention resources for users. So, at this point, we have on the page; a link to government information online; the virtual reference service of CIC, and a little bit broader; and a catalog of government publications. Because of the locate libraries feature that is there, and the ability to get to, directly, online publications, you get to browse topics there. Many of you are participating in browse topics by maintaining one of the pages, and if you're doing that you too can be one of the specialists.

Looking at linking to information on federal agency websites, we've got the federal agency internet sites link here, and the link to the Federal Depository Library Directory, which you'll see more about in upcoming sessions.

So the questions for Council, while we didn't directly, at this point, come up with a registry of experts, is this an approach that you think GPO should continue to pursue?

MR. SWINDELLS: Council member?

MR. SHULER: John from UIC. Absolutely.

MS. ETKIN: Okay. One.

MR. SHULER: I just had my bagel, so I'm really into this. I think, though, we did not express what you did, I think you -- you did a nice edge move and anticipated where we wanted to go without confronting some difficult issues as we're stuck in this half life between collections and pure service. And collections still remain an emblem for us of what are expertise is, but I think what you've provided here is, again, a nice, as I said yesterday afternoon, a nice piece of middleware between those existences.

MS. ETKIN: Okay. You'll also notice the other thing that we did was -- in the Council recommendation it said that this was to be used by depository librarians, and for those of you who may or may not know, we had Council liaisons for each of the recommendations. And with further discussion with the liaison for

this recommendation, it was determined that, no, this kind of concept was for users. So that's why we're also going this way.

MR. SWINDELLS: Do we have other comments from Council?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair. Addressing your question: Is the FDLP the best location for this web page? I'd have to say GPO access or higher level pages might be a better place if this is directed at end users. I don't know if it's possible to get USA.gov to link to any of this, but I -- you're giving me that look.

MS. ETKIN: No, it's early. It's not a look.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Okay. Because I think those are the pages that end users end up on rather than the FDLP desktop.

MR. SWINDELLS: other comments from Council?

MS. ETKIN: There are other -- oh, sorry.

MS. LAWHUN: Some of us are involved in

CLC's 24/7 virtual reference service, and over the last couple of years, they've developed experts in business and law that are on call, that when a general virtual reference librarian can't answer it, they transfer it to these "experts" and it seems like we could, some of the universities around probably already participating. We could maybe find out who the depositories libraries, their libraries already participating in 24/7, and like I'm getting my librarians to, that have expertise, to try to be part of that pool. So instead of recreating a new tool, let's use what we have, and I'm not sure how they organized the law, you know, the law ones. I think it was the -- one of their associations that got together people, but I have a feeling a lot of people are already doing that in their institutions. So if we can get -- bring the depository librarians into that.

MS. ETKIN: From the last biannual survey there was an indication that slightly less

than half of our libraries were already participating in some kind of virtual reference service.

John, do know if any of the CIC librarians are experts in the OCLC 24/7?

MR. SHULER: They're represented in many ways to both their institutional alignment, as well as through their subject expertise, and I would say, Kathryn, that the GIO is built exactly on that model of the law and business librarians. It anticipates building a pool of government information experts around the 24/7 service. So, I would argue that we've already done that in establishing that plank in this, and that would be a way for other depository libraries to join in the effort and share the questions which would then tie in to the greater 24/7 cooperative.

MS. LAWHUN: Okay. Thanks.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer, and Mr. Chairman, this may be out of order, so you can rule it so, but I'm curious to know from the

members of the audience whether they see this as meeting users' needs and whether they would be pointing to this resource from their own sites as well?

MR. SWINDELLS: Can we get a show of hands? And we get, let's see, one, two, three -- more than a dozen.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Would they be using the service or would they be contributing?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Well, pointing to was the question.

MR. SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindells. In terms of the approach, I mean, I think this is an excellent approach, but Gwen did raise an issue that I think we do need to address, and that's where are users going to discover these types of things.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. That's the third question.

MR. SWINDELLS: Yes. I know. And I know I'm anticipating some of these. And the other part is, which is also a question later on, is

although the collection approach to expertise I think is a good one, it's -- there needs to be more, and we need to move toward other notions of expertise that are not collection based. So -- which is, of course, a later question.

What I think we'll do is go through the questions generally for Council, and then we'll open it up to the audience for -- they can address any of these that they'd like to.

MS. ETKIN: Okay.

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, and Cindy, you said that, in sort of prepping about this further, that the answer was that this registry of experts was for end users to contact. I actually was thinking it was for other depository librarians, but there may be an opportunity for us to do a bit of both. Where there might be a lot of librarians who would be more than pleased to be contacted by their fellow FDLs, but don't want the entire universe of individuals coming to them. And I

think it also, you know, if you, as a librarian, need to call an expert to help you solve an issue for a client, you know, it's kind of nice that you're developing that relationship with that person who's then going to come back in your door because you were able to help them before, and sometimes you need help to help them. So, without making it too complicated, I would love to see that we provide one list for us to use with each other, and another list for people who are ready to be available 24/7 to the public.

MS. ETKIN: That's a very good point, Marian, and when I was first looking at this and mulling everything over, and talked with the liaison I had also remembered discussion at Denver that you were looking at, not only just subject experts, but maybe someone who was an expert in map cataloging that could provide assistance, and some of those kinds of personnel resources that could be used to help other depository librarians, and that would



indeed be something for the depository librarians and not the public. But I think we -- as we continue, I think we'll see there's a way that we can do just what you suggested.

MS. PARKER: And just a small detail to go with that. Clearly, that would be appropriate, and the FDLP desktop, whereas I agree that, for the end user, we've got to get it out there somewhere where they can actually find it easily.

MS. ETKIN: Okay. All three of them? Yeah. We've covered them, unless -- are we ready to move on? Okay.

Here's one of the reasons why we didn't directly work on a registry of experts yet, and some of this discussion was sort of on the horizon in Denver. We weren't exactly sure how we would define expert. Who decides who is an expert? Should criteria be established for determining an expertise? All of these questions about why is someone an expert, and what makes someone an expert, and if we're

going to be advertising these folks as experts, we need some way to determine that, yes, indeed, they are.

So, what do you all think about experts?

MR. HEMPHILL: Well, this is Peter Hemphill. Traditionally, in these types of virtue venues, you let the people decide who is an expert by publishing the person's qualifications. And if you have biographical information as well as information on their abilities, perhaps that would be sufficient. I don't know.

MR. SANDLER: I guess -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. SWINDELLS: No. Mark and Vicky -- I'm sorry.

MR. SANDLER: Mark Sandler from CIC. I guess this is very familiar terrain for libraries, and I'm not sure that any of us would say that more than a handful of our staff are expert in fields they're working in, but you know, they're service providers, and at least willing sort of participants in the

research process. So, you know a library will typically staff any where from undergraduate students through, you know, PhDs who are working with true subject specialty and credentials, and I guess the public is pretty good at sort of sorting that out and making decisions as to whether they need to go further or whether they need to consult with a second person or whatever. Now, whether or not that's fair online is an interesting question, but I guess, you know, the word expert may be the problem, you know, and it may be that these are information providers or service providers or numerous other terms that we can come up with, but it does seem that expert might be a bit of a -- just, it may be a bit misleading for the public.

MR. SWINDELLS: Torry?

MS. TROTTA: Torry Trotta. I sort of want to second what Mark just said, but also that this whole -- it seems like we're making this too complicated. That expertise within a

depository library for the public, it seems like we could let the experts self-select. If they want to be a part of this, they could say, "I'm an expert in this. I want to contribute to this service effort." Maybe for the depository librarians' side of the house, there may be some additional information that could be provided, however, I think the documents community knows who their experts are, and they call one another and whatever.

So, it seems to me that we shouldn't spend a whole lot of time with this kind of thing because I think our experts and our service providers will self-select. And it seems to me that, at least to start, that would be a step forward.

MR. SWINDELLS: Gwen?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair. I guess I'll echo what Torry said, that I think -- my experience with librarians is that they hate to feel stupid, and they're not going to claim expertise in an area in which they don't

actually have it. So, I have no problem with librarians self-identifying themselves as experts.

That being said, when I look at this list of collection strengths that you came up with that is based on browsed topics, it doesn't parallel the areas of expertise that my library has. Our areas of expertise tend to be geographic regions rather than what we call traditional subject areas like in Library of Congress. So we might want to think about flushing out the collection strengths or areas of expertise a little bit. Thanks.

MS. ETKIN: And we can do that. There's also, on the biannual survey, other, and you can specify it. So, geographic specialties is something that we sort of expect.

MR. SWINDELLS: Ric?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Also, one of the practical tools that we're going to have that is going is being demonstrated in the 10:30 session on the FDLP desktop is by

creating a profile, you'll be able to use that as a tool to designate areas that you have expertise on, and it'll be a collaboration environment where you can do some self-designation.

MS. ETKIN: And this would also be the method in which we would be able to restrict this kind of information to the depository community, as you were suggesting, Marian, was through the desktop, CMS system that we're using.

MR. SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindells. I'm agreeing with everyone who's spoken so far about self-selection and all these things. However, there is something I think relatively new on the horizon that we should start to take advantage of if we can, and that's -- there are a lot of, sort of, Web 2.0 resources out there in which the question of expertise, once there is no gate keeper and other functions of credentialing and things like that, is to aggregate the views of users, and

to actually get some sense of user satisfaction with advise given by different folks. And I think that trying to incorporate -- and there's a lot of different methods. I mean this is an area of intense research and experimentation right now, but I think we might look at some of those to see how we can bring in the user into that, into that equation.

MR. SHULER: This is John from UIC, and I think this is another critical role that the Council can serve in help defining and crystallizing some of these issues as the idea of expertise moves from a collection based notion to something that embodies what you just described, Geoff. And it strikes me that -- I can't believe that our experts, as government information librarians, is totally bound to an idea of a physical geography or a physical collection. At least in my 25 years experience, I know that what I have survives beyond that incarnation. And I think it would

help both the community as well as GPO, if Council could help them think that through a little bit, and maybe give them some arrows indicating where this future expertise would lie, especially in light of yesterday's discussions and ongoing issues involving the electronic depository. Once the physical location and collection is officially gone, which isn't so soon from now, what are we going to do? And I think this is where we need to be, and the more we can anticipate and build the structures and infrastructure for the survival in this area, I think the better off we'll be.

MS. ETKIN: Are there any other questions from Council or other questions that you want to ask that aren't on here?

MR. SANDLER: This is a small question, and it's following up on Gwen's point about the nature of the collection strengths. In looking at this I guess I'm wondering whether this is government information specific. In



other words, were you, you know, when you looked at this did you go, "Well, what's the body of information that we're responsible for at GPO? What are the major legislative committees?" And then sort of say most of the questions coming in are going to relate to government functions, or was this a more general, sort of, dewy classification kind of analysis of, you know, the life and times of the citizens?

MS. ETKIN: The latter. Actually, on the biannual survey there is more information than just those topics in the check box. There's information about what's included in that topic, which I didn't put on the slide. It is more of the latter.

DR. GREER: Chris Greer. I wasn't at the Denver meeting. This is my first meeting, so -- there is certain imprecision in the discussion we're having now. I don't know whether we're talking about two separate registries; one for the public, one for

librarians, or one registry that's available to both. So maybe members of Council who were at the Denver meeting and GPO folks could comment on whether the intention is to establish two or one or how this works.

MR. SWINDELLS: I can at least speak to that. Initially, in the way the resolution was written, it focused on service to depository librarians. But, Cindi's right in her opening comments in going back to the original vision statement. That was the genesis of those action items; it was a much broader concept. But, I do think that they are very different questions, and both in terms of the list of subjects and how you present those to users, and where you find users. And so, I can easily see this being developed and available for other members of the FDL community.

Once we scale it to the general public, you know, everyone out there, then I'm not sure that we're quite there yet in thinking

through some of the issues involved.

MS. LAWHUN: I'm a member of the California Advisory Board for 24/7, and the California Library Association Conference is coming up next week. And Susan McGlamory (phonetic), who's in charge of the OCLC 24/7 will be there. I'd like to suggest that I talk with her about how they organized the business and the law librarians, and see if we can do the same kind of thing for our depository librarians, or government documents librarians. At least start investigating, because we have a structure. We have a lot of people already doing this. It's a, you know, a service that people are becoming more familiar with, the public is, so it seems like we should piggyback on that, to me.

MR. SWINDELLS: It's a good idea. And also if you can work with John, because we -- our GIO is built on 24/7, although it's a somewhat separate -- it's unclear exactly where it fits in that universe, and I'm not

sure --

MR. SHULER: Actually, it fits in the same way that the law and business librarians do. In fact, that's what it's modeled on. So it's created a business and law approach for government information librarians.

MS. LAWHUN: But are you going to sites so they know to choose you?

MR. SHULER: Yes. We have our own site. We are officially part of 24/7.

MS. LAWHUN: So I think we need to get the public librarians in there.

MR. SHULER: Well the thing is, the public librarians are already participating. We already have leaks throughout most of the structure you just described.

MS. LAWHUN: So I need to just make sure in California everybody knows about that.

MR. SHULER: Yeah. I mean, we do not have any participants in California.

MS. LAWHUN: Yeah. So that's -- I think that's one of the things I could try.

MR. SHULER: Yeah. So that would be --  
yeah.

MS. LAWHUN: Yeah.

MR. SWINDELLS: I'd actually like to open  
this up to the audience, get some sense of  
what folks feel about any of the issues we've  
talked about so far this morning. And I'll  
just remind folks to tell us your name and  
your institution.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson from the  
University of Colorado Law Library, and the  
bulk of my comments are, yes, what Torry and  
Gwen and Mark said. I think self-selecting  
experts is fine, but I would say that I have  
some -- we have an integrated service point in  
our library and we do government documents  
from the regular reference desk, and we're not  
a separate department, and I think there's  
some real value in an internal -- you know, as  
Marian discussed it, an internal registry of  
people who are other librarians who are really  
good at specific geographic locations or at

specific subjects. Now, I don't know that I need to know that Gwen is the person to call if I have Hawaii question. That may be common sense, but you know, if Gwen is also really good at West Virginia, then I probably need to know that. You know, I know that I can call Peggy Jarrett if I have an IMPS question, but I don't necessarily know who to call if I have a NIST question. So that sort of thing, just to codify what's sort of the common knowledge among documents librarians about who know about which agencies publications would be really helpful.

MS. ETKIN: Phil?

MR. YANNARELLA: Philip Yannrella from Northern Kentucky University. Just in terms of tying this plan up with something I know is an existing project is, if you go into USA.gov you'll find there is a chat line and an email service function. I don't know who's at the other end, and I haven't really used it, but I think this is something the public could also

could be aware of in addition to this. So, I just wanted to let you know my comments on relationship of the two, or whatever.

MR. STRAIGHT: David Straight, Washington University in St. Louis. I have an area of expertise myself, and I think the important -- the self-selection is an important point because, certainly, my only area of expertise is not based on the holdings of our collection, which are not particularly strong in the area, but in my own areas of personal research, writing, publishing, and, I think, it's going to be -- you know, people are going to need to self-select, and we're going to get the people who may well have a lot of expertise, but it's not necessarily knowing among the documents community what people do on their other hours.

MR. SWINDELLS: Barbie?

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. One thing that you were talking about, Web 2.0, Geoff, and I was thinking

about it. I mean, this isn't something I think GPO can do because it's a non-GPO run list-serv, but wouldn't it be cool to go through the archives of gov.cal and analyze who answered what questions? And, you know, self-selection is really great, but you know, to see who out there is discussing, you know, whatever the odd ICC document is that they know about, and that would be a great library school project for someone or something.

DR. GREER: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question of the audience?

MR. SWINDELLS: Yes.

DR. GREER: So maybe I could have a show of hands, who would be willing to be listed as an expert to be contacted by other depository librarians? Could I see the hands for those of who would be willing? So, it's a significant fraction of the audience. Who would be willing to be listed as a contact for anybody on the planet who is interested in -- who had a question? Three, four, five, six,



half a dozen, half that number. Interesting.

MS. STIERHOLZ: Can I echo what Chris -- this is Katrina from the Federal Reserve. Yeah, I feel your concern. I think we are talking about two different things, and you guys are talking about something that would be opened to the public. When we wrote those questions, I thought it was for librarians, and that's still how I see it even though the vision document says something else, and I think they are two very different things, and I could imagine that they involve a completely different scope of work and responsibility. And GPO's involvement, whether or not GPO would be involved at something that's for the whole world, because if you're talking all those subject areas, well, really now, we're not just talking documents questions, we're talking all kinds of questions. But I'm not sure if it makes sense to have something for the public that mimics stuff that's already out there. So, I'm not sure about a

duplication of services, and I don't even know about this USA.gov chat thing. So, that sounds like that might also be a duplication. Anyway, my vote, if there is such a thing on this would be that it would be for depository or documents librarians.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Just to echo one of the comments that Ric had made for -- specifically to the issue of depository librarians and the new FDLP desktop. We've got that ability to enable those profiles, and one of the tools in that new CMS system is to have the ability, I'll use the term chat, there may be a more appropriate one, but based on those profiles, we have the capability in the future for you, as depository libraries, to have that communication one to one in an open environment. So that may be the start of one of the two things we're talking about. I won't begin to propose the final solution. I think this environment was set up just to talk in terms of how can GPO facilitate based on

where this started. So think about the desktop for depository libraries as a tool that we can have near term that sounds like it supports many of things we're talking about. Thank you.

MS. SINCLAIR: I didn't want it to appear that we were ignoring the part about being for depository librarians, and that's why this part came up later, and the introduction of the use of the desktop, but it sort sounded like both while the recommendation specifically said for depository librarians. And, again, in discussion with my Council liaison, we went with the broader approach, but there was no intent to totally ignore that part of it. So we are looking at two things here.

MR. SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindell. Services like Government Information Online are explicitly focused on the public, and so - - although, and I don't know if John knows, but we probably don't have any numbers on

this, a considerable number of questions that I handled through GIO a number of years ago were from other librarians.

MR. SHULER: That is true. We have John from UIC. We have a mix of librarians as well as nameless users who access the service from around the world. So we're already achieving the model, Chris, you described in that I've answered questions from military people in Iraq who have questions about military regulations that they can't seem to get from their own sources. So, it's very typical library experience, people appear before you with astoundingly other choices, but they're before you at that moment, so you provide what you can. So my experience in both this particular project as well as my other reference life indicates to me our virtual life is a mirror of our physical life in that people come to our services through any number of means, and we either decide at that point can we help them or can we not, and then we

refer them to another place, which 24/7 does very easily if we cannot help them. And I will point out, with a question about GSA, the depository library system has been living, if you will, side by side with the GSA services for over 50 years now, not in a form of competition, if you will, but more or less a form of cooperative work that we're all serving the same universe of users. And I don't think it's a zero sum game in that sense. I think there's enough out there, enough of those people to serve that a multitude of access points is not a bad thing.

MS. SINCLAIR: What I'm hearing is that both of these paths are ones that we need to be going down. So what we've done for the public in the display here is fine, it just doesn't need to be on the desktop. It can be a multiple of locations, and then we can also use the FDLP desktop and the profiles for people to provide other depository librarians notice of their expertise or specialization.

MR. SWINDELLS: That sounds good. And I also think we'll need to, in terms of service to the broad public, I think we have to have a continuing conversation about that, and where we fit into that because I think John is right. We're not talking about funneling all users to the FDLP for that. I mean, there's a variety of sources, just as we will self-select our expertise, users self-select their experts, and -- from various ways. So I think we do need to discuss where we fit in the constellation of service providers, and I think we need to continue that conversation because I'm not sure how people discovered GIO.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That is a mystery.

MR. SWINDELLS: And I think that it would be very interesting to -- and I know this is - - I know that this is part of the intent, but to find those links on agency sites, but as we all know, getting something, a link to something on someone else's site can be very

difficult. I mean, I can't even get the FDLP logo on my homepage. I can get it other places.

MR. SHULER: I will make one observation based on the GIO experience of how you get this in front of people's eyes, and in the initial release of the project in its experimental stage; we got most of our traffic from the blogisphere (phonetic). That people picked up on the announcement both from CIC -- oh, excuse me, from the initial partners of the project as well as reports in news sources who then distributed that amongst different lists and blogs, and that's where a lot of people first became aware of. So, I think this is a good thing to remember as we gear up to promote other FDLP events, that people are now -- at least people who are aware of the web are picking up their news sources from this growing region of awareness.

MS. SINCLAIR: Anything more from the audience?

MR. SWINDELLS: Thank you very much.

(Applause).

COUNCIL SESSION: OPEN FORUM

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. Gee, very sparse audience. We may have to ask ourselves questions. I'm also not sure of the usefulness of my making announcements from the chair. Never mind, I'm going to make it any way. ACO (phoenetic) Regionals, lunch is at noon today in the hotel café.

Okay. This session is questions for council, and we'll actually broaden that a bit; questions for council and GPO, questions from council, questions from GPO perhaps. And this is pretty much an open mike. Any subject is fair game.

Any members of council want to get us started? Maybe it's me. They all ran away. I don't know.

MS. TROTTA: I have a question. Torry Trotta. I think this is a question for GPO, a comment and a question. First of all I would



like to, again, thank GPO for all their efforts in -- during the PACER Project, getting PACER to the depositories. Yes. We're all excited. And I was wondering, there was a mention made of the pilot project, and I was wondering if there was any other information about the particulars. I don't know how many libraries are involved or if they've been selected yet or how all that would work.

MS. ETKIN: Cynthia at GPO. Thanks for asking about PACER. We had 49 volunteers, and part of the judicial conference approval for the pilot project restricted the number of libraries to about 15. That was the language, about 15. So --

MR. SWINDELLS: That doesn't sound like lawyers. I guess it's legal administrators. About? Okay.

MS. ETKIN: So I went through and looked at size and types and geographic area, and made 18 selections, and then had discussions

with my counter part at the administrative office of the courts, and we made a couple little changes, but we're still going forward with 18 pending the AO approval, and I'm supposed to hear back from him today of whether or not they said 18 was okay or whether we have to move back down to 15. So, that's where we are. The libraries, of course, don't know at this point, because we're not quite sure of the final list, but you'll know shortly. And the libraries that are participating are going to be obligated to keep data, and report back to GPO and promote this service. And with hopes that the Oversight Committee, the Case Administration and Management Committee in the AO's office will go to them, they meet twice a year, June and December, and will go back to them in June with data and ask that the pilot be expanded to all of those that volunteered. And I don't know that we'll be successful in doing that, but we're going to try.

MS. PARKER: Marian Parker. I know that the original discussion about the pilot being approved also said it was going to be a pilot for up to two years?

MS. ETKIN: Yes.

MS. PARKER: Do you have a more definite time frame on that now?

MS. ETKIN: We're planning for at least two, because we want to have time to collect the data and go to the Oversight Committee and ask for expansion of the pilot.

What they're actually wanting to learn from the pilot is whether or not access to PACER from federal depository libraries is reaching the population that needs to be served and is inhibited from going -- by going to a courthouse or using a for fee service at other libraries or where else it might be accessible. So it's a different kind of pilot. We're going to be looking at the users, not necessarily the capabilities of the system at all.

MR. SHULER: Cindy, how many public libraries are part of the initial cut?

MS. ETKIN: I have my list. Go on with the discussion and I'll --

MR. SWINDELLS: Ric?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. If I could add something to this. You know, we started talking about trying to get PACER access many years ago, and I think really approached the court strongly about three years ago. So this has been some time in development, and it strikes me, through our discussions with them, this is one of these let's walk, and then let's try to run scenarios. It's reminiscent, I think, of what we went through with Stat USA a few years back where you have an agency in a situation with a mandate where it's cost recovery, and there's, you know, some early concern about how this will effect, you know, current revenue generation. I think what we found through follow-up conversations over the years, with Stat USA as an example, is that

the free access provided through libraries actually served as a good marketing tool to others who wanted to pay for the service, and I think we'll end up having a similar conversation a couple of years from now on this.

MR. SWINDELLS: Thank you. Can you come to the microphone and say your name so it gets on the -- it's being recorded, transcribed.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Julie Schwartz, Connecticut State Library. Could you just do a bit of description about the content of PACER for those of us who are not as familiar with the project?

MS. ETKIN: PACER provides new content to the Federal Depository Library Program. They're going to be accessible bankruptcy cases, circuit cases, and the documentation and stuff that goes with those cases. So it's new content. Bear in mind I've never used it.

MS. SCHWARTZ: I guess I mean --

MS. ETKIN: You may have to help me out

here.

MS. SCHWARTZ: -- what courts are represented? Is it just federal courts?

MR. SWINDELLS: I think we can -- I think we have some law librarians who can provide the answer here.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

MS. ETKIN: Larry's going to answer the question.

MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer from San Bernardino County Law Library. PACER is an acronym for Public Access to Court Electronic Records. It's a -- for the federal courts. It's basically both the trial courts and the appellate courts, but it's primarily the trial courts. And it's basically any case -- anything that's been filed electronically to do with a case, not just bankruptcy case, but any case. If you've been paying attention to the newspapers over the last, I'm going to say week and a half or so, there's been a quite a bit in the newspapers about PACER regarding

plea bargains and whether the information about the particular person should be redacted so it's not made publicly available, because apparently there are websites, including something like Who's A Rat.com where they will put that information on there and you can find out who's been telling on your gain and got a plea bargain agreement out of it. So, there's been some discussion of that, but primarily it's the civil cases, the bankruptcy cases, as Cindy mentioned, that kind of material.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you very much.

MR. MEYER: Documents, pleadings. Yeah. Anything that's been electronic that's associated with that case.

MR. SWINDELLS: All right. Thank you, Larry.

MS. PARKER: And just so you'll know, users use it to get to stuff that's not available any where else, and they get to it immediately upon its availability. So, like I have faculty members who are following

particular cases and will go online every single day to see what's been filed, and it costs 8 cents a page for it to be printed out. And that doesn't sound like much until you get a \$600 bill, as I did last week. So, it's really very useful for people trying to follow specific cases or a set of cases through the federal court system.

MR. SWINDELLS: Cindy, did you have some numbers?

MS. ETKIN: Yeah. These are the numbers that have volunteered; six public libraries, four state libraries, three public law libraries, and there are some state court libraries, some academic libraries, and, of course, some law libraries, and they represent all different sizes of libraries. So, we got a very good mix of volunteers, and it's -- you know, again, we're hoping that we can expand it to the entire list, but -- and geographically disbursed.

MR. SHULER: If I understood your earlier



statement -- John from UIC. If I understood your earlier statement that both the court system and GPO want to deliberately engage populations who cannot access fee services. Is that right? They want this service to reach out to those populations?

MS. ETKIN: Yes.

MR. SHULER: And that's part of the bargain. Is either the GPO or the court helping the participating libraries set up their services so that they are reaching those populations in a deliberative fashion?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy at GPO. Promotion is one of the obligations of the libraries.

MR. SHULER: But how is GPO going to make sure that promotion takes place properly?

MS. ETKIN: Because they're going to report back to me, and that's one of the questions.

MR. SHULER: Okay. That's enough said.

MS. ETKINS: We're also --

MR. SHULER: I understand that impulse.

MS. ETKINS: The works -- we've got -- the final language of this has to be approved by the Administrative Office of the Courts. We've got survey cards that GPO's going to be printing and sending out to the volunteer, the participating libraries and we're asking three questions: How did you hear about this service? Have you used it before? And, if you have used it before, where was it; this library, another library, a courthouse, other?

MR. SHULER: Okay. So there are going to be deliberate questions sent to the user?

MS. ETKIN: Yes. And then the bi-monthly reports that they send back to me, they'll be accumulating those answers, and they will also have to tell me how they've been promoting this service within that two month time period, and again, this is going to be a report back to me every other month.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. ETKIN: Working on a PDF fillable form that they can do through the desktop.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. TROTTA: May I ask another question, a follow up question? Cindy, are the pilot libraries, the identities of the pilot libraries disclosed to the depository community?

MS. ETKIN: We will do that as soon as we have the final list approved by the Administrative Office so that the other libraries in the program can refer.

MR. SWINDELLS: I have a question about the stages. Now this is -- the first stage of the pilot is to get a sense of users, right?

MS. ETKIN: Uh-huh (affirmative).

MR. SWINDELLS: When the pilot is expanded, is that more to see how it affects the business model of PACER? I mean, is that -- I mean, you talked about expanding it, and I wasn't sure if that's another pilot or we're talking expanding it to the FDLP in general?

MS. ETKIN: No. The expansion would be to the entire list of volunteers saying that,

you know, from 1.5 of the libraries in the program is not going to give us valid information as to whether or not the population that they are seeking to reach is actually happening. So we're going to ask to expand it to all the volunteers, and we're hoping that they will agree to that, but that's not a certainty at this point.

MR. SWINDELLS: So but --

MS. ETKIN: So there may not be another -

-

MR. SWINDELLS: -- right --

MS. ETKIN: -- phase.

MR. SWINDELLS: Right. But they are concerned about the business model, obviously, because that's been the sticking point for many years, of cutting into PACER's pay model.

MS. ETKINS: Yes.

MR. SWINDELLS: Yeah. And how -- are they going to judge that based on this trial?

MS. ETKINS: No. They've got -- they can identify usage from the system reports.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay.

MS. ETKINS: And they'll know who was once a subscriber or still a subscriber to the service versus --

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. Okay.

MS. ETKINS: -- versus the usage that's going to be coming from the pilot project.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. Thanks. That clears it up for me.

MR. SHULER: I've got another -- not this topic, but to open up another question front.

MS. ETKIN: I can sit down?

MR. SHULER: Yeah. I guess. I don't know who's going to answer from GPO, but -- there's ongoing discussions at this conference about involving tribal libraries in the program more effectively or more comprehensively in some fashion. Is this an independent movement from GPO or is GPO involved in that discussion?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Yes. We are involved in the discussions

with them. There's a couple regions that are very active in this, and we're meeting today at lunch to go over requirements and ways to become creative so that some of the tribal libraries that maybe don't meet all the requirements could do -- still enter the program another way, find out what opportunities there are, and also, hopefully, to just dispel some of the continuing this about you have to take everything and tangibles and just the whole realm.

MR. SHULER: And is there, again, an idea of a plan or a schedule that -- like we just had with PACER that there's going to be -- if this is acceptable, there will be a certain percentage or a certain organized --

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: No. It hasn't evolved that way, John.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: We actually have been reaching out for tribals for about ten years, and Janet Scheitle got, I think, four, three

or four in a couple years ago. Now, the next step is to make sure that they're not just in the program, but they're able to utilize the services more fully, and so I think that will also be part of the discussion. It's not a timeline or a special project; it's a need that's, I think, being addressed.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. BYRNE: I have a -- this is Tim Byrne, University of Colorado. I have a question about one of the resolutions that council passed last time, and it has to do with web harvesting. And you've given us a really, you know, detailed response in terms of what you're doing with the documents that were harvested from the EPA pilot, but I think the real concern that council had when we passed that resolution was that there is content disappearing every day from the web. And if we are not getting that harvested, you know, we'll never have access to that in the future. So, you're working on what you've

harvested now, but what are the steps for presuming the web harvesting program and fine tuning that?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I'm going to take the first part of that, and I had just literally turned around to Robin and Laurie, and I said, "When there's dead air, we need to stand up and address harvesting." So, good timing.

GPO was approved for the pilot project with EPA, as you know. So the entire focus when we were able to expend money for that purpose was to let these two contracts to have automated harvesting for the EPA pilot. Since that time, of course, you've read in the handout what we're doing with that material, and Robin and Laurie are going to talk more about that as well.

We do what we call, and I'll ask them to describe this in more detail, both manual and semi-automated harvesting on a daily basis in our unit. Our long term plan was that to have



more automated harvesting. The pilot was for the purpose of gathering information for FDsys requirements so that FDsys could implement tools to have more automated harvesting for all government agencies. So where we are right now is we're continuing to harvest, we want to have the tools that were made available through the EPA pilot, and have them available to do it with all agencies, and that's what we're counting on FDsys to deliver to us. That's the high level. I'm going to ask Robin and Laurie to provide more details.

MS. PARKER: May I ask a -- this is Marian Parker. May I ask a clarification? You're saying that you did the pilot just to collect, basically, the requirements for what FDsys needed to do, so you're not continuing to do harvesting?

MR. DAVIS: No. The pilot was done to test automated harvesting capabilities through these two contracts that were let.

MS. PARKER: Right.

MR. DAVIS: But we're continuing to do harvesting every day.

MS. PARKER: Overall?

MR. DAVIS: We just -- we don't have an external contractor as we did for the purposes of that EPA pilot doing it on our behalf.

MS. PARKER: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: We're doing it internally at GPO.

MS. PARKER: But you're not waiting for FDsys to do it?

MR. DAVIS: Not at all. We're doing it every day.

MR. LANDGRAF: Matt Landgraf with GPO. Just to give you the FDsys perspective on the plan that we have, the harvesting function, as we said yesterday, comes in later releases of the system, but that doesn't mean that we're going to stop doing the technology discovery and studying the technologies out there for harvesting.

One of the things that are planned for

the planning of what is now Release 2 of FDsys is to conduct a trade study for web harvesting and study a lot of different -- a lot of different methodologies and technologies, and basically make our decision out of that. So that technology discovery will continue as well as the manual and semi-automated harvesting through Library Services. That sort of bridges the gap.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: The material that we gathered through the automated harvest, it was hoped that we would have a tool, two tools as a result of that process. What we found is that it is much more complicated than either vendor anticipated, and the results that we got back were varied.

The materials that had pulled we have available on our network, and they came off some hard drives, and we're going through them file by file because of what's in there are not pubs, they're files, pieces of this, some of this, a menu, this is from a database, a

lot of FR, Federal Registers notices. So we have to do scope determination, and that's the process we're working on right now to develop a checklist or a guideline for making scope determinations, because what we heard was the community wants to help us do this, and we really do need some help doing this.

Harvest was automated. Every other process associated with it is manual. So we're also working through some work flow processes, and I'll let Laurie address that.

What we didn't have for you, and I really wish we had, was a breakdown of time associated with the 200,000 plus files that we were -- that were pulled down as part of that Harvest. Now, as Ric said, we continue to do harvesting manual and semi-automated, which is our system that we've used for several years and going out and pulling material down. So, harvesting's continuing. It was the Teleport Pro software. So that is still continuing on.

MS. STEIRHOLZ: This is Katrina. Can I

stop you there for a second and just -- can you tell us a little more about what kinds of things you guys get in the manual and semi-automatic harvesting?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I will step aside and let Laurie tell you on that one, okay?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall from GPO. We go out looking at websites. We look for serials. We look for anything that's through our regular acquisition process, so we'll hit a certain agency and say, "Oh, we don't have much of these," so we'll go in and try to grab whatever we can. So, it's really kind of a random process. If somebody comes in through an ask GPO request and says, oh, you don't really have anything from x, y, and z agency, then we'll go out and grab -- you know, check our catalog, see what we've already done, check to see what we've processed, and then go really kind of -- go through that entire site and find stuff that we've missed.

We haven't talked about the project, the

sample that we're doing. That went out on a list server a couple of weeks ago. There are -- we've taken 300 documents, or pieces. We've had people go through those files; figure out what is a document, what's a serial, what's a monograph. We've made scope determinations. We're creating brief bibs from those records. We're also adding information to the serial records. So, in one instance we found two issues of a serial that we'd already cataloged like five years ago, so we spent enormous time getting all of the issues that were missing, but in the harvest, they only picked up one or two, at least out of the 300 that we found. For all of the other 200,000, there may be seven or eight other issues of serial. So we've collapsed those, created new cataloging records, put a note in the cataloging records so you know we've harvested what issues from the pilot. And we're gathering that work flow data, how long it takes to make -- pull the files,

determine if it really is a pub, gather the pieces, how long it takes to make a scope determination, how long it takes to create a brief bib, search the catalog. So, we're getting that statistic and the statistical stuff from that sample of 300. That should be -- we were pretty much going to finish doing that work by October 31st, so we should be gathering some of that data shortly. Their last count, there was more than 29 records in the CGP with that -- that had the EPA pilot information. You can search and find that specific group.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill, Hemphill & Associates. I don't have a question. What is the plan moving forward then?

MS. HALL: I also forgot one other thing. We also are creating a browse table for another group of that 300 in the sample. What we're -- our purpose is, is to gather that data, see how much -- we're talking about staffing money and resources, server space

from that 300 sample. Then we'll kind of decide how we're going to tackle or, you know, that other additional 200,000.

Oh, that's right. We've also entered into an inter-agency agreement with DTIC and ODU for medadata, automated medadata extraction, and we're going to send a substantial portion, a couple batches of those EPA records down to them, and see if we can figure out a way to get automated medadata created from some of those files as well. So, there's additional pieces of that 200,000 that we're processing in different ways.

MR. HEMPHILL: So when you get these metrics gathered, put together, I assume GPO will articulate the plan moving forward to that libraries know?

MS. HALL: Well, I think we'll develop the report, get the report out, and then kind of strategize budget, etcetera on how we're going to go forward, because, potentially, if it does take an inordinate amount of time to



process these to get even brief cataloging records, we may have to do contractual arrangements, etcetera, so -- cooperative arrangements, whatever. So, yeah, there's a lot of, you know, things that we'd have to do.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The other opportunity that we're probably going to put a call out for is, you know, again, how can the library community help? One of the things that I've been concerned about is, you know, as Laurie mentioned, we have many files which you have to look at, piece together and, at the end of the day, you might come up with a publication within scope of the FDLP. We could certainly use some help doing that, and I think, you know, putting out a call, and we'll certainly do QC invalidation on our end, but we need some help in that process because, again, automation did not solve that problem.

MR. HEMPHILL: Is there a possibility that GPO would consider some tools to facilitate that with the libraries so that the

libraries would know what you need help with, particularly as far as content?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. SWINDELLS: Larry?

MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County Law Library. In the process of doing the web harvesting project, have you -- it seems to me that if you're doing automatic creeping every couple days that you're going to have multiple versions of documents. Have you been addressing version control and, if so, how have you been doing that as part of this project?

MS. HALL: Well, we're not actually doing it that way, because that actually is an automated process, and the teleport we're not doing it that way. We're going in, we're finding a document, picking it up, you know, processing it, cataloging, and we're not worrying -- we haven't gotten to that. That's what the FDsys is supposed to do, keep up with that version control. So, we're not at that

level at this point at all. It's simply identifying a title. You know, occasionally, like for serials, we will go back and, you know, look at that site again and see if we can pick up an additional issue if we know it's quarterly. There's no automated way to do that right now other than the serial catalogers, you know, going back and looking for the next quarterly issue, the next monthly issue, and making sure that we've captured and archived that. But the version issue and the version control requirements are what FDsys is working on.

MR. SWINDELLS: Do you have any more questions from counsel?

MR. SHULER: I think, for me, I understand this discussion a lot better than I did about ten minutes ago, because when you say web harvesting, it was a different thing in my mind than what you guys just described. What you're describing is GPO designated publications harvesting, that it might be

imbedded in the web, and when I think -- at least when I talk it over with my colleagues, when they say web harvesting, what you're capturing is in situ, if you will. It's like an archeological dig. You're capturing the entire website regardless if it has GPO determined interests in what is embedded in that website. So I think this has been a very useful moment for me in that web harvesting could mean different things to different people, and it benefit to have that explained.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. That's a good point. And you know, John, when we first did -- we let these contracts under Matt's leadership for the EPA pilot, you know, the hope that we had, the over arching goal was deliver back content with a one-to-one correspondence. Let it be a publication, let it be end scope, and we defined parameters to try to do that. Again, what we found is that the technology right now, for lack of a better word, is not smart enough to be able to do

that. So you get this stuff back, and then you still have to go through it with the human intervention, but I think also what we've learned from that pilot is the go around, you know, how to make the parameters better, and your hope over time is technology advances as you put more parameters and better parameters in there, that you have less human intervention on the back end. But where we are right now, is there's a tremendous amount.

MR. LAWHUN: This is Katrina. Ric, so from what I understand of the FDsys timeline, that -- FDsys really won't be ready for automatic web harvesting, gosh, for probably two years at least. I mean, realistically. So, in the interim, I think we're looking likely at some major changes in administration, and certainly a new President will be elected, which means changes in cabinet members, which means changes in websites. And one of my concerns is capturing that information before it goes away.

MR. DAVIS: And that's something that through, as we've used the word, I don't like the word semi-automated, but that's what it is, through these various means. That's what GPO has historically done every time there's been a change in administration. We've done it through manual process. And the other thing that I want to mention is, even with FDsys on the horizon, this year, for FY '08, as we did last year, of course we're under the continuing resolution, we asked for 2 Million Dollars just for the library budget to assist us with harvesting given the fact that the timeline for FDsys is a year or two out. So we have that as a primary budget item that we're still waiting to come out of conference.

I mentioned yesterday that the House approved 35 Million, the Senate approved 38, so we're looking at an increase, and to me there is no higher priority than what we can do with acquiring content.

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells. This

isn't exactly a question, but when I think about this issue, I think of it in a slightly different way in terms of preserving or grabbing that endangered content. I see that as the first and most important step. So -- and I see that open to automatic harvesting. And then once that information is collected, mining that for in scope publications, cataloging and all of that as a later step, and I'm wondering if we're getting caught in the -- in we must only collect in scope, which isn't to say -- well, no, no, no. I'm not saying -- I'm not saying that we should be applying metadata and saying this is within the GPO electronic collection to out of scope materials. I'm just wondering if the cart's before the horse here. In other words, whether we might be applying tools to a collection and processes to a collection for the in scope to determine scope and all that for later processes, but we will have been somewhat assured that we will have collected

data. And I may be thinking about this wrong.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. It harks back to a conversation that I had with former Public Printer, Bruce James, when he first came onboard, and his statement was, "Why should we even bother any longer in the electronic age with determining what's in scope of the FDLP? Let's collect everything and put it up." And I know that in accordance with Title 44, we're not able to do that, but I think in terms of going through the processes that we have to go through to determine what's in scope, I think first we have to collect, and then, you know, siphon through it because, ultimately, if we don't collect it, there's the chance that it's going to vanish on us. So, we've got to get it.

MR. SWINDELLS: And that was my point. I'm not -- I mean, I have larger questions about in scope, out of scope, but those are much larger questions, and we do have Title 44, but, yeah, I agree. I mean, I think in a



lot of ways it would help -- it would make me sleep better at night, not that I really stay up at night about this issue, but to know that some where there's a good chance that we've captured the information.

MR. SHULER: Well, let me rephrase that in a different way, Your Honor, since we talked about lawyers earlier. Is GPO able -- John Schuler, UIC. Is GPO able to tell the library community and the council that they have a program where they are capturing government content on a comprehensive or, I'll say comprehensive knowing what that means, basis, so that data is not lost until we figure out what is in scope and what isn't.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I'll stand up and say it. Yeah. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. No. We don't have that. And, John, thank you, really, for asking that question because there's a number of reasons why. We don't have the server space. I'm trying to get five terabytes back from another unit of GPO so we

can put the web harvesting stuff up. We don't have the expertise to know what's most at risk, and maybe that's something that counsel can work with us on. We do have partnership with UNT for materials that are cyber symmetry, and some of this material falls into that category. We also have problems with going down and pulling whole websites and, in fact, we've gotten slapped three or four times for doing just that. Agencies don't like us doing that. They don't like our crawlers going in and slowing down their servers, and they don't like when they go to our archive instead of their live site for material that they're trying to promote or count on making available. So is it a comprehensive plan? No. John, I welcome your input, and Ric, I'm hoping you appoint somebody else to this, because right now this with Laurie and myself. I guess that's it. Thanks.

MR. SWINDELLS: Ric?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO, and I'd like

to thank Robin for volunteering to lead this effort still.

You know the other piece of this that is so important, and I'm going to share a story with you that dates back 15 years to the present, is that it's technology, but it's also communication with the federal agencies. There has to be a partnership with federal agencies where they understand what the words permanent, public access mean, and they don't think, well, that's just -- when we send our records to NARA I think we've taken care of that, but we're really not sure, and my story is, and I'm not going to name the agency, but 15 years ago I was out at a meeting with an agency and we were having discussions about permanent public access to electronic information, and the statement was made to me, "Well, we're going to look at our user stats, and when nobody's really using it anymore, we're just going to take it down." The scary part about that is, two months ago, I had a

similar conversation with another, different agency with 20 of their senior people in the room, and they said, "We follow the EGOV Act. What is permanent public access?" So, I think GPO has to do a better job with all of our customer service people and in meetings with agencies so that it's not just the scraping of the websites and the technology tools, but there's an educational role where we have an understanding. And I think that's something we can partner on with the library community.

I've had volunteers from AALL locally around D.C. who say to me, "When GPO goes out to talk, we'll tag along with you to help reinforce that this is not just a GPO issue, legislative versus executive. It's an issue for all of us."

MR. SWINDELLS: Thank you. I think we had some questions out there in the audience. Sandy?

MS. MCANINCH: This is not directly related to harvesting, but I presume it's one

of the steps down the road. In the biannual survey you ask if you begin to push electronic files, would we take them. Can you enlighten us in what we would need at our end? My administration's very reluctant to say yes or no to this because we're not sure what it would involve. They don't want you not to plan for that, but we don't want to say yes when we don't know what we're going to be signing up for.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe at GPO. I think the first response to that is that it's a may and not a must, so there's no obligation, there's no punitive type measure in that in terms of a library, its constituents, and what their needs are is going to dictate that in many ways in terms of that volume. I want everything, therefore, I need x, y, z capacity and through put end servers. I have a specific niche of information that's important to the community. I don't know that GPO's role is to define that infrastructure, but it

is, in fact, our role to try to make that content available. Whether it's a pull, which is a much easier method for you as a depository because you do with it as you wish much like we do today with GPO Access. Whereas a push, based on statutory and other obligations, you know, in the current state pending some changes, we have a much different obligation or potentially a constraint there, but it's by no means punitive. It's another vehicle to enable access as a library sees fit is how I best describe it.

MS. MCANICH: And I didn't say who I was, Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. Well that -- I guess I'm not asking the right question. It's not the volume, it's infrastructure. If we've locks box, will be able to dump the things in there, you know? What would be the mechanism for it? And until we know more about that, I'm not sure we can answer those kinds of questions, because that's the first thing that pops up at the

upper levels of my library, is, what do I need in order to say yes to this. And so, I don't know how to answer that biannual survey question.

We don't want to say no, we're not interested, but those are our two options in that question. There isn't even, I believe, another box there. So we don't want to discourage you, but we're a little nervous about saying yes, and we are regional, and you do have that parenthetical statement, which also raised a red flag, regional and selective, retention requirements would apply.

MS. FISCHER: Janet Fischer, Golden Gate University Law Library in San Francisco. I have the same question as well. As in the past, GPO has had their technical requirements for our public works stations. Will GPO have technical requirements that individual libraries will have to meet to receive electronic depositories?

MR. SWINDELLS: Let me interject one

thing. In the document that we discussed, I believe, in Denver that looked at digital distribution, there was also a distinction between distribution of access copies and a possible role for some libraries of distribution for preservation; very different requirements for both of those. I see very few libraries that would be willing to take on files in which they have agreed to save them in perpetuity and do the kind of things that real preservation of digital files requires, although some of us are already doing that locally, and might be willing to include some of that content in other things.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis from GPO. I can probably sit down because Geoff said what I was going to say. GPO has made a commitment that we're going to maintain permanent public access to content, and in doing so, we're going to have the preservation level, electronic derivative, and we're going to continue to push out access level files



through GPO Access and FDsys as its successor.

One of the topics that did come up in Denver, and it came up last fall as well, is in looking at new models in terms of flexibility for the Federal Depository Library Program, might there be libraries out there, not forced to by GPO or mandated, but might there be libraries out there that, as part of a distributive model, want to have the permanent copies as well, other than GPO, through a locks like model or its successor, and we built that into the future digital system, not as a requirement, but as an option.

MR. SWINDELLS: Robin, did you want to add to that?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Ric knows I'm lock challenged. Robin Haun-Mohamed. I don't believe we can tell you what type of system or how robust it needs to be. What we will be pushing out will be access level derivatives, essentially PDFs, and if locks is the way that

you make them available to the public, then that works for you. If it's simply putting them on a server and making them available through your OPAC, that's fine.

The way we're looking at this right now, but we have not gotten confirmation from General Council Office, is if you pull the material down as you do now, there's not requirement to make it available, essentially, or to keep it. If we push it to you, that, however, puts it in a different arena, and then it comes into some requirements associated with that. And we don't want to lose our regionals by saying we're going to push all this stuff out to you. So, we're looking at an optian (phonetic) process, but we believe it has to be done through the FDsys system. And the biannual survey questions our own attempt to judge how many people really want this stuff right now; do we need to move it up in the FDsys requirements? We'll work a different way to make them available.

MR. DAVIS: And I just want to add to that, in the 2005 survey, the percentage that expressed they did was awfully low. I think it was less than ten percent, so we're looking at getting some current data on that to compare that as a baseline.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. I also want to make sure people know that they can ask questions of counsel. You can challenge both GPO and counsel. Anyway, do you have a -- go ahead.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Julie Schwartz, Connecticut State Library. Actually not a challenge, but sort of a follow-up suggestion to some of the conversation that just was happening around web harvesting. I liked a lot what you said about grabbing a larger piece and having that if you're talking about an agency website. For example, having that and being able to make your decisions about these other documents I want to pull off and provide bibliographic access to. We, in

Connecticut, as the State library, we face the same type of challenge, and we have a digit archive that we -- for we use OCLC as the trust depository, and we just had an instance last week where we were able to harvest the website about six months ago for one of the agencies. They changed their domain, and we lost all of the old content except that we had harvested the webpage from before so we could go back and get a particular document that somebody was looking for. So, I think, as a fall back scenario, that works very well. I understand what Robin said about the political ramifications over that, and the agencies not wanting you to go and harvest their whole site, but maybe there's a role for council in delineating some of the more important subsets of information that we might want, census data for example, or other bureaus and agencies or maybe just a few for a starting point, so at least we would have a baseline to work with.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill,

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

Hemphill and Associates. I was -- it occurred to me that if GPO is having issues with agencies not wanting them to crawl their website, that perhaps GPO should approach them about being one of the automated feeds into FDSys, present that information through that method rather than crawling websites since they do still have the obligation of providing permanent access, and see if you gain their cooperation in that manner.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy at GPO. Just wanted to comment on the capturing of the entire website, and John, I understand what you're referring to, that you're getting everything in context, and some of that is lost when you get a publication here, a publication there, but I just want to let everybody know that it's NARA's responsibility to capture the websites, and they do that before every administration and turnover, and it's GPO's authority to have a purview over publications, not websites.

MR. SWINDELLS: That raises an interesting question. If NARA is indeed doing the full harvest, then is it GPO's responsibility to cherry pick from that, things that are in scope? In other words, to use that harvest? I mean, it raises the whole issue of NARA, GPO, executive, legislative, all kinds of interesting issues.

MR. SANDLER: Geoff, this is -- Cindy probably has a better answer to this, and I was --

MS. ETKIN: I was just going to say, I suppose.

MR. SANDLER: Yeah. But I think --

MS. ETKIN: It's an option.

MR. SANDLER: -- Cindy, you were saying that NARA's doing a snapshot, right, at various --

MS. ETKIN: Various intervals, yes.

MR. SANDLER: -- time intervals, and those are actually pretty extended, so I would guess that GPO still wants to capture things

that could legitimately be called publications, right, at any point, and take responsibility for those. So I think there is a reasonable division of labor there, but I agree with the larger point, that it would be -- I just think it would be, you know, a real extension of your scope to start thinking that you're going to archive the look and feel of websites well into the in perpetuity.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think that's a very valid point, and the other thing that we need to also always keep in mind about the delineation of responsibilities is that NARA, of course, is focused on essential evidence and the records, and we're focused on the content. And I think that Geoff's point is a very good one because what they've been doing in prior years is pulling down content as well, and I think that is something that we can work with them on to analyze. And, you know, GPO Access is considered an archival affiliate. We have an agreement in place with

NARA, so we have that partnership as well.

MR. SWINDELLS: Other questions? Any questions not on harvesting? Not that I don't like -- it's an interesting conversation. Questions about FDsys? We have some expertise here just dying to answer a question.

MR. HEMPHILL: After yesterday's meetings, council got together for a little bit for a working session, and we were concerned a little bit about determining what content is going to show up in FDsys when, and what's being captured, and having a clear mapping of schedule to content and functionality of what is going to come out in what releases. Is there something that can be communicated or put together so that the librarians have an idea of when they're going to see what appear in FDsys?

MS. GIBB: Hi, Carrie Gibb with GPO. The first public release is going to take over everything that's on GPO Access, but in terms of future releases and what will go into



those, we'd be happy to put something together, and then put some information out on the website.

MR. SWINDELLS: Well -- and I think we're talking about both content and functionality. I mean, I actually think it's a good time now to revisit some of that. I mean, we've talked about when things come in different releases in the past, but we're getting closer to that big day when the world can see this, and so I think we need to sort of revisit when functionality and content will appear in different releases going out.

MS. GIBB: We are currently working on that schedule. You'll notice in the packet, the tech line details out the feature sets of what's going to happen in Release 1C. We don't have dates for those yet. We are working closely with Harris, so as soon as we get that information, we will post it on the website.

MR. SWINDELLS: Yeah. Because I noticed

we did have -- we do have information through 1C for a lot of that, and dates are interesting. I mean, late 2008 is later than we, well, than we all expected, including you guys.

MR. LANDGRAF: Just expand a little bit on sort of what content will be made available when. As Carrie said, the first public release really replaces GPO Access and it encompasses the content that's currently available on GPO Access. Subsequent releases focus more on the other types of content. So the next release, agency content submission comes in. So for publications that actually weren't actually really sort of housed within a GPO server, that sort of stuff comes in in the next public release.

Also, in the next public release, this is after the first public release, we have converted content, any kind of things that come in through digital conversion through our partners or within GPO, and of course, in

Release 2 of the system, there's harvesting content that comes in. So, there's a larger view of functionality of when it comes in, but, you know, I guess it's more the detailed information that the council would like to see at this point?

MR. SHULER: At least to put another focus on this, in your conversations about FDsys over the last day and a half, you have mentioned agency content; you've mentioned GPO specific content related to their work with the agency. I think what I would be very interested in, both as a council member, and as a depository librarian, is when are you going to get specific about library, the depository library content in the same way that you talk about agency contents? In other words, there are specific aspects of the system that we've often associated with Ways, the Ways community, if you will, that I think would be very beneficial. You have 450 librarians in the room, and it might have been

-- it might be a good idea to think about what aspects of FDsys would show a direct impact on their lives. Not to say they aren't appreciative and recognize the hard work that has gone in on behalf of the agencies and the publication life cycles of the agencies, and how important it is for GPO to digitize those aspects, but I think there's a great deal of interest in seeing how the libraries are going to play this next time you talk about this publicly, and it could be even suggested by the next conference, Depository Library Conference, having some demonstrable aspect of how libraries are going to look in this universe might be a very good thing.

MR. SWINDELLS: Can I ask a clarification question? Are we talking about, for instance, when will libraries be able to submit digitized content?

MR. SHULER: That is one aspect --

MR. SWINDELLS: One aspect of it?

MR. SHULER: But there's this entire

other mechanism that libraries use to regulate their depository life with the GPO, and one assumes the way you talk about FDsys, it's going to incorporate that blood -- that exchange between libraries and GPO, right? Am I wrong about that?

MR. BARNUM: No. No, you're not wrong about that. I'm George Barnum. You're not wrong about that, John. That, however -- that functionality, at this point, I mean, you know, we've clustered things together for better or for worse, I mean, you know, you do these schedule things and then you almost immediately either start changing them or start regretting them or both; so that's functionality that's -- we can say now where we see that happening, and that's Release 2. Now, you know, where we put Release 2 on a calendar, I don't -- I'm not going to commit to that, and none of these people are going to commit to it, but -- because we're just not quite there yet, but it is in the -- in the

progression of things, that is Release 2, so that's the second public -- well, it's the second group of public releases.

The point that I wanted to make, to get back a little bit to the content, about when will we start to see what from whom, from where. Keep in mind that the way we're deploying this functionality currently, it's going to continue to be driven much in the way we've always been driven before in terms of what comes to us and what's made available to us, and what we can get to. So, when we talk about how -- what content looks like, we're not looking at it as agency content so much or as congressional content. We've done that some in making the -- grabbing all of the GPO Access material. We've tended to talk a lot about this is congressional material, because it principally is, other than the Federal Register, but we haven't been -- in the planning, we haven't talked a lot about, well, you know, in this phase or in this month, it

will be Executive Branch material or it will be Judicial or it will be from this agency or that agency. We've focused the rollout of the system on these three types of content; the deposited content that's pushed our way from the agencies, the harvested content that we go out and kidnap, and the converted content that we will be converting, and will be talking with the partners to work on the conversions, and those we can then start -- those we can talk quite specifically about, where those puzzle pieces start to fit in as specifically as we can talk about anything having to do with schedule at this point.

MR. HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill. Forgive my ignorance here, but where does Ways content fit into that?

MR. BARNUM: The WAIS content is -- will be in the -- that's the GPO Access replacement, and that's the first public release.

MR. HEMPHILL: Okay. And even if you

don't have a specific schedule, I think it would be good to publish at least GPO foresees as being the priority of content going in there to make sure, because right now, I'm sure, there are all kinds of wild expectations that are all over the place as to what is going to be in FDsys, and I think it would be important to make sure you communicate and set the expectations appropriately --

MR. BARNUM: Sure.

MR. HEMPHILL: -- in the community, so that they know what they're getting.

MR. BARNUM: And you're right. I mean, we have to keep saying that. I think you'll find that, in the Tech Line currently, and I think we have to keep reiterating that it's -- what we're looking at is the path by which it reaches us for now is what gets it high or low in the implementation. So, we're dealing with deposited content first for a lot of reasons. You know, we don't need to go off into the fact that deposited content has affect across



the agency. I mean, these are issues that we had to deal with on the incoming side, the in just side, the plant side, as well as distribution to the libraries. Whereas, harvested and converted content, it's much more a concern on the distribution side than it is on the rest of GPO's business. So, you know, those priorities get -- have all gotten factored in, and that's how they've ended up in the releases where they are, and that's all out there, and we just have to keep hitting on it.

MR. HEMPHILL: I'm thinking, and maybe this isn't the right place to put this information, but communicating this information through the FDLP desktop or something so that people can go out and look and see what content is going to be up and when or in what order.

MR. BARNUM: Sure.

MR. HEMPHILL: Same hold true with functionality. I think a lot of people out

there have a lot of expectations of what's going to be in FDSys, and that kind of mapping would provide to be useful for GPO to set expectations and keep everybody focused on what is actually going to be delivered --

MR. BARNUM: Sure.

MR. HEMPHILL: -- in a release. You know, Windows, when it first came up, it was far from perfect, and I think the library community needs to expect FDSys will not be perfect, but that you are working on enhancing its abilities over time. And, in fact, I'm glad you used the word acquisition and distribution, because so far what we've seen in the public discussions is the acquisition side of things with implications to the distributions issues gotten at by individuals rather than a collective discussion, and I think, at least the sense that I'm getting, is we would like to see more deliberative discussion between council, GPO and the community about what the distributive

implications for the libraries are going to be in FDSys.

MR. BARNUM: Okay.

MR. HEMPHILL: As represented by WAIS and many other -- I mean, there's a whole bunch of stuff we can talk about, but we would like to see that coming to the floor more often than it has been.

MS. PARKER: This is Marian Parker. You referred several times to Tech Line; that the information was there. Maybe I'm the person, but I never saw this until it was my package yesterday morning. So, where is this normally published and who is the intended audience?

MR. BARNUM: That's a -- Carrie, do you want to talk about Tech Line? I'll just give you a little, like, little capsule history. This is a piece of literature that we've used over, and Carrie can talk more about its current production. It's a thing that we've used within the PMO to take out when we go out talking to groups to sort of summarize where

we are over the past x-number of months. So, that's going to have been in your packet in some form the last several meetings.

MS. PARKER: But the meetings only occur every six months.

MR. BARNUM: Right. And we update that two or three times a year, and that -- all it's intended -- it's not really intended for a very wide distribution. It's mostly something that we can take along with us that sort of summarizes what the current state of the presentation is. Carrie is much better at this.

MS. GIBB: I am? Carrie Gibb, GPO. Actually, the council session drives Tech Line for the most part, and its how it's put together. So we finalize that three days before this meeting, and this is the first distribution of it. We do have an FDsys website off the GPO page that those materials are posted on once they're developed, and also a blog that we're trying to keep updated

weekly if we have news and events type of status updates. So all of that's accessible from the FDsys website, which is listed there in Tech Line, but that's the first time you've seen it because it was just finalized right before this council meeting.

MS. PARKER: Okay. Because this contains the kind of information that people are asking for, and because mostly people aren't going to go crawl through the website and get to the FDsys individual page, it might be a really useful idea for all of us, if you at least provided a link on the FDLP desktop saying what's the latest with FDsys or something, and then just link to your site where you had the latest information.

MS. GIBB: That's a great suggestion, and we'll work with Ric's group to do that.

MS. PARKER: That would just be fabulous.

MS. GIBB: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PARKER: Thank you.

MR. SWINDELLS: Well, we also might

stress -- might think about FDLP and where it might come in that mix. Obviously, you don't want inundate people, but now that we have the ability to narrow cast that might be a feature that could be useful.

MR. DAVIS: And the other tool I want to give a few props to, again, is this new FDLP Express, which you'll see in your inboxes when you get back to your respective offices, and that is something that Karen Sieger launched over the weekend for the sole purpose, or one of the primary purposes is to divide quick hitting, and very timely information, and something like this I think would be a perfect fit.

MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne. I think a couple of years ago you did a presentation that was a Day in the Life in the FDsys that actually had an example of how a librarian, a depository librarian, would use FDsys in the future, and I think that was really helpful to many of us in really understanding it. I think a lot of

depository librarians are just totally lost when they think about FDSys, and that's the sort of thing I think John was talking about as -- in a presentation like we had at this session. That would have been good to show the whole audience what they can really expect in the future.

MS. PARKER: This is Marian Parker. I read during the past month about the Blue Ribbon Task Force and its sustainable, digital preservation and access that has been formed supported by the National Science Foundation, and the Andrew Mellon Foundation, and it says there's also support from Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Administration, the Council on Library and Information Resources, and the Joint Information Systems Committee of the United Kingdom. Is GPO participating in this?

MR. SWINDELLS: George?

MR. BARNUM: No, we're not. I mean, we'll be going to observe, but that was a by

invitation only group and we weren't invited.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. But you are going to be active by being observant?

MR. BARNUM: Oh, we'll be -- yeah. We'll be observing. Oh, yeah. Absolutely.

MS. PARKER: Hooray.

MR. BARNUM: Yeah. We'll definitely be observing. The other group of that sort of scope that we are now members of and are participating in, and my office mates are all going to laugh at me because I'm getting a shameless plug in here, but we just joined the International Internet Preservation Consortium. So we're working with that large group of national libraries and others who are interested in web preservation, and it's already paid nice dividends for us.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The other ad to that, the other free group that we're involved in is the National Digital Strategy Advisory Group, which is part of NDIIP and please don't ask me what that acronym stands



for.

MS. STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the Federal Reserve in St. Louis. I have a question about FDSys and about many of the things on the FDLP desktop in general. Are some of these things going to be restricted to depository librarians and depository libraries, or will they all be open to everybody? Because I know you have a user name/password set up.

MR. BARNUM: I think I can do this one. When we get to the point of some of the things that John was eluding to earlier where you'll actually be dealing with depository administration kinds of things through FDSys, things that are currently done through the desktop, you know, where you have to log in to change your item selection profile --

MS. STEIRHOLZ: Okay.

MR. BARNUM: -- or change your depository directory entry, things like that, then, yes, they will be restricted, but it's a loose kind

of restriction. I mean, obviously, it just keeps the information secure.

MS. STEIRHOLZ: So like the email alerts. I can see lots of librarians who are not depository librarians --

MR. BARNUM: Sure.

MS. STIERHOLZ: -- being very interested in getting those.

MR. BARNUM: And I think -- yeah. From the FDsys point of view, everything that we talk about in terms of individuals things like that, there's a range of permission possibilities. So, it's just where we set it.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I wish we all could be also in the session that Karen is giving right now. In the current environment, pre-FDsys, part of what she's doing in this re-launch that's she done of the FDLP.gov website is, we're building on council recommendations in the past, and also the council vision document to create what were termed collaboration zones in a virtual

environment where the library community could come in and interact, and they wanted GPO to facilitate that effort, and that was from a past council discussion. So, there'll be opportunities to do that just for the library community as well in the current environment.

MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne. The comment about Tech Line being something that is really produced for these council sessions really reminded me how much of how GPO relies on these meetings for setting deadlines for itself, and that much is set so the new things can be rolled out for the council sessions, and you know, for the conference, and it really would be helpful to council if we could get the information a little sooner rather than getting here and, you know, seeing the handouts. I think if we can get them before and have time to read them and think about some of these things before the session.

MR. SWINDELLS: Questions from the audience? There must be a question out there.

Oh, I see someone heading up this way.

MR. SESMASKY: David SesModuley, California State Library. I'd like to emphasize the importance of something that Gwen said yesterday when talking about agency submission of content to FDsys, and that has to do with the importance of engaging regional offices of many important agencies in that submission process, and doing enough outreach to those offices to convince them of the importance of submitting their documents or publications to the system. I was just trying to make a short list of some of the agencies that have important regional offices that produce publications that are important regionally; Forest Service, US Geological Survey, Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, the EPA. They produce environmental impact reports, records of decision that tend to disappear from the regional websites very quickly. As soon as the issue is over, and the record of the decision has been issued,

they're gone.

I also thought when Gwen mentioned that, would there be some kind of way that depository librarians who are in those regions could actually submit those publications themselves in a manner similar to the way that the agencies submit? And, if that isn't possible, and we're going to depend solely on a depository librarian reporting that such a document is not currently in FDsys, would it be possible to get it, it's going to be really important, I think, for GPO -- when you monitor those reports from the field, that somebody intimately connected with FDsys is going to be reading that stuff, and not somebody from some other department of GPO who's not going to be intimately connected with the submission process from the agencies. I don't know if that made sense.

MR. SWINDELLS: David, I think that's a really important point. I'd even add to it. Some of us have -- are involved in

digitization projects of -- in my case, mostly State agencies, so they wouldn't come into play, but I've got lots of folks right down the street from me producing federal materials, so -- and who might be willing for us to put the resources, the University of Missouri behind it to digitize stuff, so I'd include that as well.

MR. BARNUM: I think that's -- you're right, David. It's very, very important, and Carrie can talk about the regional aspect, but I think your suggestion about depository librarians submitting content, I think, is an interesting one, and we sort of had our heads together. I think we'd probably look at that from the angle of your telling us about these things on websites, and we'd harvest them rather than as submitted. Remember that the deposited content is really about agencies pushing stuff to us when principally, not solely, but principally when they need other GPO services. So when they need printing,

binding, and that sort of thing. So, it would hit on the line there a little bit. There's nothing that would say, no, we couldn't do it, but I think the more effective way for us to pursue that would be that you would inform us and we'd harvest those, because I think we'll be looking at ways to do real directed kind of harvests, and regional offices of the agencies are one of the really big trouble spots when we start trying to focus our activities on harvesting. Finding the main EPA website is big deal. Finding those regional office sites that sometimes have nothing much to do with the main agency website is a very big problem, and that's -- you know, if you tip us off to those, if the community's tipping us off to those, I think that's probably the more effective strategy because we'll have more tools for it.

MR. SWINDELLS: Well, I appreciate the difficulties of actually having depository librarians submitting material to FDsys, but I

guess my concern is with the current fugitive document reporting system, which I don't think is working as well as either GPO or depository librarians would like in the sense that I think many fugitive documents are reported, and nothing ever happens with that reportage. So, my concern would be that whoever is monitoring the reporting of fugitive documents be in FDSys, and not some other department of GPO where they read this stuff and say, "Well, that's not really important."

MR. BARNUM: Let's just -- let me speak directly to that. There isn't an FDSys as a organizational entity. Currently, this group and our colleagues back at the big red buildings, the Program Management Office are guiding the development of the system, but very soon here, like, the first public release, we turn it over to the customer, and the customer in this case is the already existing GPO organizations who do stuff. In your case it's -- we'll turn it over to



Library Services and say, "Here are the tools, go use them." So, it's still going to be the Library Services staff who will have responsibility for acquiring material for the program and making, you know, dealing with fugitives and all that sort of stuff. FDSys is not a new GPO organization or a new GPO entity, okay? We're just building the car. We're not going to do any of the driving. Okay? So, it isn't like we're creating a new administrative function here that's going to solve the fugitive documents problem. We're going to throw a lot of new technology at it though, and hope that throwing technology at it does a better job than, you know, depository library inquiry forms.

MS. GIBB: Hi, Carrie Gibb with GPO. David, I just want to follow up on the regional aspect of that, and we do realize that a lot of the fugitive documents come from the regions. We have the national account managers. I don't know if you all are

familiar, but they go -- they're located in each of the regions. They go out and meet with the agencies, and I think it's a matter of education. Like I mentioned yesterday in the outreach update, I personally went to these nine cities and met with over 30 federal agencies, and I can tell you that, out of the employees that we met with, over 50 to 75 percent were not familiar with the library program. They didn't know about it, they don't understand it. So, it is a matter of education in the regions, and it's also a matter of providing them the easy tools to make that happen, which I think FDsys will do just like with the GPO Express Program. A lot of those documents were getting produced outside of GPO, and we provided them in easy tool to access that was convenient, then it started coming back through, and I think FDsys with the education is going to provide that to the regional offices.

MR. SWINDELLS: Other questions? Okay.

I want to thank everyone for coming to this session, and you can all go to lunch.

COUNCIL SESSION: PUBLIC ACCESS ASSESMENT

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. I think we're going to get started. A couple of announcements as usual, just a reminder to leave your evaluations with the registration desk. If you're taking off early, leave your evaluations with the registration desk. If you stay for the full term, leave your

evaluations with the registration desk. In other words, do the evaluations. They're very helpful as GPO plans future meetings. And just a reminder, council will have a working a session today from 3:30 to 5:00. We will not be setting up here. We will probably be over there somewhere in a more comfortable area, but you're certainly welcome to watch us think out loud.

We may or may not have the 5:00 to 6:00, 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. working session. In addition, it'll depend on how the 3:30 to 5:00 works out. So, just to let you know.

Okay. The subject is Public Access Assessment, and I'm going to turn it over to Kathy Brazee, librarian in Education and Outreach at GPO.

MS. BRAZEE: So how many have heard of Public Access Assessment so far? Okay. About a third of the audience, maybe a third to half. Okay. Public Access Assessments are our -- is our new -- well, if you can't hear

me, please just raise your hand in the back.

Public Access Assessments is our new term for what used to be the Inspection Program, which also included self studies. It's the Revitalized Library Assessment Program. Our goal is to emphasize how the (inaudible) libraries serve the general public federal government information needs by reviewing how they provide access to, and services for the federal government information products.

I just want to mention a few terms that I'm going to use just so that we're all on the same page, and there is some overlap in the terminology. The purpose of assessments is actually set up in Title 44, which is obviously a legal requirement. I'm mostly going to use the terms rules and regulations, and right now the instructions to the depository libraries has those FDLP rules and regulations for the libraries, and then there's performance guidelines, and those tend to -- well, those -- some of those are in the

guidelines for the Federal Depository Library Program, which is supplement to the Federal Depository Library Manual. So, there's obviously some overlap in some of those things except for legal requirements, but I don't want to confuse the issue by getting into the specific terminology. I just wanted to give you that overview.

So the purpose of assessments is in Title 44, Section 1909, the Superintendent of Documents shall make first hand investigation of conditions for which need is indicated and include the results of investigations in his annual report.

It is the responsibility of GPO to ensure that the resources that the agency distributes to depositories are made accessible to the general public. Publications are federal property, and it's a governmental function to distribute these publications out to the libraries. But, having said that, the interaction that we've had at GPO through the

inspection program, and we plan to have through Public Access Assessments, is an intricate part of our liaison activities between the libraries and GPO. I actually thought about putting that at the top of the screen, but I didn't want to put the legal requirement at the bottom. But, assessments offers an opportunity for GPO personnel to interact with an individual depository library's personnel, and a regional librarian.

So the process, as we're planning it, is going to start with a review of the biannual survey responses in libraries' web pages. We're probably also going to look at a parent institution's -- or, your parent institutions' web pages as well. If there's an access policy on your institution's website that affects the library, then that may be something which we'd want to look at.

We're going to get into, when further review is warranted in this presentation, but if for some reason we just need clarification,

if there is some kind of public access problem that we see somehow, we'll certainly call the coordinator of the library. If there are any policies that aren't posted on the website, if we get copies of those, a coordinator sends those to us, we can take a look at those. Libraries can do a voluntary self-assessment, stress the voluntary. We used to have a mandatory self-study. Looking at having visits by the regional librarian or a peer expert maybe a librarian who has been a coordinator for several years, and then there can also be an onsite visit at any time in this process. If you want to request an onsite visit now, you can do so through the request for GPO participation on the FDLP desktop.

I also wanted to stress that how your library performs to depository management is a local decision dependant upon your library's overall situation. We get questions all the time asking us if there's exactly one way



libraries should be doing something or other, and it's usually your choice on how you accomplish, but of course, the ultimate objective remains free public access.

So since the Spring Council Meeting earlier this year, we've surveyed the regional librarians in the program. The regionals, of course, have that focus of consultation with the selectives in the state so that a lot of the regionals have already been out and visited a lot of the libraries and do a lot of the same kind of activities that the GPO assessment personnel would be doing, visiting libraries. So we got a 50 percent response rate from the regionals, and overall the regionals were requesting some kind of self-assessment resource. I didn't -- we didn't ask in the survey what exactly that would be, how that would be set up, that was very helpful for us.

Also consulted with our friends at the PTDLP located in Old Towne Alexandria, just a

little bit south of here. They have a very different library network set up. They've only got about 100 libraries, but it was really helpful to visit with them and to see if there were any lessons we could learn from them. And also had a really interesting visit with the National Library Service with the blind and physically handicapped. They're part of the Library of Congress. They have two full-time consultants who go out and visit the regional libraries. They have regional libraries and sub-regionals in their network, and these two consultants go out and visit and actually spend two or two and a half days at each library. And they're focusing their visit on American Library Association, ASCLA guidelines. ASCLA is the Association for Specialized and Cooperative Library Associations, I believe. And the guidelines, as I said, were created by this ALA organization, so there's buy in from the library association community on what these

National Library Service libraries should look like and what the performance scores are. And, of course, like any good librarians, we're redoing the literature.

So, at this point, as I mentioned, assessments may be conducted at any time upon request or as needed as determined. We're basing those on the current rules and regulations with the focus on public access, but we are developing this public access program more formally, and expect to start what I've been calling systematic assessment of libraries; basically assessing libraries based on some kind of schedule in a year or so. And we've developed an SOD policy, an individual library assessment. This is in your packet. It's on yellow paper. This is a Superintendent of Documents policy in draft format still, but it's just basically reiterating our legal requirement to investigate individual depository library conditions.

And then we've drafted another document that's in blue in your handout that's entitled Focus on Access, Collections, and Service. Communication is a component of all three categories of access, collections and service. And, again, this gets back to the goal that was stated at the beginning of the presentation. And this really is the basis for what we're looking at in terms of public access assessments. The previous era, period of self-studies and inspections and all that follow the same categories that you now you have in the instructions to depository libraries, bibliographic control. The question of bibliographic control maintenance, human resources, physical facilities, public service, cooperative efforts, and then regional services for regionals. So this is a different focus. I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. We're not necessarily following that, or we're not going to be following the same organization scheme that

you have in the instructions. And another goal is to stream likeness to make it much briefer so that we can evaluate all libraries on a regular basis.

So we're requesting your review of the document entitled Focus on Access, Collections, and Service, and we will be putting out a message to the depository library community asking everyone's input. This is a document that really focuses on a description of libraries and all of the formats of publication that they have. It's not -- it's based on and focused on the legal requirements. It's not based on the rules and regulations that you find now in the instructions, and also now in the successor in the handbook. It doesn't focus on the operational activities and best practices in the handbook, so we certainly don't to assess on best practices. We want to assess on the outcome of what you do, which is whether or not public gain free public access at your

library.

I also wanted to mention that this is done with the understanding that there are limitations with GPO's system of items selection mechanisms. We're not going to -- certainly not going to expect that you can perform miracles and go beyond the capabilities or the abilities -- the capabilities, I guess, of the FDLP, and the item selection mechanism, and certainly, we're aware that there are issues at your library, Caleah (phonetic) filtering -- State laws requiring filtering and all that, obviously, take those into consideration. Each library's different.

So what's next? We're looking for the feedback by November 30th on the document, on access, collections, and service. We got a real positive response from the original librarians in about creating, updating at least, a self-assessment resource. Something we've been trying to do or planning to do with

NGPO for quite a long is provide more educational resources for you. So if you think of the self-study document that's out there, you would kind of think of this as an update of the information that's in the document. It'll go beyond what's in the legal requirements, but also include a lot of the operation activities that are in the handbook. This is a voluntary, voluntary, voluntary resource. We're not expecting to make any of this mandatory, and it's something that we would like to set up by modules. You could say we perform -- you know, sit down and just do collection development in one session, for example, and then sit down maybe a week later and work on another module, and really looking at this as an educational and strategic resource for your library with the assumption being that if you have a good understanding of what's going on in your library, and good information on which to base your decisions, then it'll be so much easier to provide that

free public access. And we are looking at the possibility of regional libraries and other peer experts visiting the libraries and so we'll finalize the Superintendent Documents Policy.

So here's my favorite slide. What can public access assessments do for your library? I was a federal depository library coordinator before coming to GPO. I had to write a self-study myself, pretty much by myself, and I have been through a library inspection, and it was the most valuable thing for my library because it helped us provide free public access. So I'm aware of the leverage possibilities of having a document from an outside entity coming in saying, "These are the kinds of issues you've got, and we recommend that you do some things, and we want you to provide free public access in the FDLP." So beyond that the opportunity during the public access assessment is still there -- well, it will always be there for information



sharing between GPO staff and to you and other library staff. Certainly we're -- we at GPO are always available for consultation. Call us up any time and explain your particular library situation, and we'd be happy to give you ideas of things we've heard that are successful at other libraries. But, I think almost more important for GPO is that we hear back from you, what's working and what's not, and we relay that information back to everyone at GPO, and that's extremely helpful to have that communication with each individual depository. And, certainly, we get a lot of that too in the biannual survey.

But, I've been meeting with our new Director of Quality Assurance at GPO. Mr. Garcia actually works with the entire agency, but he's got a background in assessment and strategic planning, and he was giving some ideas about ways we could potentially give you something else as a part of the public access assessment. For example, we might have some

certificate of accomplishment, and I'm not sure what this would cover yet. So, what I would like to do in the near future is set up an open session with those who would like to volunteer and participate and discuss this particular issue so that we get some more exposure to the opal resource. But, I'd also really like to hear from you and from different types of libraries what you would find most valuable as a deliverable from the process beyond the report, and, of course, when all libraries provide free public access, that's from the FDLP as a whole.

So what's new about public access assessment that's different, I think, from the time period of inspections and self-studies is that we are trying really hard to focus on outcomes, whether the public gains free public access partly to make this a shorter more stream lined review, but really to focus on public access itself. You know, discuss some operational activities, but in the context of

the result of those operational activities are designed to do at your library. And we are really looking at ways to incorporate or to solicit, engage general public feedback. Certainly we have the emblem for the front door of the building. We're thinking about having that on something that you would put on your web pages as well. As long as I'm mentioning that, I just want to mention that policy changes are outside, or affected outside of the assessment process, and assessment has to focus on the legal requirements and rules and regulations in place at this point in time. And then if we have complaints -- we get about, oh, I don't know, five to eight, I think, is what we decided on average, phone calls or emails from the public during the calendar year. And these are complaints about access to particular library. They're usually resolved within the day. And I'd actually like to mention there is another session tomorrow

called Persistent Problem Patrons, so if you're interested in security and conduct issues related to depository patrons that might be a really good session to attend tomorrow.

So how can you prepare for public access assessment? As I mentioned before, we're assessing on the legal requirements so you're probably already doing everything you need to be doing, just following Title 44 and FDLR rules and regulations. And collections and services need to be visible and promoted so that the public is aware of what you have as a depository. And, of course, what you have should be based on whatever the government information needs of the community, so that gets into collection development.

So GPO is looking for positive evidence of activities that you perform on a regular basis or especially for the depository, things like cataloguing; existence of what gage is promoting the depository collection;

promotional events like anniversary celebrations; and I think particularly, whether or not you've got an access policy for public depository use or an access policy for the library that covers all components of the library. And always recommend that you routinely review general public depository access in to your library, and we're actually going to get into a lot more of that in just a moment. Gwen Sinclair and Tim Byrne are going to help facilitate some scenarios that we set up to kind of illustrate the types of issues that really focus on public access. But, here's a really extreme scenario. So I've got an individual university library that really is invisible to the public because nine or only a few depository resources are catalogued, and it could be a library that has purchased these few resources. Tangible publications are in closed stacks, none are catalogued. There's no information about the publications in closed stacks any where on the

public web page or in a handout at the library. The web pages do not indicate the library provides assistance with U.S. Government research, and more significantly, anything else that's a real trigger for a follow-up in a public access assessment. The web pages indicate that the library surfs only New York City community. That's something we have seen. If we see any kind of wording that we just want to the coordinator about and clarify, we'll certainly call immediately, and we have always worked with the library to give, say, three month -- a three month time period or, hopefully, sooner than that for the library to revise an access statement or an access policy that is inhibiting. But we really want the web pages updated immediately. When we get public access complaints, sometimes it's because the library's just changed their web page and their language is confusing, or it doesn't necessarily cover all situations. So, sometimes policies have to go

through a review, certainly they do at GPO, so I'm sure they do -- all of your institutions go through a review process, but we'd certainly like to see the web pages updated immediately.

So, I'm going to hand it over to Gwen and Tim. I just wanted to mention that there is going to be a fourth handout on public access assessment at the end of this program. If you have to leave, we're going to have extras at the handout table at the registration desk. But, again, I just wanted to mention, as long as I have your -- I certainly welcome your comments on the document of Focus Collections, Access, and Service.

Thank you.

(Applause).

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. I think what Tim and I will probably do is take turns talking about each scenario. Time, do you want to go first or do you want me to go first?

And what we're talking about here is

scenarios that might trigger an additional review, and what we want to have here is a discussion about what types of things the library might do to correct these, just to give you an idea of what -- what types of things they should be thinking about in terms of assessments.

MR. BYRNE: For the scenario, it was a depository library (inaudible) tangible closed storage. Obviously, if you have everything in closed storage, you want to have access to them in your catalogue, and they have to be something different, accessible or retrievable (inaudible).

MS. BRAZEE: Can you hear me now? I just wanted to mention the reason we're setting it up this way and giving the handout after is we really want to see if we're the same page as all of you. We haven't been out inspecting libraries for a few years. The program is on hiatus as we -- we're focusing on the consultant program, which is really focused so



much more on the educational aspect of depository management training. The consultant program is a very ambitious, wonderful program, but it's not currently an option as it just wasn't funded at the level it needed to be. So what we really are interested in is your feedback on what you do to address -- if you were at a library that had a situation, what you would do to address this situation on an operational level, probably, and these same scenarios are on the back of the briefing paper in white in your packet, and it gives you the all five options. Then I'll have a follow-up question to ask you for additional situations that you may run across. And it will help us identify, too, issues that we might want to look at.

MR. BYRNE: Well I can see one of my selectives out in the audience who actually is in this scenario. (Inaudible).

MR. BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. We're sending, for example, much of

our collection to remote storage, especially our hearings. Our hearings are the most (inaudible) part of our collection. So, what we've done to mitigate that situation, is we've purchased Lexis-Nexis digital hearings, and I can't wait for Lexis-Nexis to come out with their records, which won't be for couple years. So, what I'm doing is I'm adding direct durable URLs to all the hearings and all the documents, records, so that everybody will be able to get to the hearings right now. It'll take me a few months to finish that, but that's the way we're mitigating that situation.

MS. SINCLAIR: How do you retrieve that material for your patrons?

MR. BROWN: We have a request button in our OPAC, same as the local patrons that we retrieve --

MS. HOFFMAN: Hi, Elaine Hoffman, Stoneybrook University Library. We're being pressured to send a lot of materials offsite

in the entire library. I know the next step is going to be why can't we send all these government documents offsite, nobody ever uses them. The way that they're handling retrieving things from offsite is to ask people to go through the library alone, and I only found this out a little while ago. I said, "Well, what about people who aren't part of the university community?" And they said, "Well, no, they can't use the library alone." So we suggested another mechanism be developed that someone from outside can just come in like the gentleman was just saying to request through the OPAC, because that could be a real barrier to people. It's not a question, it's just a statement, unless you have any suggestions.

Mrs. Troy-Horton: My name is Rebecca from the State University in Lake Charles, Louisiana. I was left with a very unique situation after my predecessor retired, and it was closed stacks. Mainly, the reason told to

me as because that after Hurricane Rita, the collection was in such disarray, the contractors throwing half the damaged collection and then leaving it mis-matched on the shelves, but I found out before that it was closed stacks as well, and a good chunk of the collection was not catalogued, and almost all of the Louisiana documents collection is not in the catalogue. So I was left with quite a doozy.

As of right now, I'd say close to 50 percent of our Louisiana State documents are in the catalogue now. I've tried to -- I'm revising policies, and I'm updating the website using Web 2.0 features. I've done so much, and I'm very stressed out, and I'm sure I will be calling you for consultation, because it's gotten it to the point where I want to make sure I'm doing everything correctly, and it's been a crash course in government documents that's for sure, and it's my first year. I've only been a documents

librarian for eight months now. So, I want to make that I'm doing everything right. And I don't mean to throw a pity party or anything, sorry, I'm emotional, but I'm so glad I came to this because I'm going to need a lot of help, and I'm worried about doing the right thing. So, if anybody can please maybe give some advice that would be very helpful. Thank you.

MS. SINCLAIR: One of the things we're looking for is demonstrable effort, and I think this definitely --

MS. MARTIN: Mary Martin, Libraries of (inaudible). Well, I've been involved in documents for over 20 years, and we're facing a similar situation here. We are being pressured to move most of our collection to a remote storage facility, and I have a about - I was talking to our regional librarian yesterday. I was trying to estimate. We probably have 300 or 400,000 documents that aren't catalogued, and we -- I don't know how,

even if we hire people around the clock to catalogue the materials, how we could have a record of all of the things that are going into storage. So, I think that -- I mean, it says that it would possibly trigger a visit, and I think this requires some serious consideration by council and by GPO, because for a very long time it was only necessary that you had, say, a shelf list, and I'm not going to go into the shelf list problem, but that was all that was required was the shelf list, and then the stacks, and as long we could retrieve the items. And it's a very, very big problem that the collection is going to go to remote storage, and there is not a record of what is there, and we may not be able to develop one before we actually move them, so it would be nice if some possible alternatives to this scenario could be found. Thanks.

MS. GOLDSMITH: Hi, I'm Janet Goldsmith from UCLA, and we have a good portion of our

materials in remote storage, but it's all catalogued. It has to be catalogued before it goes in there, and we have a very good retrieval system. The only drawback is I would like it to be more often, because it's once a day. If you happen to get your request in early in the day, it'll be there that day. If not, it's the next working day, and that could be the Friday of a three day holiday or something like that, but that's our only big drawback, and then the storage facility is for all the southern UC campuses, so they'll only take one copy of everything. That's the only other drawback. So, what I do is I get my things in there really fast so that the other people can't, and then they either keep them or then, because we are consortium, they may be able to discard them if it's opened in five years.

MR. GENZER: Eric Genzer, Illinois Institute of Technology. We are currently being pressured to move our entire fiche

collection into closed stacks, which would make a majority of our collection in closed stacks. Right now, we probably have about ten percent closed stacks. It's all catalogued, which is a good thing. I'm thinking about expanding, we have an on-demand scanning program for the fiche that has been limited to our university patrons mainly because we just didn't want to get flooded with people from all over the world, possibly, trying to request scanning the fiche. But the only way I can think to really provide access, because our old fiche reader's going to disappear, I'm sure too, because it's ugly, which is why the fiche cabinets have to go. And so the only fiche reader we'll have will be in my office, so I will have to be scanning for the patrons, and I'm a little worried about being called upon to do that more often than I'd be able to provide the service.

MS. BRAZEE: What? You don't work 24/7?

MR. MEYERSON: Larry Meyerson, Bercadino



(phonetic) County Law Library. When I first looked at this scenario I thought, you know, it's not a problem, it's not an issue, obviously, you can do things, but it dawned on me as we were sitting back there talking about this. If the depository library is a college or university, and the material is off stored, for a member of the public that means at least two visits to that school or university, and I'm wondering if that, in some way, puts a burden on the public that a student, who obviously lives on campus, wouldn't necessarily have other than the students who wait until the day before something is due to start doing their work.

MS. SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of Michigan. I'm aware of a situation in my state that is some what alleviated now, but it's a really good example of this. A large metropolitan library kept theirs in closed stacks. They shared a catalogue with another -- with a group of libraries, one of

which was a small public library depository. They catalogued everything, and they ended up in a situation where their patrons were coming in and requesting from the small depository that which was under their feet, and that seemed to be acceptable until we kind of had a discussion about how this wasn't acceptable, and I think in this scenario it's very easy to come up with something like that where you end up in a situation with shared catalogues, you end up with one depository bearing the burden of the cataloguing, and somebody else housing it, and I haven't quite worked out in my mind whether or not that's okay. My instinct is that it's not.

MS. ETKIN: Cynthia at GPO. I just want to address the scenario in respect to the cataloguing questions, and I know a lot of our libraries out there do have the requirement that anything that goes in remote storage is catalogued so that it's findable, accessible, whatever term you want to use. We heard

yesterday that -- and we announced that the development of the handbook is two phases. One was the consolidation, the second one is to go through and look at what policies need to be created or revised, and one of the things that we are looking at because of the shift in tangible to electronic, because of the fact that now you can get cataloguing records free through our CGP, we're looking at requiring that -- requiring cataloguing for things that go into remote storage, and for any of the online pubs that you want to make accessible, and another benefit to this is that what we discovered with some of the Katrina libraries who lost their shelf list, having your materials catalogued also provides you with the accountability that you will need if something happens to your shelf list. So that's one of the things that we were looking at as we go back through the handbook. The timing just seems right to make that a requirement now.

MS. PARKER: Tim, can we ask Kathy or Cindy or anybody to comment on the fact that the basic rule, as I understand it is we're supposed to treat documents like we treat all of our other material. So, you know, if a library is in the position where it no longer has physical space on the main campus, and it's, you know, it's got this remote storage thing, then there's going to be material that goes out there. I mean, there's just no doubt about that. So, you are consciously putting in different rules for handling material that goes offsite than have been in place. That's a question, not a statement actually.

MS. BRAZEE: First of all, cataloguing is not the only option. There can be other things. Somebody saw a record, and that's actually in the supplementary handout. I actually don't think it's new. I think it's just a continuation of having some accountability for a tangible publication so that you know what you have so you can serve

the public with that information, and hopefully, you know, hopefully getting this information out here today helps the plan. I mean, ideally, in an ideal, obviously, there'd be planning and adequate time and staff and researchers for cataloguing before something to remote storage, but I don't think it's a new requirement. There should be already at least some level record of some kind for the tangible resources.

MS. MARTIN: Mary Martin. I just wanted to point out that the collection that I'm talking about is historical. We have catalogued everything since 1976 and also gone back and retrospectively catalogued portions of the collection. So I'm talking about historical documents, serial stacking paper and things like that for which -- well, some of them we can't catalogue or part with them because they're rare documents. So I'm thinking that maybe some difference could be - - there could be some differentiation between

current collections and historical collections. We've been functioning since 1913 and much of this material -- even though there were shelf list cards made at one time, we took a shelf list and matched it to the shelf, and found that there was almost no correlation whatsoever. So just differentiate between these historical collections, and then collections for which machine readable cataloguing is available.

MR. BYRNE: One of the things that I am very aware of because of my role as a regional (inaudible) is that space is a crisis across the whole library spectrum, libraries really need space, and in many cases, library directors are now looking at a depository collection and we're now thinking about re-purposing that space for collections that get more use, and it seems that the smaller libraries, they're simply just told to withdraw. The larger libraries, if they have the luxury of having offsite storage or

storage facility, are looking at putting a lot of things offsite. I see you are doing that, but we do have the rule that anything that goes to the offsite storage has to have a record in the catalogue. So there was a lot of pressure on me initially to move a large part of my collection until I, you know, reminded them that it needed to be catalogued, and suddenly it was no longer a priority. But I wonder if, you know, we have a case where there's a lot of pressure to free up space and maybe move things to a storage facility that is un-catalogued and this putting it there might initiate a public assessment review -- would there be pressure then on the director to, say, instead of catalogue just put your log in.

MS. BRAZEE: It's a very legitimate question.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. This is Gwen Sinclair. Going on to scenario number two, a review of the biannual survey and other

library documentation shows appropriate depository management practices, however the library and/or institution website, building signage and phone recording state that the library is closed to the general public. Do you have any experience with that type of situation or do you have any thought about how a library would address that?

MS. MARTIN: Me again, Mary Martin.

We've had restricted access of our library for about 16 years, so I just wanted to point out that we have a policy whereby any patron can come in twice a semester, you do have to show identification. You're not allowed to come in without identification, but we also allow what we call depository library patrons to come in. If they state they're using government documents, they can come in. We find that the number, and I'm sorry, a number of people who have used that just to use the library, but we tend to just overlook it. You know, most of time we know, even though it's a huge library,



we know who's there and what they're doing because of the access policy. But I just wanted to point out that it can -- even though we have a policy, it wasn't our choice, in fact I fought it tooth and nail, you can get around it by saying that depository library users can come in and use the library.

MS. SINCLAIR: I know that sometimes it's an issue for GPO if -- we are required to allow minors to come into our libraries and minors might not always have an ID. Are there ways to deal with that type of situation where you have a person wanting to use the depository collection who doesn't have an ID?

MR. AHRENS: I'd like to know if this policy is legitimate. Our policy is if you're under 18, you have to someone 21 with you. There's no ID issued, but would that violate the spirit of what we're talking about?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Our General Council Office has said that depository library users are patrons of any age, so, yes, but there are

lots of things you could do. You could post policies. Even if your policy says you're closed to the public, immediately, the next sentence below it because it has to be visible on the same web page, "We are open to federal depository library patrons. If you are under 18, please call this phone number. We will provide mediated assistance for you." You know, in terminology that they'll understand. "We will provide public service for you." There has to be recourse for that.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, USC. I have another example of how this scenario is gotten around, and that is the observation that a -- and let's, for a hypothetical reason, call it a public library, public university library for instance, has asked members of the public to show ID cards at certain hours, they have an age restriction much like Karen just described, and when these differences are point out with the spirit of the depository regulations, the observation is made case

closed by the fact there are other depository libraries in the Congressional District that meet those requirements, therefore, we do not have to. And, in addition, for instance, this hypothetical public university has now decided to put passwords on its computers. So, in a sense what they've done is they have chosen the primary clientele, obviously you can tell who the primary clientele's going to be, and like Mary has pointed out, one could fight this tooth and nail, but definitely the trend within this public institution is our library, our stuff, our users, get in line.

MS. BRAZEE: I actually want to say -- I'm sorry, I didn't mean to -- I've had personal experience with this scenario so it's something that has been going on for a time. It's not necessarily a new scenario.

MS. HOFFMAN: Miranda Hoffman again. I just wanted to say we're a public university, and recently they decided to make all the students log in with their, what they call

their net ID, but we do have a guest log in as well, which we insisted upon for people who just come in off the streets, so to speak, to either use the depository library or to use the databases at the library which they are entitled to use because it is a public institution.

MR. SHULER: Yeah. I will say in this hypothetical situation that condition exists as well, but in one's experience with this, it is as if you've blocked access because you still require a form of check in to get the secret password, if you will, and that is barrier enough for some people.

MS. HOFFMAN: You don't need any check in. Someone can just sit down at the computer and log in as a guest. It's on every computer.

MR. SHULER: Not us.

MS. ENFIELD: Jane Enfield from Catholic University in Ponce, Puerto Rico, which is one of the United States territories. We have a

policy of no children under age 8, which obviously is a violation of this. In addition, I have -- our staff members are very intoned to a level of authoritarianism that you cannot imagine within much of the United States, and are so attuned to requiring ID from students and professors that they are insanely resistant when I say, "You have to allow public access to patrons who want to use documents." It's a reaction of, "We have to do what?" And I wondered if anybody else has that particular kind of problem, but it is certainly a major problem for me in that I simply have fellow staff members and librarians who are very resistant to the idea of access without requiring some version of, "Here's my ID."

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. As a State library we do a lot of advising in different kinds of scenarios legal and otherwise to libraries throughout the State, and the mantra of the Library Law

Consultant has become my mantra which is that you focus on the behavior you wish to prohibit, not the group of people most likely to exhibit it. And I have had libraries ban minors because they were unattended, and I have had other libraries ban minors because they didn't want minors to be preyed upon. Two totally different reasons for banning minors, neither of which was acceptable, and so I just keep coming back to that same fundamental principle that, you know, the problem patron section is clearly well-timed because that's the only way to deal with this kind of a situation, is you have to cover yourself legally and you just adopt that kind of a policy.

MR. BYRNE: There's a library in Colorado that has a problem with this. It's the US Airforce Academy. After 9/11 they really shut down and really increased security. So if you're thinking about the chilling effect of a sign, how about the chilling effect of a

machine gun? They also have a policy that restricts minors and this was put in because they had a problem with high school girls coming in trolling the library - I'm assuming that they probably established a policy that anyone wanting to use the depository collection would be assigned a chaperone.

MR. AHRENS: Arec Ahrens of Illinois School of Technology. We recently have shrunk our public access hours. We had prided ourselves and fought hard for public access especially in our neighborhood we're one of the few places where people can go, but due to laptop thefts, we shaved off about four hours, so 6:00 p.m., the guest computers automatically boot people off the computer, and then the door is checked for IDs at that point. In the past I've, at conferences such as this, it seemed as though tacitly it was kind of okay in a post-9/11 environment to have limitations such as that, and obviously our concern isn't a 9/11 type thing, but is

that something that's legitimate in our research?

MS. BRAZEE: Well 6:00 is better than 5:00 for someone who works an 8:00 to 5:00 or 9:00 to 5:00 schedule, but what would really help in the access policy or library web pages, if you're unable to visit the library during those hours, and you absolutely need to visit, you can't get assistance through a phone call to navigate web pages, then you can set up, you know, a specific time to meet that patron or patrons.

MS. SINCLAIR: In fact, our library did that. We -- our documents collection was only open from 10:00 to 5:00 Monday through Friday and on Sundays, and when people needed to come in after, before or after hours, we allowed them to make appointments, and I mean, we hardly had any requests for appointments, so it wasn't a huge burden to do that.

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public Library. I have to speak for public



libraries who are getting all your patrons who are not being turned away or feel that they are being turned away. It has created problems because they're angry. So we already have to deal with the complexity of government documents, and then anger on top of it. So -- and we also can't have everything that universities have, so the more you can do to make people feel welcome who really do need your documents that you have, would really be appreciated by public libraries.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, USC. There's another aspect of this that I've often wondered about as I see it unfold on a daily basis, and that is the scenario where the object isn't the documents collection per se, but access to the web, and at least at many universities, mine included, since (inaudible), that network access to the web is not controlled by the library. It's controlled by campus computing, which has a totally different ownership paradigm than

library physical space, and they are pretty much driving the notion that they pay for the highway so they get to determine who amongst the people driving on that get preferential treatment, which will be our students, faculty, staff. Everybody else, we're sort of indifferent to. If, in the future, increasingly government information is provided over these privately owned roads, what lever do we have to move that stone?

MS. SINCLAIR: Sometimes a letter on GPO letterhead can cause wonders for some of these situations, but not in every case.

MS. BRAZEE: Well actually this is scenario number 5, which we haven't gotten to yet. It's happening every where. Obviously, networks have to be locked down for security purposes. That's perfectly legitimate. How it's managed, what signage you use, what policies you have, how you perform outreach to the general public is another, I don't want to say recourse, but is the other way to go to

make sure that the public is given access. Mediated searching is an option, although that can get very complicated from all the questions, and again we're looking at the comparability issue, if patrons have unlimited time on the computers, then we do want to make sure that the general public has that same type of access to the public services staff for reference questions.

MR. BYRNE: Tim Byrne. I'll just go back to the hours question real quick. This last summer, because the use during the summer, which has really dropped down dramatically, there was a lot of pressure to cut back on hours and close earlier. It really hurt me to do that, so I did put in a condition that anyone wanting to use the documents collection off hours, please contact us, and we would see that they got it, and when the hours actually came out, it surprised me that no one else, no other department library had that concern. And then I was just filling out my biannual

survey, and it asked whether our hours were less than or comparable to the general reference desk, but there wasn't an option for better than. I'm proud of that.

MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Let's go on to the next scenario.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Four. Is the deposit library, is it mostly an electronic depository library and select some of the few primary depository resources in tangible format. And, of course, this is something that is becoming more and more common. In fact, as a regional, I'm recommending it to more and more of much smaller depositories.

MS. BRAZEE: I actually didn't write this very well. Obviously this is a common scenario, but there are issues related to this that you may come up with.

MS. BRAZEE: What is the issue? The FDLP has a lot of guidance for this situation, but no specific rules or regulations, so we don't have a regulation that you have a graphic on

your web page like we have the regulation about the emblem on the door, so there may be an invisibility aspect there if there isn't other information out there on the library web pages. So it's just trying to get to -- awareness may not be the exact right word, but it's -- there's got to be some recognition awareness information out there that the library still is a depository, first of all, and that they do provide access and reference service for certain types of publications that they're selecting through the item numbers. Now whether that means you're cataloguing the item selections -- I mean, and extensive web page listing subject areas that they select in. There's all kinds of ways to address that issue that shows that the library is still a federal depository library and provides public service and access.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. This is a real life example, and Kathy, don't forget to put that all this library

does, and it's not just one, is point people from a general web page to the CGP, the Catalogue of Government Publications, and it calls itself an electronic depository. You could walk into that institution and not know that it's a federal depository library. Not an emblem sign on the door, the reference staff are not familiar with the electronic resources, and no materials are actively being sought other than them pointing to the CGP. Is that acceptable?

MS. LIBEL: Arlene Libel from the Oregon State Library. This is kind of a different take on the scenario, but it's been discussed in my library. I think a lot of libraries do have -- that serve the public particularly have time limits on the amount of time that users can use their computers. Usually it's, you know, increments of 30, an hour, whatever, and what I find interesting about that is there are certain documents that I can't even imagine getting a bit of a handle on in 30

minutes let alone, and in the tangible environment, you know, they can sit down with a book and look at it for hours, and hours, and hours, so I think that that's another thing that we need to be reminded of when libraries are talking about, "Oh, we provided access online." Well, do you provide adequate access online in terms of length that you will allow somebody to actually sit at a computer and look at it online? I think that, you know, mostly we have limits on our computers because we need to keep the teenagers from looking at MySpace or whatever it is that we are trying to do to make sure everybody has equitable access to the computers, but sometimes, because of the information requirement, there may be a need for more access because of the information that they're actually looking for.

MS. VASSU: Linda Vassu, Phoenix Public Library. We now have cataloging records for everything that's currently coming out in

electronic, but because of the restrictions on our OPACs not being allowed to go out onto the internet, you can click all you want to on that pearl, but it's just going to tell you this computer does not allow internet access, and then you have to go use the computers that do allow internet access, but sometimes have an hour or an hour and half wait on them. We just cannot keep up with the people doing MySpace and playing chess and whatever else. So, that's the way we are kind of limited. If it's a small document, we will usually print it out for people, but those are the ones who come to us. I tell a lot of kids, especially, that you can do this straight from home if you have a computer, and they're very happy to get that hearing from home rather than -- I mean, to look at it on microfiche from the library, but we do have that limitation on our PACs, and I don't see that going away. If our PACs became internet access, you would never be able to check anything in the catalogue.



MS. BRAZEE: May I ask you a question about that?

MS. VASSU: Yes.

MS. BRAZEE: Are there signs on the OPACs saying, you know, please ask at the reference desk for assistance? Something like that?

MS. VASSU: I don't think so, because it's a public library, and those -- you know, children use them. It's not just in the government documents area.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears with the University of North Texas, but as most of you know I've been 23 years at the public library in Tulsa. I just wanted to make a comment about what Arlene said. For most public libraries, we are not limiting the time because we're concerned with what they're doing on the computer. We're limiting the time because we don't have funding to have enough computers in our libraries, especially our small branches for the amount of demand that we have for them. So that's something

that you need to be considering. You know, we're not doing it just because we don't like what they're doing. And what we've done in our -- well, at Tulsa, what they've done is that if you are doing legitimate research, if you're doing something with a government document, you are allowed to come up and ask for an increase in your time, or if you do contact a staff member, then they can use the staff computer to help you access that. We also have a few dedicated, stand alone machines that are specifically for government documents, and we release them to the internet for somebody's who's using government documents. So those are options.

MS. SINCLAIR: Suzanne, can I ask you a follow up on that? Is that in your access -- or, in the public library's access policy or signage?

MS. SEARS: It's in the policy manual, which is online. Whether or not customers, whatever, go to that, probably not. It's

certainly not in signage. Public libraries, at least the library I was working in, signage, you have to really, really, really, really, have something important to put on a sign, because they don't like a lot of signs.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair. I think a lot of us probably have -- what we do in our library is we have a bunch of computers that are government documents computers and we just have a sign, an evil sign on them that say priority given for documents users, and we are not hesitant about booting people off of those computers if they're not using government information, if we need to use it for that purpose. So if you can put a sign on a computer that most of the time gets used for people playing chess or using MySpace, that is very effective, because all you have to do is have the sign on there, and you're given license to eject.

MR. BYRNE: We put a sign on our computers that said preference given to --

priority given to reference and research, and then there was a time that there was a guy doing pornography right on the computer that everyone could see in the middle of the department so I asked him to leave and he pointed to the sign, and said, "I'm doing research."

MS. PARKER: At my library we had put the logo on the computers that are specifically reserved for documents use, and I can't remember at the moment whether we say restricted only to or preference given to, but they're also right in the area where our reference librarians can see who's using, and if -- you know, if there needs to be any intervention there, so we don't have a lot of people come in from outside, but everybody who comes in can clearly see when they walk in the door what's available, and it's -- it's been very helpful to our reference librarians to know that there are spaces reserved for the gov docs users, and they don't have to fight

with the law students.

MS. COLLINS: Katie Collins from the University of California, Irvine. I thought I heard somebody say something about adequate reference, and I am concerned about adequate referencing. You may have a catalogue with a thing in it, but the cataloguing may be such that it doesn't tell a sole what's in there, and if it's in storage it's even worse, but if they come to the reference desk for help, and there's nobody there who can give them any help, how does that fit in to this policy?

MS. BRAZEE: You probably do this for non-depository questions as well, but refer them to the subject specialist, which is probably you, at your library. In that case, it's a matter of training or having information for your -- available for your colleagues so that they can refer the patron to you, give the patron your email address or get the patron's information.

MS. COLLINS: Well what if I'm at the

depository conference?

MS. BRAZEE: That's where the beauty of the FDLP being a network of libraries really helps, and obviously, there are 400 plus of us here, but that means that there are 850 or so still at the libraries, and in that case, having a list of neighboring depositories.

MS. COLLINS: But are we required to locate the depository? What is the level of reference that we might be required to provide? Is that address any where? Or just refer -- if you can't do it refer it to some where else? That puts another day for some people. When you're there, and can do it, but -- and you try to train the other people, but if those questions come in, and they can't answer them, then the user does have to wait until they can find an expert, is that right?

MS. BRAZEE: Well that would be the case for any type of questions. You still need to do follow-up research on it, so that would be comparable treatment then in terms of the

reference question. In terms of specific requirements, we don't have anything specific about a lump service written down, like nine out of the ten questions must be answered in five minutes. That would be -- I mean, it's way too constraining, but that's not the type of thing we're looking for.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair. Another option that you could use in that situation is to use a virtual reference service that is available to people who are not affiliated with a particular library. You could use our virtual reference service, and we'd probably have somebody on duty even late in the day.

MS. MARTIN: Mary Martin, Claremont Colleges. I find the -- what you're saying on this adequate reference service, and in addition to that, the adequate web page access. I find those very squishy requirements, and that's fine as long as you're not -- it doesn't -- I don't think

you're seeking to be restrictive. I think you're seeking to her just to provide these things, but I think it would be nice to have some assurance that this would not be used in some kind of punitive way. You know, I do not have control over what's on our web page, and the government publications portion has shrunk, and shrunk, and shrunk over the years to one little line. Now, if there was a statement that as to what we did have to have, then that would something I could take to IT, say, "You know what? For our web team, you have got to put some more recognition of government publication." So the thing is if you leave it squishy it really doesn't give us anything to any leverage at our institution to ask for certain things, and to simply have all -- I don't know what you can do about the reference thing, but to say every government publication question will be adequately answered by the reference librarian, government publications librarian whenever she



returns from wherever she is, is -- that's kind of squishy, so I don't know if you can come up with just a little bit more concrete statement as to what those expectations might be.

MS. BRAZEE: I actually think, in terms of reference instructions to depository libraries right now are kind of squishy, and we don't really have anything for guidance really for our web pages in the public service guidelines for electronic formats -- the FTP use policy -- is a little bit more succinct. If you're commenting on the documents and focused on access questions and service, and you have specific things that you think would be a good measure. One thing I didn't mention is that in an assessment resource, or resources we'd like to build, kind of an update of the self-study, we're looking at creating some kind of benchmarks, low and high benchmarks that you could strive for. Really trying to make this a really useful

educational resource for you. That is, again, a voluntary thing, but the more specific we are, I think, the fewer libraries it really addresses in our multi-type, multi-size library programs, so we're looking at the entire as a whole, and so if you have reference servicing, you have library web pages, and you have an access policy because you're open to the public, you're doing really well, and you've got bibliographic control, you're doing really well.

MR. SWINDELLS: I have a question, a hand-raising question. How many of you are in institutions that explicitly limit the kind of logos that can appear on your web pages? Any pages actually. Well I don't -- okay. That's about a dozen people. I mean, the reason I ask is for us it's not a question of -- for us it's different types of web pages. The library entrance page has to follow university guidelines, which, as we found out, not only the GPO logo, but in our attempt to create our

own logo for the library. We actually hired someone and we created a new image for the library and a logo, and then we found we couldn't use it. And that was just as I was about to put up the logo over the (inaudible). I was interested in that because that does limit it. For us we can put it on material pages.

MR. SINGLE: I have a question. Bill Single from the University of Maryland School of Law. One of the things I see with electronic document is that they're so much more you need to get a usable tool, and I'm curious how the workstation requirements would be factored into self-assessment and do you look at that? Will there be expectations that will provide additional software to manipulate, download or capture these documents?

MS. BRAZEE: Did you say public access workstation?

MR. SINGLE: Yeah.

MS. BRAZEE: Check in requirements.

MR. SINGLE: I didn't say exactly that.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy at GPO. Council has reviewed the latest draft of the recommended stacks which would be for 2007. I need to incorporate their comments and then they'll put out, and the question about being able to download and manipulate some of -- the requirement to be able to download is there. I don't know what kind of manipulating are you getting out there?

MR. SINGLE: One of the things that dataset can anybody use it or even a patron wants to use it, but you're not providing any additional software to allow them to do that. So essentially that document is useless to them. So will that be a requirement in the future or do you see that factoring into how you analyze a library's electronic collection.

MS. ETKIN: Where there has been a requirement for many, many years now to have the ability to make various kinds of formats

available, and have different kind of viewers in your browser, the capability to download, and also to have some kind of office suite of applications available like the spreadsheets or databases or whatever so they can pull in the data into one of those applications.

MR. SINGLE: Yeah, but I would be willing to venture that there are many public libraries and publicly accessible institutions that don't provide all of that on their accessible work stations. So my question to really is how will that factor into the analysis? Or do you have a sense of how it will factor in the analysis?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Have you thought about this, because I was going to answer?

MS. BRAZEE: Well it is a current FDLR rule and regulation so, yeah, go ahead.

MS. ETKIN: We've also said, and this was in the days of the inspections so he also said that when the inspectors came through we certainly wouldn't sit down and take off the

case of the PC and start looking and seeing how many whatever's you have in there. I wouldn't know if I saw a whatever or not, but I have added memory to a computer. So we've all always taken the functional approach. Are your users getting to the online government information that they need, can they view it, can they download it? Have you gotten any complaints about, "I'm trying to get to this particular document, and I can't?" That's how it's been. I pass it to Kathy for the future.

MS. BRAZEE: Well, I think we'll need to revisit that issue with Rich Media. It's just going to more of an issue to leverage and it's a good question.

MS. HOFFMAN: Elaine Hoffman. I didn't know I had so many issues until I came here today. I actually had that scenario a few weeks ago when someone walked in from the public and wanted to use the government documents computer, and requested a specific statistics program, which was CSS, I believe.

What I found out was that it's available to our students, which was totally unbeknown to any of the reference librarians, and I've since requested that. I was told by the computing people that I should just request a license for the documents computer. Of course, I've asked twice now, and not seen it yet. I have another related question which is -- and, I fought this battle, and I didn't win it. Our library has a special room for people with disabilities, but actually it's for students with disabilities, and they started becoming much stricter about who was allowed to access it. I was trying to fight for the right of people who just came in from the street and wanted to use government material to be able to use that room because it has machines that will make things larger, it has audio especially -- we used to have brail typewriter, but anyway, the room is partially funded by the DSS, the -- they keep changing their name, yeah, the Disability Support

Services, and they have put in a password restriction. Do we have any obligation to provide those kinds of services for depository patron?

MS. BRAZEE: We always look at comparable treatment again. You may have an alternative. It may not be the exact same thing that's in the room, but there may be an alternative that you could provide on the documents computer. Did you say you have documents, specific documents computers?

MS. HOFFMAN: We had a specific documents computer, but it's in an open area. So we wouldn't be able to, for example, provide the ability for someone who is blind to read a document as you can in the room. But now we're being told that we cannot let anybody else use the room.

MS. BRAZEE: There may be alternative resources or alternative ways to access that publication that would meet the spirit of the FDLP that would be comparable treatment. I



mean ideally patrons would be allowed into the room, but we're always looking at comparability. It doesn't necessarily mean exact same resource.

MS. ETKIN: Cynthia from GPO. As part of the recommended specs, there's a big section after the specific specs called related issues and considerations or something -- issues and considerations or something like that, and in there is some language about having to be 508 compliant and providing access to persons with disabilities as an extension of the federal program.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson, University of Colorado Law Library. I'm hoping that I'm not going to get in trouble because my regional's standing right there, but we had a similar situation that our disability computer is not accessible, actually it wasn't even set up, and I had a blind patron come in, and all we managed to do was unlock one of our public work stations for him so he could use his own

screen and software, and that seemed to work just fine. That seems to me like that fits the comparable treatment. Yeah? Okay.

MS. ETKIN: That would be comparable treatment. Kathy's right, it's also -- I just lost the word. Accommodating.

MS. SINCLAIR: Because we're almost out of time, we're going to skip the scenario number five and go onto the last question, which is: What other situations are similar that might, if not managed properly, lead to limitations on or denial of free public access? And I know you all have not been quiet about bringing up your personal experiences, so I hope if you have additional ones that we haven't dealt with, you will share those.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yale University. Renovations. We've got one, and I know GPO has some guidelines on the website but those might want to be looked at in light of the public access.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Art Burns IAT. Tech people. And we have our own tech people. We don't have to use the university. We have our own people, and we still have to fight them tooth and nail.

MS. BILLY: Andy Billy, Farm City Community College. Two of the things I can think of off the top of my head are library inventory and also closing for holidays like Chanukah, Christmas and New Years.

MS. GIBSON: Hi. Kerry Gibson for Ursinus College. I have a -- it's probably technical with all this transition from the various formats that the agencies produce. I go through what's on the site, a project for the floppy disk and CD ROMS, and I'm talking -- of CD ROMS that we do have a computer that people can use while in the library. I was just thinking though that they have to, as a member from the public, they would have to pay \$25 to have it circulated so they could take it home. So that might be one limitation, but

I was also thinking to a conversion all these various formats, and how that can be addressed as far as the progress that's made tangible to CD ROMS, to DVD-ROMS to floppy discs to the electronic media. Thank you.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. One limitation that we have to deal with is that we are a part of a government agency on a Statewide basis. We have been lucky in the fact that the agency, Department of Technology has not discovered that we are one of the only agencies that has a library that's opened to the public, and that they have to deal with computer problems that they don't have to deal with any where else, so that if they keep putting -- we're lucky in that they have not put on any filters at this time, because we have screamed it has to be opened to the public. We get federal dollars, we get state dollars that allow us to do that. So it's a constant vigilant of -- on our public PCs we do not have a Word

capability or Office Suite, but we do make accommodations that the general public can come to a staff computer in order to do that, but we have to be careful that we have to have to those mediated with staff personnel because the agency technology part is afraid that they're going to go on to State networks, and be able to get into classified or sensitive information.

MS. MUNGA: Deborah Munga from University of Rhode Island. Another scenario might be a conflict with existing State law. This is relatively minor, but I can not put a depository sticker on my front door. A few years ago in Rhode Island we had the Station Night Club fire where 100 people were killed, and we now have a draconian fire code where we can not put anything on any egress areas. So this is something minor, but it's something I have to deal with. Another scenario might be in Rhode Island the public libraries are required to put filtering software not only on

their public computers, but also on your staff computers, so there is absolutely no complete access to the internet in any of the public libraries. And so for the depositories that are public libraries, that could be a difficulty. So I just wanted to bring those up as possibilities that you might run into.

MS. SINCLAIR: Any final words, Kathy?

MS. BRAZEE: Well thanks very much, Tim and Gwen. I appreciate your assistance. There are additional handouts here in front. I didn't want to crowd the back door in case you didn't get one, and we'll have more at the handout table. I'd really appreciate any comments you have about the scenarios today. You can email me directly, and my contact information is in the handout. Fill out any comments you have on the paper and focus on access, collections, and service. Thank you very much.

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY

COUNCIL MEETING

October 17, 2007

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, I think we're going to get going. Good morning, everyone. We survived. Council's here, Council survived, that's even more survived, probably. Okay, a couple statistics for you this morning, 493 people registered for the conference, but only 421 attended, and we're trying to find the others. I think they may be lost somewhere out on Army Navy Drive.

A reminder to turn in your evaluations before you leave, evaluations can be turned in at the registration table. Extra handouts are available there as well. If you've requested continuing education units, they will be available at the registration table at the lunch break.

I'm quite excited about this morning's program and to introduce it I'd like to



introduce Mike Wash from GPO.

MIKE WASH: Thanks, Geoff, and good morning. This is The Access to Electronic Legal Information Committee. Am I doing okay so far? We had a lot of debate about the title. I was going to call it The Authentication Session, but it really is all about the legal information.

And what we want to do is talk about some of the challenges with electronic information sharing and the challenges that we are all trying to address using electronic techniques for authentication and signatures.

This morning I'm going to give a brief description of what we are doing at GPO in FDsys for authentication and kind of introduce the topic. And then Mary Alice Baish and Sally Holterhoff are going to talk about some of the activities associated with the authentication report and the national summit that was held this year.

And then Frank Wagner is going to come up

and speak. He's an attorney here in the D.C. area and he currently works as the reporter of decisions for the U.S. Supreme Court. In his past he's been a legal editor at a couple different places, so I think you will find his comments about this topic very interesting.

And then also, we have Peter Lefevre with us, also an attorney, judicial law clerk and is currently at the Law Revisions Council. So I think you will find that there's some very pertinent and interesting conversation about this whole challenge of electronic authentication.

So now, if I could figure out how to resume. Some of this, I know is a repeat, but just to kind of set the stage. GPO's mission is to provide printing and publishing services for the three branches of the federal government, provide perpetually free and ready public access to these documents and publications and to distribute them on a cost recovery basis. All of that is pretty well

known, I'm sure.

The challenges that we have in meeting that mission today in a widely electronic and digital distribution type of world is how to handle that in an authentic manner. Digital information needs to be authentic and verified to be the correct version. It's a simply concept, but a very difficult task to do correctly, as we know from our research and as I'm sure you all have experienced to some extent.

Digital information needs to be available for access almost immediately. We're challenged with that every day at GPO. We put information online before it's distributed in print form when we do congressional printing on a daily basis, and it has to be authentic, and it has to be, you know, clearly representative of what Congress wants us to print.

And then one of our challenges that we didn't really discuss earlier this week is we

have to be capable of preserving that information and making it available for generations to come.

FDsys is a content-centric solution. You know, GPO in the past, as we've discussed in earlier sessions, has been modeled around a print-centric type of workflow. We get information from agencies and Congress, we make it available for printing, we print it and distribute it. That was the way we have been doing it.

Since GPO Access has gone online, we've also been making information available electronically. And with FDsys we are focusing on making sure that we're preserving and managing the information so that it can be available in electronic form as well as print form.

And then the challenge comes of how do we do that in an authentic manner, so that we can demonstrate that the digital information is unaltered. So FDsys and document

authentication, some of the challenges, and we just pose these as questions, just to kind of trigger some thoughts. How can a user be sure that a document is the one that is intended? Or in other words, hasn't been changed or altered in any way.

There needs to be a process to verify that the information is indeed unaltered and has the integrity that's intended. So there needs to be some way of having assurance that information was not changed anywhere along what we would call the lifecycle of that information, from the beginning of it until it's ready for distribution and preservation.

In FDSys we use content authentication methods to insure that the content has been approved by, contributed by or harvested from an official source. So in other words, we need to have a relationship with the author. During the demonstration on Monday we used a lot of our internal terminology, we call it content originator. But in reality that's

whoever authored the information that is being published.

There needs to be a relationship with the author of information so that you can have a chain of custody. And that's what that first sub bullet means. In the days of print media and information being delivered to GPO for printing and publishing, it was a personal relationship, we knew the person that was delivering the information to us and we had confidence that that person was representing their agency or Congress in an authentic manner. "This is the information we would like you to publish."

When we receive things electronically, it's a little bit more difficult. It just kind of arrives one day as a submission package, as Matt Landgraf (phonetic) described earlier. So we need to have ways of understanding that whoever provided that information to GPO is authorized to do that. And we would have the record of that delivery.

Content needs to be verified by GPO to be complete and unaltered. So again, that's something that GPO has done for years and years and years. When we receive information from printing and publishing services, we go through it and make sure that it's complete, it is indeed received from an authorized person and it has not been altered. And then we go through our printing and publishing services.

So for an FDsys type of workflow, we see this content originator, or the author if you will, depositing content into FDsys, like you saw on Monday. FDsys, the system would be able to authenticate the user based on a role. Very quickly at the beginning of Matt's demonstration you saw a login. That's one of the ways where you could have a login name address and password to show that the person that is providing the information is indeed authorized to do so by an agency or Congress.

The author, or the content originator,

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

would enter metadata as the information is deposited. You saw a brief sample of that, and if you recall there was lots of tabs and things that could be used to provide more and more of that data, by either the author, the content originator, or by GPO.

And then the content is digitally signed. We today are doing some digital signatures within content as we receive it. And we are also starting to do some bulk signing of publications as we disseminate it. So at least parts of digital signatures are starting to be incorporated by GPO to ensure that information that is received is unaltered through a signature.

And from an end user perspective, our library partners, general public, research folks looking for federal publications, they'll have the opportunity to receive digitally signed information. And what that would mean is that they would have a proof that the information that they're receiving is



unaltered. And that's a part of a bulk signing initiative that we have started over the last couple of years and are starting to roll out now.

So in our current status of what's really going on at GPO, we have beta testing that's underway, for digital signatures. The test includes the public and private laws from the 110th Congress. GPO staff is manually signing PDF files, and today's signature type of technology really is working well with PDF, which is one of the gaps. You know, we've talked about technology gaps in the past, digital signing technology and authentication technologies are still very early in their development lifecycle. And there are things that we're doing and doing background research and market research on technologies so that we can find solutions that will be able to do more than work with PDFs, for example on a effective method.

And in future plans, we're going to be

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

rolling out an automated bulk signing capability, again for PDF types of documents. And we're anticipating including all public and private laws that are part of GPO Access, so the digital records that we have today, and making that available some time in early 2008.

So that's a very active project right now within GPO. The project is well underway, the integration activities are ongoing right now with Adobe LiveCycle. And we just need to go through some testing to have confidence that that's going to work properly and have that available by early 2008.

So it's a big issue. So if you think about some of the problems that we see associated with living in a digital world and being able to have, you know, proof that documents have been unaltered all the way through its lifecycle, from the author to someone receiving it, think about that and think about where we are at GPO with some of our early digital signature type of work

that's going on, which I think is very good, and the background work that we continue to do in market research and technology research to continue to provide good solutions as we further roll out aspects of our digital systems.

Additional information, there's the GPO FDsys website which we've shown for a while. And then there's also a website at [www.gpoaccess.gov/authentication](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/authentication) that will give you additional information about the beta test that's underway. And we would encourage you to go check that out.

So with that I'd like to turn it over to Mary Alice, provided I can get her presentation up.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. I just want to begin by thanking Ric Davis for appreciating the work that AALL has put into this issue in asking us and telling myself to come and speak with you this morning about the AALL authentication

report. I'm going to cover that part of it and Sally is going to speak about the national summit that she convened in April as president of AALL.

I'd also like to thank Mike Wash, really for recognizing the importance of digital authentication and making the Government Printing Office a national leader in this arena. No level of government today in the United States is authenticating their electronic files. France has been doing this since 2004, Brussels is another country that has been doing it, but there are just a handful of models out there. And both Ric and Mike have been very helpful to us, as you'll see in a minute, in putting together a report and also Mike was the speaker at our national summit as well.

The progress that GPO has made on digital authentication during the past three years is really noteworthy. And I'm just not talking about the technological challenges themselves.

As Mike mentioned the other day, we're in an era of such dramatic technological changes all the time, and it's really hard to get a grasp of it. And he just mentioned a minute ago, about how they are digitally signing the public and private laws and waiting for some more technology to appear and be tested to make that an even better system.

As someone who works out inside the Beltway, I also want to congratulate both Ric and Mike for the wonderful outreach that they've been doing to Congress, the House and the Senate, to the courts and to federal agencies. This is not a easy thing in Washington, D.C. And I'm one of those wonderful optimists who see the future of the FDsys and the wonderful, new services it can provide to agencies, Congress and the courts in the electronic age, in terms of authenticating their own information and making it permanently available and preserving it.

And I'd like to think that the GPO digitally signed information is going to help that GPO brand in this new century of electronic information.

AALL has issued two reports during the past couple of years. In 2003, and many of you may be aware of the one, it was the result of a 50 state survey to look at what the states were doing in terms of permanent public access to their information. And I'm pleased to say that the Library of Congress really took the work that we did in this report to heart and used a lot of their in depth national digital information infrastructure preservation program funds to bring state librarians and state archivists together and to work towards a solution for permanent public access at the state level.

We began an initial discussion about doing a follow up survey on digital authentication in the summer of 2005 and it really has been almost a two year project. In

March we published the AALL 50 State Report on Authentication of Online Legal Resources. The goal of our report was to determine which states, if any, have adopted website versions of primary legal resources, as official and/or is any state using technology yet to authentic these electronic files.

And for the purposes of the study, we looked specifically at six state legal titles, the administrative code and the administrative register, the session laws, the statutory code, and we also looked at state court opinions, both at the Supreme Court level and at the intermediate appellate level. And we especially wanted to know, you know, what are they doing with their court information and opinions.

And the way we did the survey, this year, as opposed to the 2003 report, we had a very lengthy online survey. And we had member volunteers in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, complete the online survey and

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

then we pulled the findings together, and I'm going to go through them in a few minutes. And each of our state authors then did a report for their state, answering the question, "Are any of these six titles official in your state (the online versions)? And is your state doing anything to make them capable of being authenticated?"

So as we began the survey, we had to give guidance to our authors. So how do we define official, and the obvious definition is information that is mandated or approved by statute or court rule. We also said that an online official legal resource has to have the same status as the print official legal resource, makes sense. And it's much easier in the print world, because of the fixed nature of print and the fact that multiple copies are broadly distributed, ensures that the print official legal resource is also an authentic resource.

And this is not to say that there could



be, not typos, but errors in a court opinion, for example. But those are remedied even for the print world, so.

We had a lot of trouble coming up with a definition for authentication for electronic information. And so we turned to, how many of you remember GPO's white paper on digital authentication? I can't remember what year that was published, and that's where we borrowed their definition for the purposes of our survey. Content, as Mike just said, verified by a government entity, to be complete and unaltered when compared with the original version approved or published by the originating agency.

As Mike said, with the digital signatures, typically there will be a certificate or mark that conveys that the information is authentic. And the models that GPO has had and that we have had, as I mentioned in France and in Brussels, the use of encryption, digital signatures, public key

infrastructure to make sure that as the information is transferred, say a congressional bill from Congress to the GPO, that nothing has been altered during that transmission. And also the importance of that chain of custody information that Mike referred to a few minutes ago. We are very pleased to see that GPO is working on that first pilot project in authenticating the public and private laws of the 110th Congress.

There are six major findings to our report. The first one, the most alarming one for the Law Library and the legal community is that states are beginning to discontinue their print official resources and substituting online official resources. And we see this as a trend. It's happened, as you know, at the federal level and at the state level. It will only continue.

State agencies believe that they are doing wonderful things for their citizens by making the information available quickly,

getting things up on the website within 24 hours of publication. That's a very positive thing that we all appreciate. And of course as federal agencies do as well, these state agencies are looking to the online environment to save the costs of publishing in a tangible format and distributing it. So those are the pluses from the state's view.

Why we found this so alarming is that in these five states that are listed here, they give official status to their online legal resources, but they've also eliminated the print resource. And unfortunately none of these titles that have been eliminated in print carries any technology to allow us to authentic their integrity. And of these five states, only Utah has enacted a statute guaranteeing the citizens of Utah permanent, public access to all of their electronic state government information.

So Mike mentioned earlier the importance of the lifecycle from creation to

preservation. And that authentication and permanent public access and preservation I know are what we are all having to deal with on a daily basis. Thus the disappearance of our print official legal resources, without having an authenticated online version threatens, as a question of our report was, threatens the trustworthiness of these resources.

The second key finding is that ten states and the District of Columbia have designated, as official, one or more of their online primary resources. So this is a step in the right direction, we're happy to see this. Here the states listed, and you can take a look to see if your state is included in this. Together, among these ten states and D.C., there are 23 sources of law, most of them are the regulatory materials, that are available in an online resource, that are considered by the originating agency, to be official.

Key finding three, eight states have

official traits but evidence as to their actual status is really conflicting. And so we had to come up with this definition of official traits, because we found that so many states were sort of very difficult for us to find out if the states were calling it official. For example, the word official isn't used on the resource. We found, in some states, that official is noted on the website, but if you do some research into what that means, that there is sort of a disclaimer saying if you really want the official version you have to go to the print.

And (background beeping) we also found that the official status is often noted on these websites. That's almost like the bagpipes when I was speaking in Honolulu at the SLA meeting that Gwen had invited me to. Right in the middle of the speech, it was St. Patrick's Day, right, and all the bagpipes came on. So let's knock on wood that that does not recur, either one.

It was very troubling for us. The official status is noted on the website, but there's no link to either the statute or the court rule that is telling us why the online version is official.

Key finding four, and I'm sure this will probably be one of your favorite ones, all of you as I'm sure state depositories for your government information. States have not been sufficiently deliberate in their policies and practices. And we believe they haven't really acknowledged the important needs of their citizens and researchers and faculty and students who are using their government information.

Secondly, states really have not considered the issue raised when their only legal resources are not authenticated. And Frank Wagner is going to speak in a few minutes, and there are copies in the back along with our slides, about principles that were adopted last February by the Association

of Reporters of Judicial Decisions that really mirror the findings of our report.

Our recommendations, we found that there were some quick things, and there are more of them listed in our report, that states could do to help end some of this confusion. And first would be to provide a clear statement of the official status and the source of the authority for calling an online version, official. We would like to see them identify the print official resource as well. For example, the number of pro se litigants in this country, as many of you know, has just risen dramatically. And while they may find access to the electronic version very helpful, they may need to go to one of your libraries or a law library to track down that official resource.

We'd like to see states identify the source of the data. As Mike and I have mentioned, it's really important to know that chain of custody, in terms of the

information's integrity. And we'd also like to know what processes, what technologies are they using. We would like states to display very clearly on their websites any representations and disclaimers and provide the scope.

An entire section of a report is articulating the many different types of disclaimers that are available on these websites. And interestingly, even for some of these legal resources that they say on the website that it's official, there's also a disclaimer of saying really, you know, you can't use this, there's no warranty of reliability here.

And lastly ideally what this AALL report and the national summit that Sally's going to talk about, are our way to try to educate and find advocates, because the goal that all of us here in this room want to reach is to have governments really address official status, authentication and permanent public access for



all of their online legal resources.

Key finding five, no state's primary legal resources are authenticated or afford ready authentication by standard methods. And the four states listed of the top, Minnesota, Ohio, Vermont and Virginia, they're really beginning to address this problem. And I'd like to add Utah to that actually, we've just received a press release from Utah saying that, because of the AALL report, are adding hash marks to some of their administrative materials, so that you could find the information you need, you could print it and download it, you could take that hash mark and verify it against the hash mark that the government has put on it.

We also found, because we asked our state authors -- you know, and we had them call COIS, state librarians, state archivists, the folks at the Capitol Legislative Information Services, to say, "Are you thinking about authentication?" So these other states

listed, and please see if yours is among them, they're beginning to really view digital authentication as a need that they need to figure out how to resolve.

And key finding six, and this is that since our 2003 report, and I give substantial credit to the Library of Congress and to End Up (phonetic) as I mentioned, nine states have provided, by statute, for the permanent, public access of one or all of these online primary legal resources. And they're mentioned right up there. So again, please look and see if your state is included.

Of course all of you, I know on Monday there were a lot of show of hands of those of you from state libraries, talk about an unfunded mandate, the typical language in these statutes is, "The state library shall coordinate with agencies and depository libraries, to ensure permanent, public access to state publications."

So in conclusion, in terms of the

findings of our report, online legal resources are increasingly the sole official published resource. That official status, in our view, following the model of France and following what GPO through the FDsys is working very hard to achieve, is the use of encryption, digital signatures, public key infrastructure and that important chain of custody information.

And the goal of our report, and I think the hope of everyone in this room, is that online legal resources and all other types of online government information will be as trustworthy as the print version. Thank you very much.

SARAH HOLTERHOFF: Good morning. My job now is to tell you what happened after the report got published and all this work. The report, we've got some copies of it up here, is available online on AALL's website, and it's also -- copies are available in print for purchase, 250 page report. Doing this survey

and complying, editing and publishing this report was a huge accomplishment for our association and a tremendous amount of work, but as with many things with life, the work goes on.

The next step was okay, the report is done and we have routed ourselves and a lot of our members and colleagues, but what do we do to try to make something happen. Because as Mary Alice has shown, there's no state that really we can hold up just yet as a model that has the whole thing, the official and the authentic status, really not. So we've got to do something.

So we talked about those and during my term as AALL President, which was 2006-2007, we decided that it was time for us to try to have some kind of a national meeting where we'd bring together some key stakeholders and talk about this. So we began September of 2006 to talk about having a national summit.

And our concept of this was we would

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

bring together 50 people, our association would pay for everyone's way to come to Chicago, and bring together just the right group of people, not just a representative from a whole lot of different groups per se. We wanted the right person from that group.

So this ended up requiring seven months of really intense work. But we did, in April 2007, have our summit in Chicago. Fifty delegates representing the legal community, the judiciary, a number of different organizations and we had a day and a half meeting. Some of the groups that were represented were the American Bar Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and we had a state commissioner there, two Supreme Court justices, representatives from nine different states. People like revisers of statutes and registrars of regulations, some technology people. And it was really interesting group.

Most of these people did not know each other. And we were kind of worried how we would get them all to really want to come. But once we got this group together, it was really great, the synergy. And we had a keynote speaker who is someone who is a law professor at the University of California Berkley, and a former law librarian. And he got things off to a great start.

We used a lot of our delegates to be speakers, panelists, reactors. So we tried to get everybody involved so they weren't just sitting there for a day and a half. And it was really a wonderful synergy from this group and came up with some -- our ideas of what we wanted to do at this were to explore legal and technological solutions to this matter of authenticating and creating official status for online primary legal materials, and also to come up with an action plan and some strategies to implement that.

So at the end of the time, when we kind

of summed up what we had done, the people felt like that we wanted more to happen, so of course once you've done all this work, there's more work to be done yet. But it was just the beginning, as this last point on the slide says. And that was kind of like, "Oh my gosh, now we've got to do something else."

But what do we do next? We have been trying to -- we set up a webpage which is on AALL's website, and we have things about the summit there, but also the things that have been happening since the summit. And we do have some possible state initiatives going in a few states, in Connecticut, Delaware, Minnesota, New Mexico and Washington State.

One of our really exciting things was the commissioner from the National Conference of Commissioners of Uniform State Laws she's proposed that perhaps we could get a study committee, which is the first step to getting a model act for states to look at. So that's still in process.

We'd like to come up with some best practices. Because we feel like if just a couple states would kind of get this right, that that would be such a good example to hold up to other states. But what we really need to do is build alliances at the state level. One reason that we're up here today is that we're hoping that you all can perhaps help with that.

And so what could you do? The first thing would be to look at our website, because there's some wonderful links to articles that some of our delegates have written since the summit, in the six months since then. This is a screen capture of the front of our webpage that we have on our association's website with links to a lot of the presentations. And down the page, which you can't see, there's links to really some wonderful articles that some of the judges and professors and attorneys who were at our conference have written since then.



And we need your help because we aren't in every state. We've tried to get our chapters of our association members, and a number of states are doing what they can, but you have contacts and could see opportunities perhaps to build some alliances in your own state with your state library association, with document scripts you have in your state.

The problems that we're talking about are not readily apparent to the average person, but you are the group that would understand what we're talking about. And we need to work together, because without something happened on this eventually it'll be a big mess and it will have to be fixed. But we could avoid the big mess coming if we who know about this do something and look for some changes. And it's a wonderful opportunity to make something positive happen.

So we're looking for your help and we hope that you might want to start by reading our report or at least the executive summary

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

with the findings and the pages about your state. You can actually go on our website and individually look at the findings and you can print off the material for your state.

But if you want to buy a copy we can get you a discount. So anyway, okay, thank you very much.

FRANK WAGNER: Good morning. I'm Frank Wagner, I'm the Reporter of Decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, but I'm not here today as a representative of the Court. The Court has had no need as yet to take any sort of position on this stuff.

I'm here as a representative of the Association of Reporters of Judicial Decisions, that's people like me who edit and publish the opinions of appellate courts in official publications. I'll call them the ARJD henceforth. As you may know, opinions cite and rely on all sorts of government information, all sorts of official documents. And we've become concerned that people are

publishing these things online without authentication, without any promise of permanent public access. And we're concerned that a great deal of primary public source materials are in danger of being lost or adulterated. And therefore we issued a position paper called *The Statement of Principles: Official Online Documents* which Mary Alice mentioned. I think there are copies in the back.

We define official similarly to the AALL, in that we say that something is "official" if it's authorized by law or if it's designated official by the issuing government or agency. We believe there should be only one official version of a document at any one time. And we believe that at present the print publication should be that document. In my case it's *The United States Reports*, the official publication of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The reason we think the print publication should be official at least for now is that

it's undoubted authenticity and longevity, it's permanent public access to use the AALL's phrase. We think that in order for online documents to be designated as "official" they should satisfy two criteria. One they should be authenticated using encryption digital signatures or a similar computer process. And two, there should be some assurance of permanent public access. We'd hope for a technological solution, but that doesn't seem to be in the cards right now, so some commitment by the government agency, by the state legislature itself or by the particular entity, that when the paradigm shifts, they will continue to make this document available.

We're very happy that -- I just learned I didn't know that nine states had made such commitments, and I'm very happy about GPO making that commitment, since I think *U.S. Reports* will be part of eventually what goes on to the GPO site.

We think that so long as the print

version is the only authentic and permanent version of a document, that as I said, it is official and it should control in case of a conflict. If you look online and the online product says one thing and the print version says another, the print version controls. We say that on the Supreme Court website. And we think that the issuing agency should say that so long as they are not authenticating their documents.

And that's our position. This is important stuff. And I can perhaps give you an example that I mentioned to Mary Alice. A few years ago the Court cited a publication of the -- it was a Georgia agency and I think it was the Georgia Tax Commission. But the thing was available only online. We cited it in an opinion. We went to print publication in our preliminary print, which is our paper bound preliminary edition. And the thing was still online and everything was fine.

We got to the bound volume and it was

gone. I had to call the Georgia Tax Commission, and I cajoled them into putting it back up. I should have checked, I'm not sure whether it's still there, but it was there when the bound volume was published.

This is important stuff and hopefully we can all work together to find solutions.

Thank you.

PETER LEFEVRE: Good morning, my name's Peter LeFevre. I'm the Law Revision Council of the House of Representatives. It's a pleasure to be here. I've been a big fan of libraries ever since I got my first library card in Chicago at age four. You folks do a wonderful public service.

The Office of the Law Revision Council, which I work for, is a nonpartisan office in the U.S. House of Representatives, responsible to the Speaker of the House. It was created in 1975 and given two main functions; to prepare and publish new editions and supplements to the United States code, and to

prepare legislation to enact titles or code in depositive law.

Most of you, no doubt, have some familiarity with the code. But I'll talk a little bit about it, what's in it and how it's put together. When a law is enacted by Congress, it is initially printed as a slip law and then later as part of the statutes at large. The statutes at large includes all the laws an originally enacted in chronological order.

The code is more selective and organized differently. It contains only the permanent and general laws and it arranges them into 50 broad subject matter titles, 24 -- I'm a little slow on the slides. Twenty-four of the 50 titles have been enacted into positive law, the remaining titles, referred to as non-positive law titles, consist of sections from many different laws that have been editorially organized into the titles. The code is now well over 40,000 pages and growing every year.

Only Congress can create and determine what goes into a positive law title. But the arrangement of laws in the non-positive law titles is a function of the Law Revision Council's office. As soon as a bill is passed by both the House and Senate, a copy of it is sent to our office. We have a team of attorneys who carefully read through the bill and decide which provisions should go into the code, and if so where they will be placed. This process is called classification.

Any amendment to a section already in the code will be classified to that section. For new provisions, we make a judgment as to whether they are permanent and general. If they are we will try to find the best place to fit them in the code.

Some laws will be picked up their entirety and made into new chapters. Many others contain a mixture of new provisions and amendments and cover more than one subject area. These laws have to be split up into



dozens, and sometimes even hundreds of pieces, which are disbursed throughout the code. We keep track of all these pieces with our classification tables which are posted on our website. These tables provide the most up-to-date information available on the codification of new laws. They can be used to identify all the sections of the code affected by a particular law, and also whether a particular section of the code is affected by any new laws.

Sorry. After a new law is classified, the next step is to incorporate it into the existing code. We begin this step by obtaining an electronic copy of the slip law from the Government Printing Office. We take that electronic copy and feed it into a process we have which extracts the classified provisions and sorts them out according to what they affect in the code.

By law, the printed slip law is considered competent evidence of the law. But

what we actually use is an electronic copy of the slip law that we download from a GPO file transfer site. We have to rely on GPO to give us the correct electronic copy, because we do not have the time to verify that every word we take from that copy is identical to the printed slip law.

Has there ever been a problem with this? Unfortunately the answer is yes. There has been at least one instance where the electronic copy of a law made available to us was not the right one. We discovered this during the review process when an editor noticed that the text of a new section we were adding to the code did not match the slip law. It turned out the GPO had temporarily placed the wrong file on their transfer site.

There have also been a few cases where a slip law has differed from the enrolled bill. In these cases GPO has had to print a corrected slip law, known as a star print. This is one of the reasons why I'm very

interested in the work being done by GPO and the American Association of Law Libraries to advance authentication of electronic documents.

Once our office has sorted out provisions of the law, we do the actual text editing and preparation of the editorial material that explains and documents each change in the code. Because of the volume and nature of federal legislation this editing process requires a great deal of work. On average a two year Congress enacts between 5,000 and 7,500 pages of new law. Much of it is amendatory and Congress, unlike many state legislatures, tends to favor the use of cut and bite amendments. Rather than replacing an old section with a new one, these amendments make changes by specific word and phrase substitutions and there can be a lot of these.

For example, the recent bankruptcy reform law made 46 separate amendments to the first section of the bankruptcy title. The rest of

that 200 page law made similar types of amendments to more than 160 other sections of that title.

It is not unusual for positive law titles and major acts of the code to be amended hundreds and even thousands of times over the years. The Social Security Act as originally enacted in 1935 started out with 87 sections and took up 28 pages in the statutes at large. Today the Social Security act has more than 450 sections, and some of those sections are more than twice as long as the original act in 1935.

If a judge or a lawyer had to reconstruct one of those sections from scratch today, using the statutes at large, it might take a couple of days to do it. Fortunately that isn't necessary, because the code shows the Social Security Act as it currently reads and provides a source credit and an explanation for each amendment that has affected the Act since 1935.

This might be a good point to let you know that my daughter, who just graduated from the University of Maryland, prepared my PowerPoint.

As you would expect, accuracy and precision are essential in maintaining the code. Certainly failing to execute an amendment would be a problem, but even putting a comma in the wrong place can change the meaning. Cases have been decided by the Supreme Court on the basis of the punctuation used in a law. My staff and I understand that the official U.S. code is what lawyers, judges, agencies and the public ultimately have to rely on as the authoritative source for much of the federal law. So ensuring the accuracy the code is our highest priority.

Those are the basic steps we follow and produce in the code. But what does the law say about the publication and official status of the code? There are six sections in the code that deal with this. Basically they

require that there be an annual update of the code, incorporating the laws enacted in the latest session of Congress, the code and supplements must be printed by the Government Printing Office, and in all state and federal courts and public offices, the then current, printed main addition and supplement shall be considered evidence of the laws they contain.

As a practical matter, how is the code published? Since 1934 there has been a new main addition published every six years and a cumulative supplement published each year in between. Each main or supplement cumulatively incorporates the laws enacted during one session of Congress, and is current through the last law enacted in the covered session. Within a supplement or main addition the code is updated on a title by title basis. This means that we start with title one and work our way through the 50 titles in order.

When a title is finished we release it on our website. And as we complete work on

enough titles to fill a volume of the code, we send the volume to GPO for printing. Under this system we must wait until the end of a session before we can release even the first title, because the last law enacted in a session might affect something in that first title.

For many years the actual printing of the code was done using hot metal typesetting process. In 1976 the first addition of the code was printed using a computer database with GPO photo composition codes. To make that possible everyone word of the 1970 code and fifth supplement was double keyed to create the code database. Since then our office has maintained and updated that database and that is the database that is used today to print the code and for our online code.

It is also the database that is used by GPO for their U.S. Code on GPO Access and by Cornell Legal Information Institute, for their

code website.

Although our primary focus is on the print version of the code, our website is very important to us. The main feature of the website is the searchable version of our most current titles of the code. This version allows the user to call up a specific section or research the law by doing word searches. Our website also has searchable versions of 14 past editions of the code, and downloadable versions of current and past editions of the code in various formats, including ASCII, text, PDF and GPO Locator.

We also carry current and past sets of our classification tables with the most recent tables linked to our searchable code, so that when you search for a specific section of the code, you will be alerted of any new laws that affect that section.

Although the same database is used for both the print and online versions of the code, there are differences between them.

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO



Everything in the database is tagged as main only, main and supplement or supplement only. When printing, the tags make it possible to include everything in a main edition but only new material and changes text in a supplement. That is why people using the books will need both the main and supplement to get the entire law.

On the website there is what we refer to as a virtual main edition published for each year. We had programmatically merged the main and supplement data so that the reader's looking at the entire code as if there was a new main edition every year. However, most of the time this virtual main is actually a composite of titles incorporating new laws from two supplements. This is because we update the code on a title by title basis and we start loading new titles on the website as we finish them. So at any given time the searchable U.S. Code on our website will likely be a combination of two supplements.

For example, on October 1st we updated our online database to Supplement Five, for titles one through 41, but titles through 42 through 50 were still based on Supplement Four.

Two other differences between the online and print versions are worth mentioning. Because different formatting is used in the digital and print versions, the fonts, capitalization, headings, indentations and some characters are not the same in both versions. The printed version is more true to the statutes enacted by Congress. And finally the printed version undergoes more checks than the online versions. Every page that appears in print is reviewed by three proofreaders. But when a virtual main addition is generated on our website, no one actually looks at each section. We take it on faith that the computer programs will properly merge the main and supplement data into an accurate rendition of each section.

Because of these differences and because there is always a chance that the wrong version could be loaded on our site or that our database could be corrupted, we carry a disclaimer on our website which cautions people using our database for legal research, to verify their results against the printed version of the U.S. Code.

Now I'll finish up with a few comments about authentication and the code. The code database is being accessed hundreds of thousands of times each month. Some percentage of the hits are by people doing legal research and perhaps relying on the site to make important decisions. Those users should be able to know exactly what they're looking at, where it comes from and that it has not been altered. I believe there is a compelling need for authentication of the online code database.

However, I would not like to see a digital version of the code replace the

printed code as the official version. And I would not favor reducing the number of printed copies that are distributed throughout the country.

For one thing, only the code books printed by GPO are considered evidence of the law in court. But in addition, as convenient and useful as the online code is for research and access, it does not have many of the advantages of the printed code. Browsing the books often gives the reader a better perspective on the law. And flipping through pages in a book can often be a better way to figure out the law than scrolling through hundreds of computer screens. Plus, it is my impression that there are still a lot of library patrons out there who prefer the books to the online code.

But there is another reason why I think we need to keep the printed code as the official version. As I have described it, the code database is very large and complex and

continuously being change. Yet it sets out the national laws that apply to everyone in the country and it must be true to the enactment sort of Congress down to the smallest detail. Even with authentication technology a computer glitch, a website failure or some kind of tampering or corruption of computer files could undermine the integrity of an online code.

Thinking about this issue caused me to remember George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The animals took over a farm and one of the first things they did was agree on seven commandments which they painted in big white letters on a wall. Later in this story one of the pigs, Napoleon, began to take over the farm and establish a dictatorship. As he broke each of the commandments, he would secretly change how it was written on the wall. He added or erased words so as to do away with the rights and protections of the other animals.

Some of the animals were confused, because the commandments seemed to be different from what they remembered. But in the end they trusted what was written on the wall more than their own memories. If a few words in the code mysteriously appeared or disappeared, how many people would even realize it? Like the animals we would be more likely to rely on the written word than our own memories.

By this I'm not suggesting that anyone would try to subvert a digital official version of the code. But there is some comfort in knowing that in every courthouse and in many libraries throughout the country there's a set of the U.S. Code books which are permanent and which cannot be altered. Thank you.

MIKE WASH: Thank you. With that I think we can open it up for questions from Council.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler from UIC, and perhaps Mary Alice or Sally can address this.

It's interesting that one partner that hasn't been mentioned in this has had a long history and relationship with state level information, has been Legal Publishers. And from my experience one reason why we've not had universal free access to state legal information, even in the printed world, has been the long monopoly these legal publishers have held over these official publications. And in fact the recognition of their private citations as being de facto evidence in the courts.

I'm curious at what their role or opinion or involvement in this authentication effort at the state level might be.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Very good question. When we were pulling together the summit under Sally's leadership, we purposefully decided to bring in as our outside delegates, state justices, revisers of statutes, in other words representatives of the creators of these state legal online legal resources. AALL beginning

in the early '90s established an effort to get state laws to enact what we call medium neutral citation, in other words paragraph numbering that is not related to any kind of format or any one technology.

In fact we do address this in our report on page 25. And I'm happy to say 13 states have enacted this universal citation statute for their court opinions. So there is progress.

As opposed to the print paradigm where we all receive those titles that we arrange on our shelves our put into our microfiche drawers, and I think all of you would agree, that in the electronic environment it's the responsibility of the government, not of any private publisher, to deem its electronic information as official. And it's a responsibility we believe that the government, just as GPO has illustrated, to ensure the permanent public access to this information.

And so what we are trying to do, since

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO



state governments are the creators of the information, they're also the disseminators of this online information, we want them to become responsible for all stages of the lifecycle. And I have, in working with members of the ABA, when I first began to speak to the ABA standing committee in the Law Library of Congress as we were beginning this online survey, one of the members, a former judge said, "What are you saying to me? Are you telling me that the opinions on Lexus and West aren't official?" And I said, "Yeah, that's exactly right."

And he slammed his fist on the table and he said, "Gee, we have to do something about this." But again, it's not up to a commercial publisher to -- their information is not official, it's up the government, to the Government Printing Office and to the state legislative services and to the state courts really to make that determination and hopefully to ensure the entire lifecycle of

the information, including the authentication piece.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Yeah, and I would say also that what the commercial publishers sell are usually enhanced versions. And I think there's room for -- I mean the average citizen that should have free access, you know, no fee, to the basic documents of the state and federal government. I mean and people will continue to buy the annotated, enhanced versions of all these materials. But I think that those commercial publishers are getting them from the states.

I mean it's the government's responsibility to make sure that there is an authentic version. Because there are times when what's on one commercial service and the other is not agreeing. It's really -- how do you know? Somebody's got to keep the official -- and have the integrity that we can rely on as citizens.

PETER HEMPHILL: Oh, I'm sorry. Perhaps

this is a follow up to John's question. I'm Peter Hemphill of Hemphill and Associates. I'm the technological consultant part of the Council. To what degree have you reached out to private industry to help solve some of these issues? Certainly there are parallel issues in private industry with regard to digital rights, management protecting intellectual property and content that parallels some of these issues that happen in the public sector. I certainly can see where there would be value in doing that for the public sector. Certainly these issues go not only from the federal level, state, local governments, all throughout government. And to what degree can private industry help solve some of these authentication issues and provide tools for not just the federal government but all throughout the whole process?

MIKE WASH: I can answer it from a technology perspective, not a policy

perspective. We have been monitoring technology for authentication and signing for a number of years. And I think for the most part technology is still in an emerging state, to do more than the bulk signing or the PKI type of initiatives. We've been tracking it pretty closely and we've been doing a lot of outreach, similar to what we've done with, you know, outreach to communities that want to use a digital information system for content, we've been doing outreach with industries as well.

So we are trying to stay current. Some of the most promising technologies, and this isn't an endorsement by any stretch, but some of the most promising technologies are currently being tested today with the *New York Times*. And Hewlett Packard has developed some very, very interesting signing technology that is really an adaptation of the types of technologies that are used in bulk signing today. But what they've done is they've

created a way of clustering the signing technology so that you can actually get traceability back to a large publication, even at a small, what we would call a granular.

And the tests that they routinely do is with the *New York Times*, where they will actually digitally sign a *New York Times* and provide granular authentication back to a paragraph level on a daily basis. So it's pretty fascinating. So we've been watching that and we've been watching some other technologies that are emerging so that we could be best prepared to recommend a type of technology that will allow us to, you know, have the most robust type of solution to serve the needs. So we've been reaching out to the industry.

PETER HEMPHILL: And I was thinking in terms of also providing perhaps a AALL report to Microsoft, large companies that can help solve these issues so they are aware of what the government is facing, to be able to help.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing Office. Pete, I want to address your question from the policy standpoint. We have a lot of interest in the private sector that of course over the years have obtained information from the Government Printing Office, whether free as a reference source from GPO Access or fee based through value-added products that we've sold as part of data transfers, that they've subsequently added value to. And what we're finding through voice of customer feedback is that their customers are asking them the same questions that we're getting asked as a government agency, which is where did you get this information from.

And in the past it was good enough to say, "Well it came from the Government Printing Office, we got it through an FTP data transfer." And now the question is, "Can you prove it?" And that's the same question that we're getting.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: I was going to say that several of the delegates at our summit, we had a person whose title was Co-Chair of the ABA Information Security Committee of their Section of Science and Technology. But he has a private information security firm in Utah. And so that was one person, and there were several other people from state agencies that came at -- you know, keeping information secure from a more sort of post 9/11 angle. And it was very interesting, because for them to hear what we were saying about what we considered secure information and what was considered their angle on it.

So I think we did have some contact with private sector people. But I think probably much more needs to happen.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Absolutely. And one just quick additional point is -- and I want to also acknowledge that Mike Wash attended our summit and was a speaker at the panel we had on technological progress and future

solutions. What we're trying to do, Peter, is to again educate and do advocacy and get folks energized to help us out at the state level. But what we asked the delegates to do, for example, the justices and the revisers of statutes was to go back to their state to work with the other even branches, how dare I say of state government, and to try to work towards testing different technologies, because certainly what GPO is doing is not available budget-wise for many of these state agencies.

But to look at different technologies, because we don't have standards on authenticating online legal information. And to test out some of these other solutions so that we can look at developing minimally best practices as a step towards actual standards.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Other questions on Council? Chris.

DR. CHRISTOPHER GREER: Chris Greer from the National Science Foundation. I have a



question for Mr. Wagner about the Statement of Principles, particularly the third item in which you say that, "The print publication is the preferred official version. A digital version should be official only if it can be authenticated by encryption or other methods impervious to corruption and permanently, publicly accessible."

In the world of physical objects such as in biology, which is my area, these three things are accomplished by a reference to a type specimen by a rational redundancy of collection and by the existence of a system of reliable preservation organizations. In principle all of these things can be accomplished in the digital realm as well. So is it the intention to impose a higher level of standards on digital objects than apply to printed objects?

FRANK WAGNER: First of all I'm an English major and I didn't get a whole of that. But --

CHRISTOPHER GREER: I can translate.

FRANK WAGNER: No, I think what we're after is a transition. We want to assure that what's official is right for now. What we want for the future is simply that some form of authentication is used and there's some commitment to moving along when we shift from one medium to another. We, at the court, have seven or eight year worth of digitized material that was done with an A-text (phonetic) system that simply isn't useful anymore. We can't find anybody to extract it. So I don't think we're trying to impose a higher standard, we're saying that when online becomes the true official, it must be as reliable as the print publication is today, that's all.

CHRISTOPHER GREER: Thank you.

MARIAN PARKER: This is Marian Parker. First I want to thank everybody who spoke for us and with us this morning, because from my perspective this is the most important thing

that we are doing. And all of you have done such incredible work, we are just very grateful.

I also want to thank Mr. Wagner for saying that when GPO solves the problems of authentication, certification, etcetera, etcetera, that he sees the Court being there. I know that's not a commitment but it is -- you know the Court was the leader in making electronic information available to the public. And I am one person out here who's hoping the Court will continue to be a leader in moving us along this road that we're already rapidly going down. And we just want to make sure we get there right.

And then thirdly, I really want to ask Mr. LeFevre, I have a question about Congress requiring more and more government information to be published in a digital format. And yet at the same time it's requiring that all of its publications be published in paper. For me that's a conundrum.

I hope that you will also see once GPO is able to solve the problems of making sure these digital documents are as authentic as it's possible for anything to be, that you'll move along the line of that we don't have to have paper everywhere. I mean paper's nice, but paper really isn't the only thing that helps us out. So we really want efforts by Congress to support getting to the authentic digital version of the official laws of the United States.

PETER LEFEVRE: Yeah, I can't really speak for Congress but --

MARIAN PARKER: But you're working for them, and so --

PETER LEFEVRE: Right.

MARIAN PARKER: -- you're making all this available to us, and we do appreciate it a lot.

PETER LEFEVRE: Yeah, I know there has been discussion about getting away from paper as the official copy in terms of processing

bills through Congress, you know, the introduced version and engrossed version and so forth, because there's a tremendous amount of waste in printing these copies. Every time a bill's introduced it's printed, then when it's reported it's printed and then when it passes the House it's printed and then when it's received by the Senate it's printed.

And so I think there's definitely a direction to go in there to eliminate some of that paper. However, I think that I'd be really reluctant to give up the paper as the ultimately authoritative official version when it comes to the public laws and the U.S. Code. That's actually the law, it's the kind of thing that, you know, you feel that it ought to be in a book so that if there's any question about the database or whatever later on, you can always refer back to the book. And that, you know, cannot be -- it's permanent and it's reliable, both for the statutes at large and the Code as I was trying

to make the point, it's a very big and complicated document. And you know, if you have 25 years from now you have 25 years of online versions of it, and then somehow something happens to it, you don't have the fallback of going back and looking at the books for one authoritative source.

So at least looking at it now I'd still like to keep the printed version as the official version.

FRANK WAGNER: As would I. I'd like to reiterate that I'm not here speaking for the Court, I'm speaking for my Reporters Association.

MARIAN PARKER: Right.

FRANK WAGNER: I'd hope that the *U.S. Report* survives long after I retire and I think that they will survive at least as long as Justice Souter is on the court.

MARIAN PARKER: Just let me follow up a little. I am lawyer, I teach law students how to do legal research. And I deal with the

issue of maintaining the collections of all of this stuff that comes out of your offices on a daily basis. And what I'm saying is I don't disagree that paper's great, because you know, it's easy, we're used to it. It is more or less immutable.

But once GPO and others solve the problem of the authenticated, version controlled, certified piece then, you know, I'm hoping that our government agencies that are required to publish can go along with that's the official version, and any time you want to print it out, everybody's printing it out from the same version.

I mean that's what's happening now. You actually create all these documents digitally, nobody's writing anything by hand and sending it to GPO for hard press. So you create it digitally, you transmit it digitally, you store it when you use it digitally. And you only print it out, you know, when it's try to distribute it.

So we're just sort of in this transition phase that we know we can't go all the way yet, because we don't have the security of the information. But once we get that security, life is going to change dramatically.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. That's very good point, Marian. And the other thing I want to add to that is the one word that didn't come up this morning. We talked about confidentiality, authentication, integrity, there's also the non-repudiation aspect. The non-repudiation insuring that as the disseminator of the information from the Government Printing Office, we can't deny having sent it.

And likewise the key point to me in the future is it's great that GPO is going to be authenticating the information, but the most critical element is the chain of custody. So non-repudiation has to come in from the point that it's created by the content originator, and they can't deny sending it to GPO either.



And I think we're going to need that piece as the most critical part, to be able to really move towards saying that we have real, authentic information in the future online.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler from UIC.

There's another aspect of this that I think both recognizes the authentication of paper and the future authentication possibilities of the digital world. And I thought it was nicely embodied by the discussion of the code, in that for our users, and I think for the demands that we're going to have on the future digital system, 80 percent of our business does not demand the authentication just described, but it insures or trusts that if needed, that authentication is going to be there when called upon.

So I think as we move through these systems, yes an ideal world, an *Animal Farm* that worked is what we want. But in the meantime we are working in an *Animal Farm* that is, where a lot of business has to be

transacted with some degree of assurance. And I think what the depository library system brings to the table is that we have that authentication by association, if not by authority.

And I think as long as our systems that we develop assure a more immediate response that we don't have to wait for that level of authentication that's demanded by some of our relationships, but is backed up if you will, the credit is backed up by the gold bar, if you will, that's what we would desire. So we wouldn't want to see any kind of slow down of these system developments looking for the idea, waiting for what I call Gadaugh (phonetic) to come.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Right. And I should have reiterated, I'm not sure if it was on the slide, when we're talking about authentication, using GPO's wonderful definitions, it is capable of being authenticated. And for the French, le Journal

Officiel, there are actually two databases. You can go in and a very user friendly, like a GPO Access, so that the normal person can go and get the unauthenticated version, and then France also has their official journal site, in which you can get that certificate showing the chain of custody and the digital signatures. So in France they're doing it in two different ways. But I think your point is well taken, if we remember that we want the information that is capable of being authenticated for the proper legal uses that demand.

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, I think AALL is to be commended for all of the work that you've done on this issue. I was surprised to hear Mary Alice say that France and I think Belgium were two countries that have taken some steps in authentication. And I was surprised that there really weren't any others. Can you elaborate a little bit on the research that you've done about what other

countries are doing.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Well there are a handful of other nations. And I think Former Public Printer Bruce James and Bob Tapella (phonetic) and some others did a trip through Europe to go meet with the French people who are publishing le Journal Officiel and went to Belgium also to find out what technologies they were using and what their statutes read like. And also just to follow up. France enacted the statute in 2004 and to follow up, you know, are you having any problems with it.

And Mike, I'm not sure if you participated in any of those trips. But you might have something to add here?

MIKE WASH: We've been trying to monitor what other countries are doing. We also visited Canada, in Ottawa and looked at some of their facilities and their capabilities and trying to just see how they've been embracing technology and adapting it to use. So I think, you know, as Mary Alice said that we're

keeping track of it.

The French, the folks in Belgium have been some of the decided, you know, early adopters of technology. And the Canadians have been pretty forward thinking as well.

GWEN SINCLAIR: What about any international organizations like the E.U. or U.N.?

MARY ALICE BAISH: Well I think as some of you know, they are moving all electronic. And that has it's pitfalls, in terms of the authentication of their information. And fortunately the head of the U.N. Library in fact attended our annual meeting in July and came to that AELIC program. I haven't been able to follow up with her, but there's certainly issues when an international group, a nation or a state decides to eliminate print without recognizing the needs for naming the online version official and for ensuring that it's capable of being authenticated.

And I mean again as I said at the

beginning, we're so proud and grateful to the Government Printing Office for taking a national lead in these issues. And in our national summit, in promoting this to groups of judges and legislative information folks, we are using GPO as the best model that we have here anywhere in the United States.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: One more question from Council, and I'd like to at least get one question from the audience.

PETER HEMPHILL: You bet. This is Peter Hemphill. Certainly in authentication and being official, there are different levels in dealing with those situations. Council has been discussing situations where fugitive documents and retrospective collections exist out there in the real world.

We've seen how the ideal world would work in authenticating sources. What about the situations that I just described for retrospective documents? How would you see those being a different level of

authentication or officialness from certified sources.

RIC DAVIS: That's my question. Ric Davis, GPO. A couple people pointed at me, so I guess I better stand up here. I think the levels of authentication question is something that we need to develop more in policy. And speaking, this is a personal perspective, I think that the level of authentication that you would receive from what Mike refers to as "deposited content" where you have an electronic chain of custody coming from a content originator to the Government Printing Office, official, we authentic it, we make it available, might be a little bit different than if you had a, you know, a 1936 hearing that's converted content and you're trying to authentic that. You certainly can't trace the chain of custody back necessarily to the content originator because that person may no longer be with us.

My perspective is we need to probably

reflect that in the metadata and we need to define policy-wise, working with Council and the community, what those levels of authentication mean and develop a policy statement and get it in the metadata when we go forward.

PETER HEMPHILL: Very good, thank you.

SANDRA RIZZO: Sandy Rizzo, from City of Mesa Library in Arizona. This is coming from probably a dumb question area, is it possible to have "an" official version, or does there have be "the" official version? In other words, can't a print and an electronic both be the official version, with print provided for public access if it's preferred, but either of them standing up as viable and trustworthy.

FRANK WAGNER: We think there should be one official version and at the moment that would be the print when at some point in the future it may be the online.

SANDRA RIZZO: But there has to be just one official version?



FRANK WAGNER: Well if there are variances how do you tell which is --

SANDRA RIZZO: Well but I thought if you certified --

FRANK WAGNER: -- you could make a senior official and junior official but --

SANDRA RIZZO: -- that both of them were --

FRANK WAGNER: -- one thing has to be the real deal.

SANDRA RIZZO: Okay, that's the way it works?

FRANK WAGNER: Yeah.

SANDRA RIZZO: That's what I wanted to understand. And then secondly, I think John Shuler's question about publishers really is a valid concern. Because I think while there's no doubt that it's the responsibility of the government to authentic this information, I think there are things that a publisher does, there are errors made. We all know about databases that once they get to the end result

they're very different from print.

And that this may not be an issue with the legal community, but with the public, so that, you know, maybe marketing more to the public that there is an official seal or something, so they know when they're using something that has been gone through a chain with a publisher, that they know that this is official stuff they're dealing with, so that seal of approval thing for the public.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Well and that kind of gets back to a point I made earlier about GPO branding their information with the digital signatures, because our publishers of all types of information go to GPO Access for that information. And once the version, hopefully in my view, the only version that would be available would be that digitally signed, then that is what the publishers will have as well.

SANDRA RIZZO: Okay, thank you.

MARIAN PARKER: This is Marian. Let me also clarify a little, because I was going to

say it earlier when we were talking about commercial publishers printing official state materials. There are two ways that states may publish. One is they may have an in-house publisher, like the federal government has GPO. So everybody recognizes that as official. But many states no longer have in-house publishers of their information. So they hire a commercial publisher to publish their official version of materials.

Then secondarily, we have all those same commercial publishers creating their own versions with their own name on it and putting it out there. And this is what lots of people buy, because that's where they do the added value work that makes it more useful than the raw, official version. So there are commercial publishers printing official materials, but only under the auspices of the government that hires them to do that.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I can take one more.  
Kathy?

KATHY HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. In your key finding number six, you're saying about state libraries "shall coordinate with these agencies." In many states there is no teeth in the code, and that is one thing I think I'd really like to see AALL address, because many of these legislations were created in the 1920's, '30s, '40s, '50s before even the onset of digital publishing.

And that it's only in Pennsylvania, by Governor's mandate, that they even allow us to have this material. And it's by us beating them down at the door in order to get this information. And GPO's going through the same thing by trying to harvest this information. They throw the net out, they not only get the tuna, but they get the beer can too.

So that we need a better system. And I think AALL can help state libraries in order to make the digital publishing part of this, because many agencies publish on it own, they

put versions over versions, there is no official version of a particular state document, because we can't keep track of it all.

MARY ALICE BAISH: Thank you very much, you've just actually summarized everything so perfectly. And that last slide about the model statutes that have been enacted in these nine states, as I mentioned, it's up to the state library, the state archives. It is an unfunded mandate. But certainly these institutions at the state that have that ultimate responsibility for preservation face the same challenges that GPO does, in terms of these official -- you know, there are no -- what are the carrots and what are the sticks.

And I think in all of these states, as Sally said, AALL wants to work with the state documents groups and others. There's so much that need improving, and that's, as you pointed out, one of the important ones.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: I want to thank the

panelists for the an excellent panel. I especially want to thank AALL, Mary Alice for their leadership on this issue. We're back in half an hour.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned)

\* \* \* \* \*

## Tech Services Update at GPO

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, I think we're going to get started.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Okay, I'm Laurie Hall, for those of you who don't know me. I think I've been up here for many, many times in the past 21 years. Yeah, it's been a long time. This session was put together kind of at request from folks from the last conference, previous conferences, on their surveys who wanted a little bit more about the operational things that are going on. They often would read one list-serv, miss a couple list-servs, pick up one little bit of information, what's going on in the day-to-day operation and some of the projects, but really

didn't get a good sense of all of the things that are going on in Tech Services.

And Tech Services at GPO is pretty much like the Tech Services in your libraries, it's classification, acquisitions, cataloging, processing. We have a whole bunch of other things in Tech Services, but it's the same type of operational that is in your library. Things are a little different and we'll talk a little bit more about that.

But these are some of the day-to-day things that are going on. When you come to conference sometimes there's a session that just talks about one project, like the EPA Web Harvesting project. We have probably 47 or 57 projects, plus more, going on at the same time in various parts of the organization. And there's a wide variety of staff that are always back at GPO conducting the regular work. So I wanted to give you an idea of what that operation is and some of the things that we're doing, because I also know there's a lot

of new folks or people who have just come into the depository program, so you've missed the stuff that we announced in January or February.

So I'm just going to give you a little highlight about some of those things. And I apologize for those of you who already know all the things that we're doing and have been in the depository program for a long time. But maybe there are some bits of information that you've missed or need some additional information on.

As well I have lots of staff here that are working on specific projects. So if you need some more information they're here till the end or till noon or whatever today, and I can give you names and stuff too, if you want to go back and email them to ask them specifically about handles or what have you.

Mike Clark supplied us with some copies of a handout called *Anatomy of a Handle*. I put 35 or back in the back, because we were



working till the very last minute on Friday evening getting the Handles webpage up, getting the Test Handles in, the cataloging records. And the list-serv announcement didn't go out till late on Friday. So a lot of people, when you saw the presentation, were going, "What is a Handle?" Lance has some more and Mike put this together, and it's also off the new Handles webpage.

And James isn't here, but Mike is here in the audience, Mike Clark. If you want to talk to him a little bit more about Handles, you know, first day everybody's still a little, you know, sleepy, you know, jet lagged. And so now we're up and available I you want some more information about the Handles webpage. So that's kind of the intention of this presentation.

In the Library of Technical Services organization there is four managers and four units, content acquisitions, and Jeff Horbinski is here to give you a little bit

about what goes on in the acquisitions section. Library Technical Services Support which is Linda Resler. You haven't seen Linda around, she's giving a presentation very similar to this at the New England Technical Services Librarians Meeting in Sturbridge, Massachusetts in October. I was supposed to go to that, but I'm here because we changed our meeting dates. I would have rather been in lovely New England in the fall, but oh well, I'm here.

So then there's Bibliographic Control which is our cataloging organization, and that's Jennifer Davis and she's here in the audience as well. And we've added a new unit to Technical Services, it's Library Services Support, and that's Joe McClane, of course he's in Paris, and not Texas, Paris, France.

But his is a whole new organization where we're looking at all the tools and things we do for you in the depository program, the services and functions and applications that

we build to make library management better for you and for the products that we send out.

So those are the four kind of organizations. And then the total organization, it's about 50 people. You know, some administrative support, etcetera, but that's how big the staff is that's taking care of all the things that are in the FDLP, cataloging and indexing program and some portions of the international exchange and bylaw program. Some of those other programs, if you don't know what they are, we can explain those to you.

Just some basic stats, we had some stats yesterday at the operational forum. But, you know, just to give you an idea of the amount of work that's going on, I wanted to point out the inquiries, because Ric asked, you know, if you're not getting an answer to your inquiry, we've really tried to improve that. But in general, just for FDLP inquiries, from the Ask GPO service, last year we got -- here's the

numbers, we've got about 286 that are in our pending to be worked on. And the statistician that put that together said, "Don't tell them, it's not exact, there's some in different status and things."

So there's about 286 that we're still working. We're here, we're not back home working so that's why there's a few more.

The total number cataloged, I thought it's a very -- I haven't done the calculations from the previous years, but it gives you an idea of the amount of documents and websites, etcetera that we're cataloging. And that's a really significant number to me, because within the last year we've lost three catalogers and one supervisor in cataloging. So we've been down a significant number of staff but those folks are still really dedicated to getting that cataloging out, and their numbers show that. So I think they should be applauded.

Just recently we're in the process of

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

hiring three catalogers and the job for the supervisor has been closed. So any kind of jobs that we have also that go for Technical Services are all sources, and you can go to the GPO website if you're looking for job opportunities at GPO, just a plug.

There's a 1,008 series subject names and corporate authorities that we contribute every year to, BIBCO, NACO, PCC. And there was that big controversy a while ago about creating series LC, but we are still doing government series. So we're continuing to cooperate. So that's a fairly big number of things that we do each year.

I tried to make this into one slide, I think I finally succeeded. In each of the sections there are significant projects that are going on in any given year. For 2007-2008 I'll go over some of those projects in each area. And I just want to make sure you know that's in addition to the day-to-day operation of processing, acquiring, cataloging,

classifying, preparing shipping lists. So we can carry on the regular operations, plus do these additional projects.

We also have cross organizational projects between all those four units in Library Tech Services, plus a lot of projects within Library Services. We work with Janet's area, Ted's area, Robin's area on a wide variety of projects, policies. Plus we also, our staff, is working on all kinds of projects with the FDSys, other GPO organizational projects outside of the organization. So we're a pretty busy little group.

I'm going to give you a run down of some of Linda's projects, since she's not here. These are the ones that are coming up. We're going to be working on authority control in the ILS. We have the whole issue of serials. We did a count not too long ago and we identified approximately 16,000 active serials in the Catalog of Government Pubs. So we've got some major work to do with our serials,

check-in, holdings, that kind of thing.

We have some major database clean up to do in the CGP, that's, you know, ongoing, that will never end. We're going to be rolling out Aleph Version 18, hopefully in the spring. That's a big undertaking for the automation librarians. And then we're working with the FDsys folks to do that integration piece between the ILS and FDsys on metadata exchange. So, you know, that's moving forward.

Just to go over some of the things, that yesterday if you weren't in that session, there's a lot of new features that we add as we go forward with the ILS. All those things are announced on FDLP list-serv messages. Some of you already know about these, but we've added some email, so you can get some more records from the catalog. We have some new searched for the new electronic titles and new titles feature of the CPG. The Z39.50 Access Gateway we hope to open shortly. We've

been doing some work with the Library of Congress to make the GPO item number an attribute so you can go in and search and retrieve. That is being currently tested by the Library of Congress network group. And hopefully once that testing results come back, then we can open that gateway for you to go in and get cataloging records.

And then the new product that we're getting ready to roll out in probably a couple weeks after we leave conference, it's the new Federal Depository Library Directory. There was a demonstration yesterday, if you missed that Patricia Duplantis (phonetic) is here and you can speak to her after, she can do you another little demo. But there'll be a lot more announcements and things that go out on the list-serve.

And that's meant to replace the PDF version of the directory that's currently up on the desktop. And we used to have a database product that died, so that's



replacing that too.

Then in that unit as well, they do the classification, the box processing, the microfiche contracts and answer a lot of your classification questions and problems in that area. So that's a very busy area.

In the cataloging bibliographic control projects, these are some of the things that we've completed this year, or we're in the beginning phases of starting projects to go into the next year. We finished a brief BIBs pilot project to start the workflow of creating acquisitions type records that would be available in the CGP. There is lots of information about that. It's a shortened acquisitions type record that we build on as we go through our processes. We never had those records available before to the community, because we worked in an internal system.

So if we receive something in the processing acquisitions unit, we're not going

to be creating a brief BIB record that will be available to you for whatever purposes. And then we will build on it and add to it to become full or abridged cataloging.

We've spent a good deal of time working with Suzanne Ebanues and Robin, the project manager for the EPA Web Harvesting pilot project on a 300 sample test that we're doing that included making scope determinations, creating preliminary brief records for the EPA material and working with serials in that harvesting project. So that project should be -- the test samples should be finished by the 31st and then we'll results published then.

So it was a really big learning process for all of us. And those records are, there's about what 30 or some, how many? Oh, 100, gosh I was on vacation, a 100 records. And you can search the catalog and pick up those records and see what they look like.

We also, early in the spring, did the CONSER Standard Record Implementation, it's a

standard level, shorter CONSER record that was approved by the members of CONSER. So now we're using that standard. And there was information about that, that was in June.

We also worked with Mike Clark and James Mauldin in Robin's area on the Handles test. Helped, you know, putting those Handles in cataloging records, getting that, helping with the beta testing.

We've also recently entered into an inter-agency agreement with Department of Defense Technical Information Center and Old Dominion University here in Virginia, to do a two year automated metadata extraction project. Last conference this time, Gopi Nair from DTIC, gave a little demonstration about some of that extraction technology. And it took us, now that's been a year, to get the inter-agency agreements signed and we're having our first kickoff meeting tomorrow. So you'll be seeing more information about that project. Our first group of documents that we

plan to send them to build some tools for us are documents from the EPA Web Harvested project. So that's going to be under way.

We had a solicitation out on the street to do a conversion of our historical shelf list which has cataloging, I shouldn't say cataloging, brief information of all the documents that we identified in both the programs, the FDLP and the CNI from about 1880 till 1992 when we shut the shelf list down. And we have a solicitation that we're reviewing the proposals for. We hope to have an aware shortly that will produce brief, brief mark records for that material in that shelf list. And that's all agencies, you know.

There's not a whole lot of information on the cards, but it's enough to start a brief record. And those records will be available in the CPG and some other mechanisms for libraries to get those brief records.

We also, our staff at GPO, we have a

small digitization staff. They're doing a small test project to digitize those shelf list cards to see if -- you know, we have to send those cards eventually to the National Archives. So we want to have a record of those cards. So we're doing a small sample digitization to determine cost, staff, whatever of how long it would take to digitize those cards as the historic record.

We're working on an implementation plan for the separate record approach. We now do cataloging in the single record approach, so all formats are on one record. With the migration to the FDsys, we're going to moving to a separate record approach to cataloging. So each format there will be more bibliographic description of the format, and we're working on an implementation plan, so there'll be more of that coming shortly, more information about how we're going to roll that out, that kind of thing.

And then along with that we continue to

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

do our CONSER, BIBCO, PCC responsibilities. Some of you old folks know, but maybe not new people know that we're a member of all those cooperative arrangements. So I was told at one meeting, "Don't forget to tell -- I didn't know that, what are those groups?" So for the hardcore catalogers, you know what they are, but we're always a member of those and keep our records up to national standards, plus the day-to-day cataloging that goes on.

Jeff is going to give you a little bit more about the acquisitions process. For some of you who don't really know what acquisitions at GPO is about, it's a little different than what goes on in a regular library. These are some of the projects that Jeff is working on. Bob Tapella mentioned the GPO Express, that's one of the cross GPO organizational projects that we have a role in.

So I'll let him go ahead and give you a little bit more rundown about what's going on in the content acquisition section.

JEFF HORBINSKI: Good morning everyone. As Laurie mentioned, I'm Jeff Horbinski, Manager of Content Acquisitions. And in one moment I'll even have my slides.

Those of you who came to the inter-agency presentation might have met me already, or kind of seen a little of what I'm going to talk about this morning. The mission of our acquisitions unit is pretty straight forward. It's identifying, acquiring publications primarily for the depository library program and then also trying to cover things that would be covered in cataloging and indexing, through not distributed to the libraries, by the rules of Title 44.

I note the Superintendent of Documents Policy 301, which is up on the FDLP website, and that is kind of the bread and butter policy that covers how we make some of our acquisitions, decisions, how we decide to distribute things out to the libraries, whether it's tangible, electronic and so

forth.

We have 16 employees total. It's myself, I have 13 acquisition specialists right now and we've got two vacancies which we're working on filling.

And a big thing to know is that we're paraprofessionals. My staff is all paraprofessionals. They're not trained librarians, it's people that have come up through the ranks at GPO, some with significant history in the depository program. And even myself, I'm also not a librarian. I'd like to think I got hired for my charm and good looks, but apparently it's because I have some experience across other business units of GPO. And so nobody's perfect.

But the couple tools that we work with that I wanted to mention, were specifically riders, the Web Harvesting initiatives we have and our work with the CRM, the Ask GPO, the help system and the knowledge base.

For those of you that don't know much



about internal GPO processes, the term rider is really the tool that lets us get all the printed material that you receive in your libraries. What happens is I have one employee right now dedicated to simply reviewing all print orders that come through the main GPO headquarters, as well as quite a few of the regional offices that fax in their requisitions. And Stephanie Daniel, you may have spoken with her in the past, she primarily looks through all of these print orders that come through and reviews whether these things should be in the program in print, whether they should be electronic and she determines the ordering based on that, as far as item number and so forth.

So either she's make kind of a full order of a massive amount of copies to be sent out to the libraries or two copies that simply come in for processing and help us identify things that the agency has told us will be on the web, and kind of that printed copy helps

tip us off that it's out there to go harvest if we haven't found it already or if it hasn't made the news and so forth.

It's become a little difficult with the Rider situation in that as part of GPO's overall printing customer service responsibilities, they've really reduced the time allowed for us to make our Rider determinations from sometimes a day or so, it's down to about two hours. So at times if you're seeing some shortages that come out to the libraries or shortages notated, or you're seeing things delayed that you felt should have come already, sometimes it's been held up in the fact that based on the information we had from the agencies, we couldn't make either the right determination on quantity or a sufficient determination. And so we run into that a bit. And we're really working on trying to improve that response.

In terms of web harvesting, primarily what we're doing still is manual web

harvesting. Either culling through agency websites, publication collections, also lost docs reports are a great way to tip us off to something that's online that we should really have, and we've definitely improved our response rate there. We were working with quite a bit of backlog and just in the last month or so I've reduced that to about where we can really respond to those in about a week and get those assigned out to a specialist to work on.

GPO Express is another source of harvesting. Typically, per month, right now we're running 3 to 400 titles harvested manually. And of those GPO Express usually accounts for about 100. And I'm going to talk a little bit more about that program in a minute.

And finally, the automated harvesting, you've seen some FDLP announcements about what we're doing working with the EPA pilot project and what we've worked with on the harvesting

there. My staff and I did a lot of work in terms of the pilot project helping determine the rules that the harvester worked by. And you know, so the problem has more become now with the volume of things there that need processing, that we're in the process of working on and have worked on in terms of the pilot.

The CRM system and the knowledge base, a lot of people have noted that it was taking a long time to get responses to Ask GPO questions. I know we have improved that response time in the last few weeks. And going forward this year I'm really looking at improving some of the quality of answers you get. So classification questions are going to -- Linda Resler's group and classifying -- but when it comes to tipping us off to a document we should have or something we missed or some other acquisitions, issue, hopefully you're seeing that the quality of the answers has gotten better and will be getting better. And

if you have any problem, definitely bring it to my attention so we can work on that.

GPO Express, you know, the Public Printer mentioned it in his speech on Monday, we started that back in June of '06. I've worked a lot with our customer service team and FedEx/Kinko's who has the contract for the GPO Express program. If you're not too terribly familiar with what it is, the intention was to provide GPO agency customers a convenience printing contract. They were going to Kinko's and other such establishments on the sly, trying to get some printing done that they needed quick, it was short runs and things of that nature. So this convenience printing contract helped bring those items, not only the printing under somewhat of GPO control and the lower rates we can negotiate with Kinko's if we all work together as the government, versus agency by agency, and then also helping bring these titles into the control of the Superintendent of Documents.

And the way we have it set up is that all files that are processed through GPO Express, all those electronic files for printing, are routing through an FTP system to my office, and we review those for inclusion in the program, based on the rules that are out there. You know, I've noted that the volumes are pretty steadily going up. I have a little chart there of all the activity in FY07, starting with October of last year. And you can see that we've had some spikes in certain months, the volume is greatly increased.

And again, we're running about 100 to 100 plus files that are in scope from that program. So it's been pretty successful overall. And the manpower investment is fairly limited, so that's been successful. And Kinko's has been a good partner in making sure that any time we have an issue with something that's gone on, they make sure they send us the files and things.

So what's going on in our office in '08?

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

We're going through a minor reorganization right now. In the past three years now content acquisitions has been split between sales acquisitions for our sales program and acquisitions for the library program. When I came in about two years ago, my predecessor and I really looked at it and said, "Boy, this just isn't working. The processes are just completely different. We need to divest these functions back to the way it used to be," kind of a back to the future kind of a thing here.

And the end of September, the last bit of sales work has been transitioned out and right now we're still doing a little support but no longer doing the day-to-day sales acquisitions. So right now it's a lot of retraining, taking some people that have been sales specialists for 20 plus years and getting them to think class number versus stock numbers. So a little bit of work is going on there.

And we're looking to add two acquisitions

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO

librarian positions this year to really help in implementing the ILS system, the acquisitions module, to assist in answering some more in depth acquisitions questions that come in from you all, helping determine some of those superceded items and such. So we look forward to adding those on and right now it's working through the extremely government oriented personnel process.

We are definitely looking forward to implementing the acquisitions module, the ILS. The mainframe that we use is thorough, but definitely out of date. And we face a couple barriers in terms of the receipt functions that our mainframe has just haven't been replicated in the ILS yet, so we're looking at really standing that up and helping us out. We are currently using the ILS module to do the brief bibliographic records that Laurie mentioned. A lot of titles that we hold in what we call our "gray bins" which is things that either come through the main or copies we



order just processing copies, of we're starting in the next few weeks here to get those items entered in brief records so that this stuff is visible to you and you know we've gotten in long before you used to and in volumes that you just weren't able to know about before, 'cause the records were locked in our mainframe and they weren't visible to you until a full cataloging was done before.

And we're continuing to work with the automated harvesting results, the files that came out of that. And looking how we can utilize the tool best going forward. And as I somewhat mentioned before, improving that CMR service level, better answer more timely, that's the goal.

So if you have any questions for me I think we'll wait till Laurie's all finished, but I'm happy to take those. My email and phone number are there also, and call late, call me at home. Thank you.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: I just wanted to

mention one thing that Jeff didn't mention, 'cause he probably just doesn't even think these things anymore, because he's so used to it. One of the big benefits, even though we're not getting a whole lot of stuff from the GPO Express, is we're getting a lot of stuff from the regional offices. We're getting a significant portion from FEMA from Kansas City. Is it Kansas City? There's a couple of offices that we're getting more regional material from than we were in the past.

So even though the numbers are small we're getting a wide variety of things that we didn't know about before. So I think that -- along with PowerPoint demonstrations and things like that. Also, another thing I wanted to point out, the current web harvesting that we're doing, manual, automated, working with the EPA pilot project, is kind of a split project. Jeff's area is doing some work, Jennifer's area,

Bibliographic Control, is doing some work, Robin's area, James Mauldin are doing some work. The web harvesting activity that we're doing now, before the FDsys and you know, in the interim as we're working on the pilot is worked across organizational team working together. So web harvesting is not all done in one unit, just so to clarify that.

One thing that Jeff didn't mention that I think is really important that his group does is his group does lots of agency contacts. They go and talk to a lot of agencies. And if you've seen lots of things coming through FDLP about a title that's no longer in paper, it's going to electronic, Jeff's group is out talking, along with the customer service (inaudible) talking to these agencies about publications that go to electronic only, what are their plans. So he's really on the forefront of trying to identify things and big titles, not so significant titles that are changing.

So he has a really good contact with a lot of the agency publishing and talking about the benefits of permanent public access, etcetera. So a lot of the stuff that you'll see coming through the list-serv about particular products, we're first to find out and then we contact them and talk to them more about the program. Some of them don't know that much about the program. There's new people in the government, there's a lot of turnover. So we're always on that stump going out talking to the agencies.

This is the new organization that I was talking to you about that's headed up by Joe McClane. And right now Joe McClane is the organization. He is getting help on some of the projects from Library Planning and other areas, but right now he does not have any staff except himself. So we're talking about future project, he's looking at, you know, what his organizational structure will be, the type of skill level we need for his area. So

there will probably be some additional hires in that area as well.

And some of the projects that Joe has already started to work on, and we mentioned this yesterday in I think it was the Operational Forum, about the superceded substitution project. We want to take that to the next level to update that to come up with a new mechanism for providing that information. We still have the static PDF pages, which are really awful.

So Joe's on that, he's starting to do some planning. So I think there's some other room for discussion on how we're going to ask the community to help us. So if you have any thoughts on that, Joe is back from Paris next week.

We also do not have a home for the Ask GPO administration. It's kind of another one of those services and functionality that is spread across all of the organization and library services and context management. But

we've decided since that's a critical piece, that that will be housed in Joe's area. So as his organization grows he will be the main point of contact or the place where that is managed. He's also, I know there's lots of discussion about the item numbers, Joe has undertaken an analysis of our Legacy system called DDIS, which I talk about a lot, it's the Depository Distribution Information System, it's a 1982, I said '82, technology that continually has gotten passed by through all kinds of different system migrations.

You know, the library part is not that important to the rest of GPO. We know how critical that is. Joe has taken that on to start doing a thorough analysis of that current software that we have to try to get it on a more stable platform, and then start working on the new requirements for that system. So you'll be seeing more about that. He's in the preliminary stages of doing that investigation. That has been a hard piece

because since 1982 a lot of people are not around GPO anymore and there's been a lot of hard digging to find out information about that system that we really rely on it. It's a critical piece of our FDLP infrastructure.

He's also working with the planning area and web content on the Webtech Notes migration, the next generation of database for the Webtech notes.

I've kind of said this already, but we work within our own organization, all the four units to get this workflow. That's going to be a big deal for us, bring in ILS. We're doing a lot of changes in our workflow. One thing I forgot to mention is we're looking at the whole workflow with OCLC and how we're going to continue to send information to OCLC, cataloging records to OCLC. So there's a lot of changes that are going to be going on in the workflow.

You'll see a lot of these things we will report to you through the list-serv messages.

A lot of things you won't know about, but there's a lot of things going on behinds the scenes that may not directly impact you.

We also work with the planning area. The planning area is providing us support on a lot of these projects that we've talked about, either analytical support or, you know, writing documents, process procedure, workflow. And then as a whole I've listed some of the other projects that our staff is also involved in. And, you know, these are major, major projects that, you know, take our staff out of operation to work on other things for the agency.

One of the big ones that Jeff is just starting now is the Oracle Enterprise project. We have representatives from our area working on that project with the rest of GPO, because it does have major touch points with our organization, just as the FDsys. So we're a lot of busy beavers.

Here's our contact information. I know

[www.CapitalReportingCompany.com](http://www.CapitalReportingCompany.com)

(866) 448 - DEPO



there was some concern that our names are not up there. My name's pretty easy, L. Hall, how hard could that be. Of course there was another L. Hall at GPO so I was getting a lot of email about supplies and printing supplies at one time. But he's retired.

But if you really don't know who to contact, the main number, 512-1114, 202 comes right in to me, and I can pretty well get it out to whoever can help you with your question. We like to use the Ask GPO service, but sometimes people just need to talk to somebody, so feel free to use that number if you're not sure where your question goes and who can answer that.

So that's kind of just the overview. The organization itself is changing, we're doing a lot of tweaking, moving staff around. So there are people that used to be in one part of the organization that are now in the other parts of the organization. It's pretty seamless to you, but there's a lot of stuff

going on in the organization, in Library Services/Content Management as a whole as we kind of rework our projects and what we need to accomplish.

So thank you for allowing me to speak to you today. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask. And there's lots of people in the audience who can answer some of those questions as well. And, you know, I will take questions on really minute issues like shipping lists and microfiche contracts or some things like that. I'm not afraid to answer those questions, or try to.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Does Council have any questions?

GWEN SINCLAIR: I have a question. This is Gwen Sinclair. Laurie you mentioned that Joe McClane is going to be taking on the item selection Legacy system, trying to figure out what to do with it. I don't have a really good grasp on why that system is such a horrible bugaboo that just seems to be a

problem that has been worked on and worked on and hasn't been resolved. So can you encapsulate the problems that system or is there an administrative notes article that explains in detail what it is?

LAURIE BEYER HILL: No, it's a very, very simple database. I mean it was built in 1982, so it's very simple. It's just never been a critical -- we always were like the third level of project. We'll get around to doing that. So, you know, we've always known in Library Services that it needs to be moved to another platform, whatever, but we're always on someone else's schedule, the rest of GPO, the IT schedule at GPO. We don't have IT in Library Services, we're on the rest of the IT schedule for GPO. So we're always like last priority.

So the first thing to do is try to get the platform stable, to move it off the 1982 technology where we only have one person at GPO who knows how to program, work with the

program, and move it to a more stable platform.

It's relatively simple data, it's not complex. It's just an integral piece of our entire operation. So it runs the lighted bins, it keeps your profiles. So shutting it down is not as easy a process, it's a very complex thing to do because of all of the tentacles that it has out to our operation and our workflow. So we had to undertake it, so we're starting that now.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay, so what kind of analysis is Joe going to be doing?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Joe is basically doing just a top to bottom analysis of what exists. And that's not as easy as it sounds, because there are very few people and a lot of the documentation is very old. So what the system does, what it links to, where its interactions are, what its impacts are. So that actually is pretty well completed.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay. So do you feel

that this is something that's underway or does Council need to take any action to help expedite things?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: It's underway. The next piece is to develop what we really want, what's the next generation. And I think that the discussion of item numbers, distribution mechanisms I think will come into play with that. So I think there will be room for that. I think that's the next step in those white papers that were done, what a year ago now.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay, thank you.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne. Laurie, I have a question about the BIB records. I know there was a lot of misunderstanding on the community's part as thinking that these would be records that would be distributed in place of full records. But I think now most understand that they are processing records. You made the comment though that we would be able to use them if there was a way we wanted to.

Will these records be associated with shipping lists? And is there a way then that we could be able to load these records as brief records when we receive items and then have them overlaid later by the full records?

LAURE BEYER HALL: Yeah, we haven't planned on that yet because we actually have not fully implemented using brief BIBs. We've only did that little test group. Now Jeff's area is getting involved in teaching his staff how to create these brief BIBs. It's part of the whole workflow process of, in the old systems, where the shipping list information is down the line. So it's one of the things we want to work on, where do bits and pieces of information come into play through the process and where we add them and who adds them back in.

So I think I understand what you -- you want those records to be built on a little bit more down the line. We haven't worked that all out yet. But that's part of that

integration piece with the ILS and where the ILS will hold certain information that used to be in our Legacy system.

TIM BYRNE: I have another question about the pre '76 shelf list digitization. So you have an (inaudible) for turning the shelf list into mark like records.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Correct.

TIM BYRNE: And then you're also talking about digitizing it in-house so that --

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Yeah, we're just doing a small test of like 11 draws, with our little unit down there to see what the implications are. Once it goes off to the archives we don't have access to those cards anymore. And we really felt we needed to have some kind of version of those cards in our custody so if we had to do any kind of research or reconciliation we could go back to those cards and just pick them up.

TIM BYRNE: Well Carrollton Press filmed the GPO shelf list when they were creating the

Kingleader Title Index (phonetic). Do you have that --

LAURIE BEYER HALL: I think we copies of the film. We have copies of some of the fiche. I think I know what cabinet it's in.

VICTORIA TROTTA: Victoria Trotta, I have two questions. One is short and one is a little bit longer. My first question has to do with whether or not GPO is considering discontinuing of certain authority control functions that the Library of Congress has recently announced that they're going to --

LAURIE BEYER HALL: No. That was announced in the spring. They stopped series, but we didn't, because government series are really important. They're one of -- you know, so no we haven't stopped contributing any authority records for anything.

VICTORIA TROTTA: Great. And my second question is I was wondering if you could give a little more elaboration on the integration of the ILS into the FDsys in terms of what the



user will see in terms of services, because I'm still a little unclear in my brain.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Gil, do you want to -  
- where's Gil, is Gil here? Come on Gil.  
Okay, here comes Kate.

KATE ZWAARD: Kate Zwaard, GPO. So when the ILS is integrated in FDsys we'll share bibliographic metadata so that bibliographic metadata from the ILS will be in FDsys, so you'll be able to see it from the Access screens. And also, as a new item comes into FDsys a preliminary acquisitions record will be created in the ILS so that can be the basis for the start of cataloging.

So that users will have two entry points for government information. They can go through the CPG and find government information that way or they can go through the FDsys for stuff that we have in the --

LAURIE BEYER HALL: And that's our preliminary discussions. We're constantly meeting, so I think that vision and stuff will

evolve as we get more into the testing of the integration.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the Federal Reserve Bank in St. Louis. Can you expand a little more on what's going to happen with the OCLC work that you do and the ILS. You have a little blurb there.

LAURIE BEYER HILL: Right. Right now we catalog directly into OCLC. We've been doing that since July, 1976. We're going to continue to catalog directly into OCLC because we're a CONSER member, so that's our responsibility to do that.

The issue that we're dealing with now is whether to, you know, catalog how much in OCLC or do it in our ILS and batch load records to OCLC and which things we're going to do that. So we're getting ready to profile with the OCLC to do some batch load testing to see a.) how long it takes, how much it costs, what are the staffing implications, what the workflow implications are.

So we're not sure if we're going to have a split processing, you know, some in our ILS. We know for certain that we cannot maintain two databases. So we're very conscientious about that, trying to figure out where our staff resources will go, mostly for the CGP.

So we're just in that beginning process of figuring out how our workflow will be integrated by the integration of the ILS. And you know, the issues of timeliness, how long it takes, how often will we batch load, what happens when our stuff goes. Because we're an enhanced library, there's not too many libraries that are enhanced library, LC is one. We can change anybody's record in OCLC expect LC's. So there's some of those issues of overlay back into our system as well that we have to work out.

JEANNETTE COX: My name is Jeannette Cox from Florida A&M University, and I have an issue that I believe I wrote to you or emailed you over a year ago. And it is the issue that

we have hundreds, possibly thousands of microfiche that have the call number ED3.10/2: and we keep getting something ILL requests or requests for them because they are found in OCLC. But in OCLC the records do not have a cutter. The call number is just the stem.

So here you have, who knows, thousands of records, some of them are serials titles, some of them are monographs and they all have the same stem. And I think you asked me how many cabinets did I have, and I went and we did a count of how many drawers, you know, regular microfiche cabinets. And I think I told you the number, you said, "Whoa. I need to get somebody to look into this." And --

FEMALE VOICE: It's the Eric Fiche.

JEANNETTE COX: Right, it's the Eric Microfiche.

MALE VOICE: Yeah.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: They're shaking their heads so they both know about it. But I thought we classified the Eric Microfiche

after the colon with that long number, that sequential number.

MALE VOICE: Right.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: So I know that the serials do not have that sequential number after the stem, but the monographs, Jennifer, would have had that number. So I don't know how old the fiche is, so talk to Jennifer who's right in front of you. Right there.

JEANNETTE COX: All right.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: So she can maybe help you to figure out what your problem is.

BARBARA MILLER: Barbara Miller, Oklahoma State. Laurie, I may be messed up on this but a year ago when DTIC came and talked to us, they were talking about -- or Judy was talking about working on a project to get some full text of records before DTIC sent them to NTIS, things that were not full text, you know, that were up on their website or there were just citations. And I know you're working on a metadata project with them, and I know NTIS

now has the darts that we have access to those full text.

But I haven't heard anything about the DTIC. Is that my imagination?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Does anybody remember any of that?

BARBARA MILLER: Is Cindy here?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Is Cindy here?

MALE VOICE: No, she's in another session.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: We'll ask her.

BARBARA MILLER: Okay.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: So it was -- you know Cindy, so --

BARBARA MILLER: All right.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: -- I'll tell her you're looking for her.

ARLENE CLAIR: Arlene Clair, University of Maryland. I'll let you finish writing.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: No, no, no go ahead.

ARLENE CLAIR: Let's go back to the OCLC test. Has OCLC indicated to you under how

they're going to be regarding GPO? Will they be regarding you with national library overlay rules?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: I don't know. We haven't profiled with them, we've gotten some information from them, we're ready to go talk to them in the next week or two, because there's some specifications we're not sure of. So that's our hope, because we're a little concerned financially that we're going to be losing credits, so we want to make sure it's a good deal.

ARLENE CLAIR: Yeah, and from my standpoint, I'd also be interested in making sure that what is happening to the Library of Congress records doesn't start happening to your records. And what happens to the Library of Congress is OCLC matching algorithms do not always load in the Library of Congress records. Sometimes they just pull in the call number, and that's it, if there's an existing record in the system.

LAURIE BEYEVER HALL: Okay, thanks. I'll make sure I ask Ann about that. Hey, Jennifer.

JENNIFER MCMULLEN: Hi. Jennifer McMullen, College of Worcester. There's a question that's been in my mind the past couple of years, but it didn't really rise to the surface until this summer when I was working on a project that brought it to mind again. Given the number of digitization projects that are going on out in the field, is there any thought at GPO, any plans in place for working with those libraries, once those digitized versions are available, to put in Pearls or now Handles in the record so that people's systems can be updated or we at least have some permanent access point for it.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Robin, that's really more your area, or half your area and half mine. Sorry.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: I'll take my half.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: I owe you.



ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: One of the things that hasn't come up is the registered digitization projects that we put up. And it started to go real well and then PML stole all the good folks that were helping us with that project. So Jim Mauldin (phonetic) is almost ready to roll it again so that it's easier and it works better and is more visible.

As far as partnering is the solution here, I think Ric's point this morning about authentication is still something that has to be resolved. Materials that are digitized at GPO or that come through the (inaudible) digital process have a different authentication level maybe than the partner projects. But that is a way that we know we have to go.

A famous man said a couple years ago we would have 70 percent of all federal publications digitized by December of 2007, that was another one of my projects.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Where are you on

that Robin?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Not gonna happen. The answer is to partner. And we have some specs that we have out there. But we also know that folks want access to these materials, and sometimes they're not to preservation specs, but access derivative specs and I think all of our partnerships right now for digital products are at that level. So that's the direction and approach we're going to take. Over to you for Handles and Pearls.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: I hate to go and add Pearls to all those records, but you know, until we get the part of the FDsys where the Handles actually can be automatically generated, which I'm hoping for, we would work with -- that would be part of the memorandum of understanding or the partnership of just what GPO would do. So if there's cataloguing records then we would go in and do the Pearls or subsequent Handles. So that would all be

part of the details of the partnership arrangement.

JENNIFER MCMULLEN: And would that apply also to those who maybe aren't officially registered as partners? Because I think some of these, like the World War II databases at Northwestern and UNT were set up before the partnerships. I may be wrong on that. But there may be some projects that were started before the partnerships, and I'm wondering if there's plans some day --

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Yeah, well that's all --

JENNIFER MCMULLEN: -- way in the future.

LAURIE BEYEVER HALL: See all the projects that went before the official partnerships, there was not a lot of detail about the staffing implications and our ability to actually execute. And I really shouldn't have said that. But now that the partnerships are in place, the new ones, it's much more detailed as to what our

responsibility is, what the partner responsibility is. And therefore then we can staff them and determine the workload implications for doing such a project. I mean it's always on our --

JENNIFER MCMULLEN: So it'll be like this for a while. Okay.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: -- mind. Yeah, it's on our mind to do those, it's just the staffing and workload implications --

JENNIFER MCMULLEN: All right, thank you.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: -- depending how big it is.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: And can I add to that, actually I know for the Fraiser materials, you guys have been adding them to the CGP. And you have, I think you're just putting in plain 856 with a link to our site and some sort of disclaimer or whatever it, "This also available at blah, blah." At least for our stuff I know you have been doing that work.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Hi John.

JOHN STEVENSON: Hi, John Stevenson, University of Delaware. I thought it was really quite exciting to hear about the results of the GPO Express. I mean those are very encouraging numbers. And I wondered if the titles coming into the FDLP through that means were coming in as PDFs or as some other format.

JEFF HORBINSKI: Yeah, our requirement with Kinko's is that they supply us that in PDF, which besides the obvious formatting reasons, that's the predominant prepress format now in printing, is PDF anyways, so it's pretty straight forward. And if the agency customer is bringing in hardcopy, we require Kinko's to scan it and make it PDF. The few issues we've run into is more where it's a really thick document, multipart and we get one file for chapter one, one file for table of contents, on and on and on. And those we send back to them and make sure that

they convert it into one composite PDF that we can work with. So that's the way we've proceeded there.

JOHN STEVENSON: Thanks. And if I could ask answer question, I think that the implementation of the separate record approach, you know, it's been on the horizon for a while and it's pretty exciting stuff. But I wondered, because of the complexities involved, if you would be using the current list of classes or if you anticipate sort of waiting until you have more revisions to the list of classes to make that, you know, granularity. I want to have electronic or I want to have some electronic and some paper.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Actually I haven't thought about that. The implementation planning is done in Jennifer's area and I haven't seen their draft report yet. So if you want to talk with Jennifer about what they've put in there, their implementation plan. I'm sorry, I don't know, we've just

talked about it at high level, but that's a good point.

JOHN STEVENSON: Okay. Thank you.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Thank you, John.

Ginny? Sorry, were you going to address the DIDAS one a little? This is Ginny Wiese, she's actually working with Joe McClane on the DIDAS systems evaluation.

GINNY WIESE: What I was just going to add, I don't know if this is on, I guess now, what I was just going to add is that one of the challenges with DIDAS is is that as Laurie said, it shares information with so many other systems. So if you change DIDAS you've got to be able to change Access which maintains all the class numbers. It's got to change the lighted bin system which is a very, very, very expensive system that just to replace one piece costs thousands and thousands of dollars, you know.

So unfortunately it's like you can't -- when we go to create a class number, we

validate that against DIDAS so that you don't end up getting trashed. We don't let someone create a new stem, it's got to be in that system, you know, to create this consistency and this accuracy of data across systems. So that's the challenge. You can't touch DIDAS without touching several -- it's the heart of several other systems. And unfortunately all those other systems are also in transition and in development.

So it's hard. You're standing on one foot trying to figure out where to put the other one. You know, with monies and with priorities and with how you're going to accommodate it. So it's, you know, as Laurie said, it's just very intricate, but also very challenging because of all these other -- it's the heart of so many other systems. So that's what that change is up against, you know, all how to relationships in the future of all of that. So that's where the challenge is.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Thank you.



GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, I have another question. I don't have a sense of the correspondence between the shelf list and the catalog of government publications. I assume it's not 100 percent.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Correct. And actually the shelf list is a combination -- George can tell us a little bit more about that, because -- but it's a combination of the dictionary catalog that was at GPO in the early years and the shelf list. And the cards were used to create the monthly catalog, but there has been no analysis between what's in the paper versions of the monthly catalog versus what's actually in the shelf list. Did I get that right, George?

GEORGE: No, not exactly.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Oh.

GEORGE: Close, very close, very close, closer than it used to be. Well we've spent a lot of time digging into this because, you know, we found this gigundus file of cards and

didn't really know. I mean the technicians knew how to use it, but nobody really knew exactly what was in it. Shelf list is, as a description of this big file of cards, is a little bit of a euphemism. It's not a shelf list in the way that we think of shelf lists in the library as being the sort of surrogate in the same order as things on the shelf. That's not what it did.

We assume that there was some kind of shelf list in the old public documents library, when we had a collection of stuff to sit on shelves. We haven't had that since the '70s or '80s. And we don't know about the shelf list.

When we say the shelf list, it's really the classification shelf list. So it's the file that was used to keep track of the assignment of class numbers. And what, as best we can tell and Cindy also can probably - - Cindy's not here. Cindy can back me up on this because she's looked at it too. What

we've verified is that what's in it is the classes that were active at the time that we discontinued using it.

So if there were older things that were inactives or were in some other way not in use, and not referred to on a current card, they went away. So it has lots and lots of limitations.

And Laurie and I are really excited about the idea that we're going to be able to turn it into something besides all these tens of thousands of cards, but I'm reluctant to even talk about it out loud, because we don't want to raise expectations about what it's really good for. What it's really good for is verifying class numbers going back. And then the kind of information that the classifiers wrote on the cards with a pencil or, you know, took out and typed on, the kind of add-on information that shelf lists always have and that we've had a way of losing in retrospective conversions sometimes. So it

really is more about classification than it is about anything else.

And there are a lot of cases where it's not going to tell us anything at all about individual publications. So converting those into BIB records, they're going to be very, very skeletal.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay, so what I hear you saying is that there are likely to be some significant gaps.

GEORGE: Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah absolutely. Yeah, it's not going to revolutionize our lives.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Right, it's going to make it worse.

GEORGE: It's going to be a help for people that are doing pre '76 retro projects, just as a benchmark. But it's not going to be anything like comprehensive.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Right, but we couldn't --

GEORGE: And it's a shame.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: -- decide where to start.

GEORGE: Yeah.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: So we just decided we might as well start it.

GEORGE: Right. There was, and we think there still is in existence somewhere, a dictionary, a catalog of the old public documents library, but that isn't this. The National Archives, it's probably (inaudible).

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Sandy.

SANDY MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I stepped out a minute so I apologize if this a repeat. Is DIDAS and Access, the things Jenny was just talking about, are they not going to be integrated either into the ILS or FDsys?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Those are the major questions. Some part --

SANDY MCANINCH: So that's what you're trying to decide?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: -- right. We're

trying to decide --

SANDY MCANINCH: Okay, okay.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: -- which pieces can easily integrate into the ILS and which pieces cannot. And if they cannot where else do they go or do we have to develop a new application or a new database or whatever to interface with those. So it's like this can go, this can't, how do we accommodate that, do we still need it, so it's that kind of integration work.

SANDY MCANINCH: Okay. One other question. Are you going to upload to OCLC these skeletal records that you get from --

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Initially the brief BIBs, the only thing that's brief BIB for the formats that are not distributed, so if we've got an electronic version and a paper version, but the electronic is the version that gets the item number. There's also a brief BIB for a record that does not get disseminated, so that's a representation in the situation, a

paper version, it could be something else.

The paper record brief does not go, it stays in the ILS, because we don't further catalog that. We're only doing further cataloging on the versions that we've disseminated or distributed.

SANDY MCANINCH: What about the shelf list pre '76 conversion records?

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Well once we go through the project and see what we get, and then we'll decide, because they may not be worth sending. But they will be available in the CGP in probably a separate library, so that you can go in and take a look at those. Like George said, some of them have significant bibliographic information, some of them have minimal. Hi Michelle.

MICHELE MCKNELLY: Michele McKnelly. I was always interested when you procured Aleph about the SFX Metalib (phonetic) procurements that came along with that. And having been working on that rather intensively at my own

institution now for a couple years, my interest is even greater.

The other part of that question is, having worked with the FSX, which is an open URL link resolver, it's the brand name, I was curious about your online serials check-in that you're planning within the Aleph. And for those of us who don't know, what is an Aleph 18.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Yeah, Patricia can -- did Patricia already leave? Patricia, do you want to address what's in Aleph 18.

PATRICIA: (inaudible).

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Yeah, the few slides you had yesterday. And then the other thing about Metalib, as I remember, Linda said we've loaded Metalib Version 4 to the test server.

PATRICIA: No, to its own server.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: To its own server. Okay, so we're starting that process.

PATRICIA: (inaudible).

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Not yet.



PATRICIA: No. One of the things with our FSX implementation is that we're never going to get down to an article level. So we're still trying to make determinations on what targets we're going to actually implement. But we're extremely limited staff and our priority right now is bringing up Version 18.

I only mentioned a few -- oh, sorry. I only mentioned a couple of enhancements that may affect the CGP. One is that they have a feature that now integrates into one menu the browse and the regular search mechanisms. In our advanced search currently we have that functionality, but we had to borrow a script from a library who borrowed it from another library. And we used it as a work around method.

And we lost some functionality within the system when we made that choice. So now that it's an actual enhancement to Version 18 we no longer need to use the work around. So we're

going to explore some options about potentially making our advanced search by reinstating some of the services we lost by using the script that allowed that integration.

The other two enhancements that we mentioned about Version 18 was about authorities. GPO hasn't really implemented much of the authorities in Version 16, but we plan to in 18. And Aleph, actually Bruce identified two problems with authorities within Version 16 and 17 that they corrected in 18, one of which was if you had a 100 authority, and the 150 and they were the same thing, the system didn't make any distinction between them and it would automatically replace one heading with the other in error.

This system now has a mechanism to inform you of that prior to doing that. So when we do our serial, not our serial, our authority implementation we're definitely going to pay attention to that.

And the other was about bibliographic tags, they corrected something with that. As far as things that we're going to be implementing in 18, we just literally had it loaded on our test server. We really haven't had a chance to play with it and see what it can do. We are going to investigate some enhancement options once we really get to look at the system. And we'll keep you all informed, via the list-servs once we know what we're going to be doing.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: The question about the serials, we have only started checking in a very minimal amount of serials.

MICHELLE MCNEELY: Well my question has to come with the level of effort and the duplication, because I mean you do get some of this access through the open URL link resolver. And you can put that information into that format into that also, and then I believe you can put a link within your Aleph straight into it, and the ability to maintain

these two systems separately, you know.

Also some of the information that's out there is already in the knowledge base, so it preexists and, you know, you can adjust it. You can also enhance that knowledge base for other, you know, libraries that have this to use. And I think that, you know, many of the vendors pull from the same sources for those things.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Okay. Anybody else?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Other questions? Council? Audience? Well I want to thank Laurie very much.

LAURIE BEYER HALL: Thank you. And like I said, we're all around here so if you want to grab anybody to ask any more questions, feel free.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: A couple notes as you're going out the door. If you signed up for the ALA Advocacy Session today, travel directions are on the handout table. Also just one note before you head off to lunch,

there were 74 first time attendees this conference.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned)

\* \* \* \* \*

Council Plenary Session: Regionals at  
Crossroads

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, I think we're going to get started. I want to welcome you to a session on *Regionals at the Crossroads*. And you'll notice that council is not up on the dias, just regional librarians. So, and I'm about to leave, so you'll get to actually hear some really interesting stuff. A couple things I ought to take care of before we start the program. Just to remind folks to pick up your continuing education units at the registration desk, and to turn in your evaluations.

I also want to read a letter that was received earlier today from Anna Sylvan, the librarian at the library that won the Library of the Year Award. I'll just go ahead and

read that, and then I want to let Rick say a few words. And I should have gotten glasses. Okay.

"Dear friends and colleagues: Thank you very much for the congratulatory notes that have been pouring in since the GPO's news release was officially posted on their website. It is a very humbling experience to be singled out from such an esteemed group of colleagues, people who I have been admiring and respecting for years. Also, my sincere thanks to those who nominated the Middendorf-Kredell Library for the Library of the Year Award; I truly appreciate your recognition of our dedication and hard work.

On a personal note, it is a great honor to have received this award for our library. I only wish I could have attended the ceremony myself, my back has not been cooperating with me lately. Many thanks, Anna Sylvan." I think that's absolutely wonderful. Anna is one of my heroes among the selectives in my

state, and I'd like just to give her a round of applause. Rick, did you want to say something?

RICK DAVIS: Rick Davis, GPO. While we're here at conference, work, of course, doesn't stop for any of us or anyone in Washington. While we've been here, we have received a letter from two senators from Oregon requesting the designation of Oregon State as a regional library, and we will be processing that when we get back. So a round of applause.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, now I'm going to turn everything over to Tim Byrne.

TIM BYRNE: Last spring, GPO issued its draft guidelines on chair at regionals, and it elicited more letters than probably any other thing GPO has done. So there is a lot of interest in regionals and the problems faced by regionals, and that's the reason why we're having this session today, and why it's a plenary session, and we don't have any

competition for it. I'm just going to turn it over to David, who sort of put the whole thing together.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: My function up here is going to be to give you a five minute whirlwind history of regional depositories, then to give you another five or so minute summation of what I believe to be the challenges facing regionals today, and then to talk a little bit about California.

This year marks the 45th anniversary of the 1962 Depository Library Act. With the possible exception of the 1993 GPO Electronic Enhancement Act, this 1962 legislation is the most significant revision to date of the Printing Act of 1895. Can you all hear me? I can't tell up here.

Until the 1962 Act, the FDLP had no regional depositories. To understand why regionals were established, it's necessary to remember some ancient history.



If one considers only physical collections, it would be fair to say that before 1923, every depository was, in essence, a regional, because before 1923 there was no item selection mechanism. Every depository received every publication distributed by GPO. After item selection was initiated in 1923, most depositories became selective, although a few research libraries continued to be full depositories.

Another ancient bit of history is that from the start of the FDLP as we know it, in 1895, until 1962, there was no means by which any depository could discard any unwanted publications. Except for superseded titles, every depository, no matter how small, was required by law to retain selected depository materials forever.

To prepare for this panel, I read transcripts of the hearings conducted by the Senate, as well as House and Senate reports on the bill that became the 1962 Depository

Library Act. I did this to determine first of all the depository situation at the time, as described by various witnesses who appeared before the Senate committee hearing the bill, and also to gauge congressional intent and expectations.

The 1962 bill was designed to fix numerous depository problems. The primary foci of the bill were two; to greatly expand depository membership by allowing congress members to designate two depositories for each district instead of only one, which had been the case, and to allow libraries in executive and independent agencies of the federal government to become depositories. And the second major purpose was to legally mandate that GPO distribute to depositories documents printed outside of the GPO.

However, because there had never been a mechanism for disposal of unwanted publications, there'd been increasing pressure put upon Congress, and upon GPO, by

depositories for relief from permanent archiving. The establishment of regionals was deemed to be the solution, and was thus part of the 1962 bill.

It's obvious, reading the hearing testimony and the committee reports for the '62 bill that the overriding purpose of the establishment of regionals was two-fold. First, to allow non-research depositories to withdraw unwanted publications after holding them for five years, safe in the knowledge that their regional would still have those publications should they ever be needed again. And secondly, to prevent smaller depositories from being reluctant to select certain publications because of the permanent retention requirement, or from relinquishing depository status altogether simply because they couldn't house the massive numbers of publications that had built up over time.

Now, most of us know the responsibilities of regionals that were written into the 1962

law. What I suspect most of us do not know are three expectations that Congress had at the time about how the regional structure would play out, expectations and assumptions that are revealed in the House and Senate reports for the bill.

Number one: there was an assumption by congress that every state would have a regional. Number two: there was an assumption that most states would have one regional, with the proviso that California, and California was explicitly named, that California and other large states covering large populations and geographical areas, "could well justify," two regionals. And the third, perhaps most interestingly, to me anyway, there is this statement in the House report: that a regional "should preferably be at the state library," presumably because of the traditional role that state libraries have had in supporting library services in their states.

Now, all three of these intentions proved overly rosy, particularly the last. Today there are 52 regionals. Of those, only 14 are state library regionals, 27 percent of the total. Most of the rest are university libraries, an eventuality that has resulted in some interesting 2007 challenges.

Library literature today is replete with analyses of how libraries are changing from gatekeepers of information bound to a physical location, to organizers and facilitators of electronic information discovery and delivery, information that is not physically bound.

When the regional library model was launched in 1962, government information was disseminated almost entirely in print, and was distributed to a broad network of geographically dispersed depositories. In 1962, research libraries, and even non-research libraries, measured their institutional importance and prestige by the

number of physical volumes in their collections.

In 1962, the interlibrary loan was slow, requiring laborious look-ups in the print national union catalog, and transmission of requests via hand-typed and mailed paper ALA ILL forms. In 1962, photocopying was expensive. Researchers hand-wrote notes and citations on 3 by 5 cards. And in 1962, electronic document delivery was the stuff of science fiction.

Today, as more government and non-government information has become available directly at office and dorm desktops, library administrators have mandated reductions in the size of physical collections, and have sharply reduced the purchase of new tangible materials. During the process of repurposing library space formerly devoted to physical collections, many library administrators, especially in academic libraries, have adopted the following set of beliefs.

Number one: reductions in existing physical collections in newer tangible materials will increase. Number two: library buildings will become increasingly information commons devoted to electronic information retrieval and social networking. Number three: library visits for pure research and library transactions will become increasingly virtual. Number four: government documents reference should merge with general reference, and separate document department offices abolished. Number five: large collections of legacy tangible materials, seldom consulted, should either be digitized and then stored far, far away, not digitized and just moved far, far away, or just discarded since these materials take up space coveted for computer work stations or the library's new Starbucks station.

Just as many selective depositories are facing collection reduction mandates from their administration, so also are many

regional depositories. Administrators are increasingly questioning the need for 52 regional collection redundancies, especially when statewide and multi-state interlibrary loan networks are either planned or already in process, or already in place, to ensure 24 to 48 hour delivery of physical materials and on-demand digital content.

What was formerly a source of pride, large, physical collections, has become for administrators an impediment to their visions of more relevant use of library real estate. And the fall-out of those administrative visions for academic regional depositories means that for many their administrators no longer look upon regional status as a bragging point with trustees or regents, but as an irritating burden.

This perceived burden of physical collections has led to creative attempts to refashion regionals within the framework of a



1962 law enacted in an age of print only libraries.

We can define a shared regional as two or more regionals who have coordinated efforts through a legally binding agreement to collectively maintain a 100 percent regional depository collection, and to collectively provide 100 percent of other mandated regional services.

Now, shared regionals within the boundaries of a single state are not new. States such as South Carolina and North Dakota each have two regionals that share collection emphases, with each selecting and permanently retaining everything within defined SuDoc number ranges and sharing other service mandates through written agreements.

Then there are regionals like Colorado, Washington, and Minnesota, who serve states that don't have regionals of their own. While they are not shared regionals in the same sense as South Carolina and North Dakota, they

still operate outside the concept of regionals originally envisioned by the 1962 Depository Library Act.

Now, some regionals see economies of scale in possibly joining forces with regionals in neighboring states, as well as exploring the creative use of selective housing agreements to share collection responsibility among partner institutions.

So, now that I've attempted to frame the history and issues, I'll very briefly talk about California, and briefly because we're a traditional regional and have no current plans to join forces with any other regional.

But that's not to say we don't face challenges. As the nation's largest regional, both in terms of total population served and the total number of selectives served, 90, I always feel frustrated that we can't do more than what our resources allow. Still, I'm fortunate at the California State Library to have institutional backing for ongoing efforts

to increase our regional service to California. Have been fortunate to have the support to do more outreach, visitation, and training to our selectives than we previously were able to do, including a series of workshops to train new depository coordinators, staff, and administrators as soon as possible after they come on board.

This is an idea, by the way, that did not originate with me, but it came with conversations from two of my esteemed regional colleagues who have been doing this for years.

In the past two years, 70 California depository coordinators and staff have attended five such training sessions. I've tried to increase regional visibility, and to make sure that all California selectives know that their regional is always only a phone call or an email message away. As Ann Sanders, my brilliant friend, and regional colleague from Michigan puts it, "What's most

important to selective depository librarians is knowing they're not alone."

For now, California is maintaining its difficult balance. We remain a traditional regional in a very untraditional state.

Now, my colleagues on the panel will discuss some other shared regional plans as well as GPO's guidelines for establishing shared regional depository libraries that was issued in draft last spring and adopted last August.

ARLENE WEIBLE: Well, thank you, David. I don't think I've ever heard the history of the regionals talked about in such a straightforward and elegant way. I really appreciate that talk.

My name is Arlene Weible, and I'm from the Oregon State Library, and that's not Oregon State University, that's Oregon State Library.

I'm going to talk to you about what we've been doing in Oregon to deal with the

situation that David described as a regional that had decided that its responsibilities in collection had become an irritant.

In Oregon, since the early 1970s, Portland State University had served as the regional, and did so very reluctantly at the time. There was a lot of trouble in that time period trying to identify a library in Oregon willing to take on the full responsibilities, with the collections and the services that regionals provide. Eventually Portland State did agree, but was always what I would characterize as a reluctant leader when it came to regional services.

So what happened is there was a change in staffing at Portland State that precipitated a period of time where there was no more communication coming from the regional to the selective depositories in the state, and we basically wanted to know what was going on. We had heard that the documents librarian had

left, but we had never heard any kind of official announcement or anything like that.

So within Oregon, we're fortunate enough to have a very strong documents group, the Documents Interest Group of Oregon, also known as DIGOR, and we had a meeting and discussed the situation, and decided that we really needed to escalate the situation by setting up a meeting with the director of the library at Portland State and try to understand what was going on, and get some questions answered about what their intentions were for providing regional services, and the state of the collections.

That meeting was really interesting. We met with the director who outlined the fantastic problems that were going on in that library in terms of budgeting, in terms of staffing, in terms of all sorts of challenges going on. What became clear is that we really needed to come up with something different in terms of having a single institution taking

all of the responsibilities associated with a regional. Obviously we know the burden of physical collections, but also the administrative and outreach responsibilities of regional librarians.

At that meeting, we basically -- we were fortunate in timing because we had just attended the, I think it was the spring 2006 council meeting in Seattle and several of us had, and the concept of shared regionals was definitely under discussion at that meeting. And that is, I think, when we first heard about what was going on in Kansas and Nebraska, so we started kind of going with those ideas, and trying to see, you know, what we could do to share the responsibilities.

It became clear that -- we also knew that the Kansas-Nebraska situation was being hampered somewhat by the fact that they were going after an interstate agreement between two states, and that was outside of the traditional structure of the program. So

while we talked initially about trying to look to our neighbors to the north in Washington to partner, we decided that it's probably going to be best if we try to do something in the state itself.

We had two university libraries, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, both of which have very traditionally strong depository collections, depository staffing, and have been actually depositories longer than Portland State, so in many ways had more rich collections in their libraries. So those institutions, obviously, were people that we looked to because of their collections.

The other library that wasn't so traditional, in terms of strengths, was the state library. We had a fairly substantial collection in the past, but not necessarily at that time; selections had gone down quite a bit. But what the state library did have was a tradition of providing outreach and services



and administrative assistance to libraries throughout the state through its programs to public libraries, you know, those things that state libraries do.

So when we started looking at what were regional responsibilities, we really kind of realized that we had two basic issues. We had how to deal with regional collections, and how to deal with administrative services. Since the state library had a tradition of providing the regional -- or providing outreach services, we thought that that was a natural fit with the state library. But we knew we couldn't take a regional collection. It just wasn't going to be possible for us to take on that responsibility, with the volume of material.

But once we understood that the other universities in the state were willing to consider housing parts of a regional collection, we began to realize that what we could do is, as long as the regional

collection wasn't based in one institution, but was distributed across institutions, that the state library would be willing to continue the role of coordination. And that's really what we were going after is we needed some leadership. We couldn't do everything in the way of collections, but we felt at the state library, we could provide the leadership.

And so the decision was made, after many discussions with our group in DIGOR, that we would propose to the state librarian and the directors of the depository libraries a plan which would entail essentially transferring the regional designation from Portland State to the state library. And then once that was complete, the state library would execute a series of housing agreements with the universities, including Portland State, who still had very much an interest in staying in the program as a selective, and maintaining, you know, a good portion of the collections,

but just wouldn't be able to continue in the regional role.

So we wrote up those recommendations, and then presented them to the directors. We were very fortunate to have a state librarian who really thought this was a good idea, and really saw how this kind of model would make sense. I think the other thing that we really liked about this proposal is that it worked within the existing parameters of the program. Selective housing agreements have been around forever, and we wouldn't have to make extra special effort, go outside of the existing program, in order to make this happen.

After those recommendations were sent, the state library did agree that we would consider pursuing designation if we could get written agreements from the universities that they would be willing to participate in the way that we had described, in terms of housing the regional collections.

So we began the process of writing a memorandum of understanding that we would sign with the three universities, and we addressed the issues of, well first, that we would seek designation, that the other partners would agree to keep portions of the regional collection. And again, like most institutions, we split out the SuDoc numbers between the four institutions, and at the state library, we actually are going to have a portion of the regional collection as well, just not as much as some of the other libraries. That those libraries would also be responsible for reference, for interlibrary loan for those collections, and would make every effort possible to get those collections catalogued.

Another thing that's interesting about Oregon. The vast majority of the depositories in the state are academic libraries, and the academic libraries in Oregon also participate in a shared catalog called *Summit* which is

part of the Orbis Cascade Alliance. So that really facilitates the sharing of documents between those institutions.

We initially talked about trying to use the Orbis Cascade Alliance as the venue for pursuing our agreements, but we had to -- we had a couple of problems, one of them being the state library was not a member because we were not an academic library, but also that that system is not generally open to the public. And that probably would cause some barriers. And just, you know, trying to get all of the bureaucratic part of this going through, we were also concerned about that.

So we didn't pursue the Orbis Cascade angle in terms of administrative issues. But what happened as a result of this agreement was that the state library has since applied for membership to the Orbis Cascade Alliance, and our state librarian made the case, a lot of it based on the fact that we had agreed to be the regional federal depository. So he was

quite happy to have that little stick there to get some leverage. We don't know yet if we're going to be members of it and participate in the shared catalog, but we're very positive and hope that that will be the case.

So we have a good infrastructure for sharing documents, and we still need to address issues in terms of public accessibility. But we've, you know, as I think everybody knows, the devil is in the details.

We struggled a bit with dividing the SuDoc classes. Nobody wanted the Post Office. So the state library took the Post Office, just because it wasn't very big. We struggled with a few agencies, but basically, I mean, what we did was really tried to go with the strengths of the universities.

Portland State houses the state data center, has long, long had a reputation of being the place to go for census data, so they took the census. Oregon State University is a

land grant. They've got a huge agricultural program, you know, taking agriculture was absolutely no problem for them.

So we were able to work it out, and kind of the poor stepchildren ended up at the state library, but you know, we were really happy to do that because what we really wanted to do was make sure that the expertise and the collections's strengths were at those institutions. Because OSU is an agriculture institution, they're not going to want to get rid of their agriculture collection any time soon, and so we felt that that was really giving a level of stability to these agreements that people wouldn't withdraw, you know, after finding that they really wanted more space, that kind of thing.

So we did execute these MOUs and basically, the MOUs were an agreement that we would execute housing agreements once the designation has taken place. And as Rick announced, the designation is still in

process, although, I mean, it's now official, but we've still got a ways to go to get everything official. And we've still got a few issues to work out with housing agreements. We haven't dealt with all the issues associated with retrospective collections and things like maps, and that kind of thing. But we're going to be working on that really soon.

We also have a plan to revise our state plan, obviously, since we're changing our configuration quite a bit. And we'll also be doing some creative things, I think, with disposal guidelines. Given that we are putting a regional collection in four institutions, we're going to have to be a little bit more creative in the way that disposal lists are evaluated.

But we've had discussions within our group with the selectives, through DIGOR and communication with those that don't come to the DIGOR meetings, and I feel really



positive. I mean, there's a real spirit of cooperation in Oregon that I think has made this happen, and I feel very fortunate to be in a state where that is the case. I know that isn't true in all states.

That's what we're doing, and we're doing it in a way that we hope is kind of low key and will still ultimately result in better access to the collections. Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: Okay, I'm going to speak about the regionals that serve other states in addition to their own state. But before I get into that, I just want to remind people that the libraries who serve as regionals don't really get anything for that. There is no compensation for regionals. Although occasionally I get told that, "What we get out of it is the prestige," usually it's a selective or someone saying that. When the regionals meet and talk about things, we don't ever mention prestige.

As David mentioned, there are several regionals who do serve other states, and for the most part they are smaller states with less population. It made sense for them not to have to come up with their own regional. So Washington serves Alaska. Minnesota serves South Dakota. Maryland serves Delaware and D.C. Florida serves Puerto Rico. Hawaii serves some of those other islands out there. I always thought those would be good, you know, depositories to visit.

Wyoming actually had a depository, or had a regional. The Wyoming State Library took on the regional status. But the state of Wyoming went through some very difficult economic times in the late '80s and their budgets were cut drastically. They had to cut back on many services, and one of the things they felt they had to give up was their regional status.

The problem that this presented for Wyoming was the problem that was presented for any of the states without a regional, was that

if you don't have a regional, you can't discard. So it was really very important to the other depositories in Wyoming that there be a regional. The University of Wyoming was not able to take on because they were under the same economic constraints that the state library was.

So the state library in Wyoming then began shopping for a regional in one of the neighboring states. I was approached at that time to become the regional for the state of Wyoming, and at that time I had a boss who felt I was doing way too much anyway. And so the idea of trying to take on something new with this person, you know, it wasn't even worth discussing.

I think they tried talking with Denver Public also. Eventually, they got to the Utah State Library, and Utah State did something really radical. They said, "Sure, we'll be your regional if you pay us." And so the contract was signed, and Utah State became the

regional for Wyoming, and I then said, "If I'd have thought of that, I would have become their regional."

But that's the whole basis of regionals. We've always just sort of assumed responsibility without expecting to get anything in return. All of those other regionals who are serving other states, they're not getting anything for doing that. I wonder, you know, if they were in the situation today of having to take on that responsibility, would they do so?

At any rate, the state of Wyoming really is more oriented towards Colorado than it is Utah. The two most populous cities, Laramie and Cheyenne, are just across the border in southeast Wyoming, and they're actually closer to me than most of my other selectives.

So after a few years with Utah State, they really felt it would be more appropriate to have the University of Wyoming again. And I had complained that, you know, if I'd known

about the money, I would have taken it. So we also had the case where the University of Wyoming had joined the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries. And so we had the documents librarian at the University of Wyoming going back to Wyoming saying good things about what I was doing in Colorado.

So in the mid '90s, I decided to hold a statewide meeting to discuss the GPO transition plan to a more electronic depository library, and I convinced my dean to co-host this with me, and to invite all the depository librarians and the depository library directors to come to Boulder and have a full day meeting on this.

Well somehow the University of Wyoming thought they were invited too. So Jan mentioned that to me, that she was expecting to come, and I said, "Well, okay." And then a few days later, she called back and she said, "Oh, yeah. I've been talking with the other selectives in Wyoming, and they're all coming

too," which might not have been a problem, except that my dean had agreed to cater the lunch and pay for everyone's lunch, and I had to go back and say, "There are eight more -- or 16 more people coming."

But one of the people who came was the Wyoming state librarian, and she asked for a meeting with my dean and associate director to discuss the University of Colorado becoming the regional. And we got things worked out and agreed, and they sent us the contract that was identical to what they had done with Utah State. It took a year to get that contract approved. Part of the time it was lost. But when it came out, it bore very little resemblance to the contract with Utah State. One of the things that our lawyers had taken out were all the performance measures, which made it a lot more easier on me, because then I didn't have to make the required number of trips to Wyoming each year.

Even though those performance measures were removed, I do try to get up to Wyoming at least twice a year. I have constant contact with them via email and discard lists, and they are always invited to anything that I do in Colorado. And as I said, some of the Wyoming people are closer than the Colorado.

It's actually been a pretty good relationship, and I do get paid. Actually, I've got to clarify that. I've said that to people and they thought I personally got paid. The University of Colorado gets paid, but that goes into an account that I control. And so my meager retrospective cataloguing efforts are being paid for by the State of Wyoming. That's about it.

CHARLES BERNHOLZ: Good afternoon. My name is Charles Bernholz. I'm from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

I have a few point form remarks to make regarding the Kansas-Nebraska joint regional proposal that is now before the JCP.

In terms of the players, the endeavor includes Kansas State University, the University of Kansas, and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. K-State and UNL are the land grant institutions for the two states. K-State is a selective, taking almost 80 percent of all offered items.

There are two remote storage facilities: one at KU and one at UNL. These will be the storage centers, in part, for the collated materials for both states. K-State will deliver to KU their pieces earmarked for storage.

In terms of the model, this is just one of many possible models that may be forwarded for a joint regional proposal. We already have many looks, such as David's single regional at this time for all of California, to support for Wyoming through the normal FDLF channels, the A-SOAR (phonetic) proposal for centers of excellence, and now this two-state, three-horse example.



We are also aware of intrastate endeavors and the two regionals approach, like that of my mentors and friends, Laurie and Dan, in beautiful New Mexico.

Kansas and Nebraska feel that the model that we have proposed for our states will maximize our chances to responsibly deliver a product to all of our patrons, and it will expedite our role as depositories, let alone as regional depositories. The proposal was developed in the exact declaration of our MOU in the best interests of the citizens of the states of Kansas and Nebraska, and in the best interests of the universities concerned.

Is there a space mandate hidden away in here somewhere? The answer is yes and I would be misleading you if I said otherwise. That's what keeps deans awake at night. However, by being forced to catalog everything in order to create an appropriate union catalog for the three institutions, we three will get all our

stuff identified and findable. That is a huge step forward for each of us.

In terms of the mechanics, the three deans began to discuss this possibility in earnest in 2003. In December of that year, the University of Kansas team came to Lincoln and the issue was discussed further. That was the point at which Jeff Bullington and I started our interactions.

At the spring GPO meeting in St. Louis, Jeff and I spent about an hour-and-a-half talking about ideas, roots, issues, and worries. This was the starting point for a large number of emails, and particularly of telephone discussions. We usually make sure we accomplish something at each GPO event.

Jeff talked with K-State throughout, and worked on the overall Kansas protocol. I was instructed by my dean to let the Kansas participants work out their plans, and then automatically accept the residual units after Jeff had assembled the various SuDoc agency

blocks for distribution. He was very fair in slicing the pie. We have no regrets. And we got the Post Office. You, he's a good friend.

Together, then, the institutions have had for some time a set of complimentary SuDoc assignments. That list was included in the MOU. The initial target back date now is January 1, 2000. We will work backwards from then as time goes on.

We have all discussed ILL, and have ironed out all aspects for prompt intra and interstate delivery. Our leakage with the GPO was very strong throughout. The deans communicated endlessly, and my dean worked directly with the GPO. Judy Russell, when she was superintendent, actually went to a meeting in Kansas for this project, and I am sure that she has remembered those discussions during the development of the A-SOAR proposals. I need to reiterate our collective thanks for her assistance.

Finally, to make a long story short, a joint MOU was submitted to the GPO, and the outcome is now in the hands of the JCP. We expect to hear a decision in the very near future. In terms of that future, overall, we expect this endeavor to help us, not hinder us, in our drive to provide solid gov-doc services to our patrons. I believe that the three institutions are in absolute accord on this target.

We expect to continue to be the regional library for Nebraska. Nothing really changes, as far as UNL is concerned, except that our item list count will go down, and we will become a sort of special selective. This reduction in item count does not mean, however, that collectively the three institutions will take precisely 100 percent of the available array of items. We each expect to continue to select and receive items for which some place else has responsibility. For example, UNL will not stop selecting

certain Ag items just because K-State will be the official agent for the A items of the SuDoc classification, because those Ag items are important to our educational mandates too.

Finally, I need to thank Debbie Madsen at K-State for her efforts, along with those of my very good friend, Jeff Bullington at KU, in the groundwork for this project. We know that we can efficaciously drive this car, we just need the keys now. Thank you.

CINDY ETKIN: Gosh, if I didn't do it again with this machine. Okay. Everybody has mentioned the different profiles of the regionals that we have in place now. I have 53 here because I knew about that letter from Oregon. So we will soon have 53 regionals in 43 states, two states with designated shared regionals. Eight regionals serve multiple states or territories. Seven states, five territories, and the District of Columbia are served by regionals outside their boundaries. That's where we are.

And others have mentioned the guidelines as well, and what I'm going to talk about today are the guidelines and how they can be used. And a way that they can provide flexibility and options for service, and enhanced service, and for taking care of some of the issues, perhaps, that your library has that some of my colleagues on the panel have already presented.

So the guidelines were issued in August, and they are to help you along with any inter or intrastate arrangements that you might find of interest, or to start investigating to better your regional services.

There's a difference between the inter and intrastate, besides boundaries, and that is that the interstate agreements must be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, and that's where we are with the Kansas-Nebraska proposal, as Charlie mentioned.

The whole designation process for regionals is very similar to other types of

designations, for libraries, that is. Of course, you need to have agreement among the institutions, approval of the State Library Commission, and then the senatorial request for designation needs to be sent to GPO.

What I'm coming up with now in the next few slides are parts of the guidelines. I don't want to go through all of these bullet-by-bullet because we want to leave plenty of time for questions, but these are up on the FDLP desktop.

But communication is very, very important. You need to have buy in from all levels. You need to have it from your administrators, from the administrators of those libraries that you're working with, and certainly you need to keep the selectives in your areas very well-informed. Free-flowing communication and reporting back is going to lead to a more successful agreement.

We'd also like to have you all confer with GPO so that we can keep abreast of what's

going on, and looking for new ideas as we see what you all are doing, as well as provide you guidance along the way, because all of these MOUs, or shared arrangements, are going to have to be in compliance with the instructions, soon-to-be handbook, and in compliance with Title 44. And we will do a double check to ensure that that actually happens with these agreements.

Collections, as everybody here has said they've identified which collections are going where, and it's very apparent and everybody knows. And the area that is going to have the regional collection of record for whatever area should be responsible for archiving and long-term security of the collections, as covered currently in the instructions.

We also need to have in place a contingency plan for maintaining regional collections, should the MOUs be terminated or modified by one or more of the parties. And this is of particular interest, not only for



the wellbeing of these collections and to the public who are going to be using these materials, this is also one of the concerns that has come up to GPO from the Joint Committee on Printing. They want to know, okay, "This agreement looks really good, but what if?" So that's important.

Access and service, we would like to see service enhanced. But if you can make an agreement where a service is status quo and nobody is hurt by this, but yet you're seeing behind the scenes benefits from this arrangement, that's okay too.

You need to identify how users will locate information, the publications that they're looking for, and how they're going to be retrieved from one location to another, particularly if you're talking about great distances. You need to talk about reference assistance, that kind of thing as well.

Now, the memorandum of understanding, these are requirements to be in any MOU:

Maintain, or preferably, improve public access. Clear statement indicating the allocation of responsibilities, indicating what services select depositories will seek from each of the participating regionals in the agreement. And a clear statement that they know that they're going to be also governed by the requirements of the FDLP. Provision of regular reviews and feedback, and particularly from the selective depositories, who are being served in a new manner. And there needs to be procedures for modifying or terminating the agreement.

This is also a question that has come to us from the Joint Committee on Printing. "What if one library doesn't want to be part of this anymore? What's going to happen?" So that definitely needs to be addressed.

And then the provisions of the disposition of the materials. Contact information, signatures of the library directors, or whoever has the signing

authority for these kinds of documents at your institution.

So where's the flexibility? One of the things that we kept hearing through the comment period, when the guidelines were out there in draft format, was, "This shouldn't be a guideline. This should be a must." And we said, well, we thought about it, and then sort of discarded some of those ideas because what we are trying to do with the strategic vision from GPO, and from the assessments program, and all the other things that we're doing at GPO, we're trying to provide a more flexible depository library program that is going to serve us as we move into, dare I say, the second transition. The first transition being from tangible to electronic, of course, in publications, and the second transition is where we're focusing more on how we're providing services in an online environment, providing services online, and to remote users.

So we really need some flexibility, and some of these arrangements might not be the traditional "we're splitting the collection and having a dispersed regional collection." We may actually find that this library wants to be the regional for the collection, and another regional has just a lot of experience and interested in doing the training, the services, and that kind of stuff. So we're not looking at necessarily the same kind of relationships in regionals that we have today and we've known for a while.

The requirements come in the MOU; the others are guidelines. But you also do need to have, and I hope this is clear that we're talking about the GPO guidelines with the first bullet, and the second bullet is guidelines for whatever arrangement you're making, so you know how things are going to be operating, the details of how things are going to work. I've heard several times through

this conference, "The devil is in the details," and it is indeed.

So you can find some flexibility there in how you're operating, under the guidance. And in the MOU you can also find some flexibility. You can provide a range of options that are going to be there. You can have the details in the MOU if you don't have these other set of guidelines, or you can have the guidelines and refer to them in the MOU, but at some place we're going to have to have details so everybody knows exactly what's going on. If JCP comes back and says, "Well, what if someone wants to terminate?" We can say, "Well, it's in the MOU, 150 days notices," whatever. We're going to have to be able to answer those kinds of questions.

So what we've done here is not made hard fast rules for any arrangement. We just need to make sure that everything is in compliance with Title 44 and the other guidance from the program, and that everybody that's going to be

served and is involved in this arrangement is going to be in agreement with this. And then we'll all live happily ever after in all of our catalogued collections in remote locations.

So put on your thinking cap. I had a prop. For those of you who have seen my office, I have one of these caps. This is from Life is Good. And I have a cap, and it has this "think outside the box" on it right here. I have it in my office, and it's tacked up to my wall above my workstation.

So when you're thinking about the problems that you're facing, the challenges that you're having, put on your thinking cap, and there may be some kind of arrangement that you can enter into with other libraries in your area, cooperative efforts. So put on your thinking cap and get out there and talk and see if others are having similar concerns, can you work together?

While I say that the guidelines are for establishing shared regionals, I also think that the guidelines can be used for other kinds of arrangements besides shared regionals. Some of the things that you see in those guidelines are things that were addressed in Oregon when Arlene was working in that area. And I know that, for those of you who got to see the Indiana presentation earlier today, they were in contact with us. We've been working with them. And you can see some of the same things that have helped to make what they've done successful, by looking at some of the things that we have in our guidelines as well.

So think outside the box, talk with folks, talk to GPO. "Is this viable? Is this not? Is this a good idea? Is it not?" And we'll see if we can face all these challenges of the 21st century together.

At this time I'm going to turn it over to Tim, because we did leave a half hour for questions.

TIM BYRNE: So first we'll open it up to questions from council, so, John?

JOHN SHULER: I'm confused, but I'll go ahead. John from University of Illinois at Chicago. I was wondering if any of the four regional folk up there could talk about how you can help the selectives, if not your responsables libraries, interact better with the congressional offices that are essentially the political heart of our designations, and using their connections through their districts in order to promote the depository purpose?

CHARLES BERNHOLZ: Does this work? John, we had to go through the hoops with the senators and everything because of this regional thing, so we had to make very good contact with the people who represented the state. We talked, I believe, to the



representatives as well, besides the senators, so everybody had an idea about what was going on.

We're not talking about places like California or New York. You know, we're talking about relatively sparse communities. And so there are not an awful lot of politicians, at least at the federal level, that we have to interact with. If David had to go and talk to everybody to get anything done, he would be operating just as he is right now. It would be very difficult.

I am sure that, for example, people who live in western Nebraska have a different perspective on the state and the operation of the state, and they have aspects of the economy, for example, ranching versus -- in the eastern part it's more fundamental agriculture that we're used to. And you'll have to give me a little room here; I'm a New Yorker.

The point is that there are regional representations, but when you get down to the depository program, in Nebraska at least, they have to get it past the center of the state. There's only one little library, and they live out in Scotts Bluff, and the people in Scotts Bluff actually think that they live in eastern Wyoming.

So there is some regional aspects here, but most of the people live in the eastern end of the state. And we have very good contact with the people who live there, and that includes the people who represent us in the federal government and the state government. Lincoln is the state capital, so someone's always running up and down the block to get to the legislative building.

ARLENE WEIBLE: Well I was so pleasantly surprised by our interactions with our senator. We went to Senator Wyden and his local staff to help us with our designation letter because he's the senior senator. We

got his staff to come to us. He had wanted to visit the library; he wanted to see what we were doing. We were shocked that he wanted to do that. But it was really great, and he was a very supportive advocate for our plan. He really bought into what we were doing.

What was interesting, also, is that after vetting the letter with the folks in Washington from his staff, they're the ones that decided that they wanted to include the other senator, Senator Smith. So we ended up with a joint letter from both senators supporting our designation and what we're doing.

So I think this was a wonderful opportunity, obviously, to do some education, but also see a lot of cooperation among two senators who are actually from different parties. So I was really thrilled with the interaction that we had.

You'll remember that, I think it was 2004, that the Southern Oregon University was

named Depository Library of the Year, and their representative came to the ceremony. We have great representatives in Oregon and they're very supportive of the public institutions there. So I think we're fortunate.

TIM BYRNE: John, I think you are right, though, that there are some of our selectives who, perhaps they're a bit intimidated or don't have quite the confidence to initiate the contact with their congressional office on their own. And I actually did try to do something with this once, where -- the meeting I mentioned earlier on the GPO transition plan, we invited all the directors and depository librarians, but we also invited every congressman and senator from Colorado. I wasn't expecting to get anyone to actually come, but I was hoping that they would send a staff person.

We did have staff persons from both senatorial offices and two congressional

offices. They then were able to hear the presentations that we made at that thing, so they became aware of what was going on with the transition plan.

I think a lot of the selectives would not have had the confidence to try to do that on their own, so we did that for them. And then as I said, we had a catered lunch; I made sure that all the congressional aides sat at different tables and had a chance to interact with people.

JEFF BULLINGTON: John, I'll just provide one more comment. Jeff Bullington from the University of Kansas. For all three of us in our plan, we actually worked with and through our governmental relations liaisons at the three institutions to help us make the connections.

At KU, our governmental relations liaison was a former staffer of Senator Roberts. Through that process, and I've done other work with him in reference and instruction, but

through that process, I have decided that I'm going to actively cultivate him to help me connect with that delegation, because they're working with them all the time because they're representing the whole institution for a variety of reasons and a variety of issues. But helping me to develop this relationship, because it's not just selectives who may be intimidated about approaching congress people, regionals, too, are going, "They're not going to pay attention to me," first off.

But now I have a good connection and I'm going to work with them on that. And through that, think about how I can help the selectives in the state also work through those things and start to develop that relationship. So we've developed very closely with my person at KU. I know we did it, Nebraska as well, and K-State. All three worked with that person, and I think that that's a great bridge for continuing those discussions and that kind of work.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: If I understand your question correctly, you're not just talking about approaching congressmen or senators when you want to make a change. You're talking about ongoing communication.

JOHN SHULER: That would be the second part of the question.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: The subject of selectives communicating with their congressmen has come up at a couple of regional meetings that we've had in California, where they've basically talked about just drafting a letter inviting them, and inviting staff, to their library.

One of the things that I suggested that they do, and I think a few have actually done that, is try to interest the staff of the congressman or congresswoman in what you can do for them, because many staff, particularly regional staff offices of congress people, get questions from the public that are asking for a particular government document, or

information on a particular subject that the government has published information on.

And what I've encouraged them to do is write letters to the staff saying, first of all, introducing themselves, what depository libraries are, but also saying, "If you get such questions, here's our contact information. Contact us and we will help you out."

TIM BYRNE: Do we have any other questions? I think we're done. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned)

\* \* \* \* \*

Council Recommendations



GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. I think we're ready to get started, the last stretch. This is the last session of the meeting and we're going to do a couple things today. But first, I want to remind you that this is your last chance to get your continuing education units. And I guess I should also say drop off your evaluation forms, but that's not on the little sheet here, so I guess I don't have to say that.

Okay. In everyone's packet, they have a yellow handout, and this lists the spring 2007 depository library council recommendations and priorities, and GPO's responses. And I'd like to start us off by -- I'm going to sort of walk through them, but I'm not actually going to discuss them up here. I just want to give

folks a chance, if they have any questions, either on council or in the audience, on any of these, now's your chance to discuss them. And after that we'll move into council recommendations from this session.

So does everyone have these? Okay, good. Anyone want to say anything on number one, on FDsys? Number two on council recommending that GPO review card projects and initiatives with the goal of seamless integration, interoperability, and ease of access. This will be quick. And I don't have any visuals for these either.

Number three, council recommends GPO harvest web-based documents hosted by government agencies. Council attaches a high priority to the development and establishment of a stable web harvesting program integrated into systems currently under development. I see no folks leaping up, and I think David's just coming to sit down; he's not going to speak. Yes, okay.

Number four, Council recommends that GPO establish a registry of depository librarians who are expert in specific parts or functions of the U.S. Government, etcetera. Did we have a --

KATHY HALE: I haven't read this thoroughly, and I have been out of touch for a while, but who's going to decide who's expert? And if all of the experts also are gray heads, and many of us are getting close to retirement, I think we need to think about that in some way. I think it's good to know who the experts are, but some of these people may not be wanting to provide that level of expertise to folks.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: That's a good point. In the first part about what council's an expert, is an unresolved issue, of course that was talked about in earlier session of the conference. But no one brought up the issue of creating future expertise, and I think that's a really good point that we need to,

those of us who have gray hair, although this is cosmetic, I'm actually quite young. It's a fashion thing.

KATHY HALE: If I could add to that thought, that's one of the things that are coming out of partnerships like the one that Tim is doing in Colorado. That it's not only those of us who have gray heads, but those who are just starting out as librarians, getting these modules together, getting lists of people who are doing different things at different conferences that are trying to be gathered in one place.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, number five, council recommends that GPO coordinate and support item level cataloguing logging of digitized works to aid in the discovery of converted resources. Number six, Council recommends that GPO recommend with libraries and other institutions on digitization projects.

MARIAN PARKER: This is Marian Parker, I just want to put the plug in here for anybody who's doing any digitization projects to please pick up that project on the registry that GPO has, because that will help us all see who's doing what and for us to do unique things, not duplicate each other. Ted?

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. And one additional thing for the biannual survey that everybody's probably completed by now. There is a couple question areas that do relate to digitization projects. And we want to encourage you to take a good look at that 'cause that's a good vehicle for us to follow up with you as well, as we move forward.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Number seven, council recommends that GPO provide an online venue for collaboration, communication, training and education for depository libraries.

MARIAN PARKER: This is Marian, I have a question. We've talked about Opal as a great

training opportunity, have you all considered doing, I almost hesitate to use the word, but a wiki or something else that all of us could contribute to for a variety of reasons, somewhere where we could begin piling all of this expertise into a commonly accessible database of some sort that we could get to? That was redundant, sorry.

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO once again. That's a beautiful segue to what Karen Sieger's been working on with our new FDLP desktop. Some of those features, not only by the profiles, but just collaborative environments so that opportunities something we can realize and enable, yes.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Number eight, Council recommends that GPO focus it's digitization efforts on specific projects requiring unique treatments and with significant national value as identified by Congress or the depository library community.

LORI SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. Generally I agree with that, but I would hate to see GPO miss an opportunity to acquire and digitize say a rare collection that's not real high priority, but is just rare. Because I know a lot of us are doing significant weeding in our print collections now. And for instance, we have a lot of stuff that we're getting read of that it's predates our depository status, from the 1930's to the 1950's, that stuff could be rare. And I would like to the opportunity to offer that to GPO and see if they would like to take that and digitize it.

So I'd hate to see them miss opportunities just because we are, you know, focusing on what has been determined to be important. You know, but they may want to consider doing some other stuff too if the opportunity arises.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That actually is part of the path forward that

we'll have to revise or review and revise as necessarily, the priorities, as some of these become available to digitize such as a rare collection that you might want to give us. So that's part of the path forward.

And I remind you that some of the digitization report is up on the website and we're taking comments through --

TED PRIEBE: November?

CINDY ETKIN: -- some time. I think it's November 2nd, yeah.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: And just one comment from Council, before I get to you Pete, is that in Council's mind a rare collection certainly would meet significant national value.

PETER HEMPHILL: I go after the last one, is this the last one?

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: We have one more.

PETER HEMPHILL: Keep going and I'll --

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay. Number nine, Council recommends that GPO evaluate any



assessment proposals in the light of new expectations resulting from changes in emphasis in the depository program. We've had a lot of good discussion about assessments in this meeting. Pete?

PETER HEMPHILL: This is Peter Hemphill. Just one request for GPO. If GPO could put these questions and responses up on the council website as well as update the council website to reflect past meetings with the appropriate transcripts of these proceedings, so people can go back and review them, refer to them, that would be great. Thank you.

TED PRIEBE: Sure, yep.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, now I'd like to move forward on the recommendations for this meeting. And I'll just read this, and everything follows from this. Council thanks GPO for the progress reports provided in the fall 2007 meeting, and recommends that the following areas be the basis for presentations at the spring 2008 meeting.

First, on the federal digital system. Council would like to continue to receive reports on the progress of FDsys development. Such a progress report would include detailed milestones and a timeline with functionality and content goals for the currently planned releases. In particular, counsel requests an update that focuses on the particulars of library service functionalities. Any comments from Council on what's behind that our questions from the audience? Anyone want to take that up? No? Self-explanatory?

JOHN SHULER: Sorry.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay.

JOHN SHULER: Wow, planet Earth to John. John Shuler, UIC. Those were such magical words I just couldn't improve upon them. Again I think this echoes the idea that as FDsys evolves into a total environment for all of GPO's components and partnership, that members of the council feel that it's important with next demonstrations, next

public releases, there be clear examples of how libraries will benefit from this system and a chance for feedback on that demonstrations. There you go, I'm going to retire.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yep. Okay. Any discussion from the audience? Kathy?

KATHY HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. One suggestion might be as one of the beta tests of the FDsys, you might include some of us in your demonstration so we can show you what we liked and didn't like that and that generate some discussion from other members of the community to see what we were looking for as librarians.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Okay, that's good points. Web harvesting, Council would like to better understanding GPO's role in web harvesting and the possibility of establishing partnerships to enhance the web harvesting process. Council suggests a session focusing on the respective roles and current activities

of GPO and NARA for harvesting web content and highlighting other relevant initiatives, for example, the Internet Archive, IMLS funded research and the like. Katrina?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: I guess I would just like -- this is Katrina from the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, I'll just ask a comment about this. I think what we were looking for is clearly GPO is doing some work on web harvesting, and we that NARA is also doing work. And I think we want to find out who's doing what and what fits where and if there are any gaps in what's going on.

So I think at least that's how I understood what we were looking for. I don't know if anybody else --

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well I think the idea of possible partnerships --

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Yeah.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yeah. And I also, just in general, it's not just Council would like a better understanding, I think everyone

could use a sort of quick update on where web harvesting is in the federal government. And I think it would be interesting to have a NARA/GPO type, assuming they can cross that branch divide, which they do all the time. They talk to each other all the time, I know that.

Assessments, Council asks that GPO provide a report on assessments and a schedule for implementation. We'll call these draft guidelines. In addition, Council recommends that GPO prepare and distribute a document on assessment for library directors, ARL, AALL, PLA and other relevant organizations to keep these groups informed about the statutory and regulatory requirements of maintaining a depository. Any council members want to comment on this? It's not required, you can though.

MARIAN PARKER: This is Marian Parker. I think one of the reasons we would like to have this done is to help everybody keep directors

informed, in the loop, moving forward and supporting the depository program and not just, you know, consulted like when there's some major decision that has to be made. And one of the things that I acknowledged as a director is I get very little information sent to me, and I am on the director's list-serv. And I just feel like there's more stuff I need to know to be able to be an effective advocate for being part of the program, remaining part of the program, marketing the program and all the things that I need to do to make us be a really great depository.

So we want your help. And we want the help with the other organizations so that they can keep people who don't do documents and don't read document stuff every day, informed about what's going on.

LORI SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. It's occurred to me that it might be nice to have a poster or something with the basics of what library

staff should know and what the public should know about the role of depositories that we could put up near our depository decals some place.

MALE VOICE: Tattoos.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Partnerships, Council encourages the GPO to continue to expand their efforts to form partnerships and other collaborative efforts to further the goal of broad accessed government information. Council asks that GPO prepare discussion of strategies that include planned and possible partnerships and collaborations. One possible strategy to consider, among others, may be a conference devoted to partnerships focusing on digitization best practices. Others may include exploring collaborative efforts to enhance tools, content or services for government information. John?

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, UIC. One narrow aspect of this was the idea that it's been a while since, especially listening to

the conversation this afternoon about the shared repositories, that there is now developing a body of expectations on how one folds together these MOUs and these agreements. And that maybe we have enough body of knowledge, if you will, that we can begin a training program for people for an introduction on how to become a partner or a collaborator in this environment, what the expectations are, what's going to be expected in a documentation, what's a good goal, what isn't, that kind of thing.

I think there's been enough experience, speaking as one personal participant in this process over the last 12 years, I think there's enough experience on the ground that we can begin to teach each other so that newcomers to the process don't have to make the early mistakes that the pioneers did. And having those moments at these conferences, these training moments at the conferences, is probably a good idea.



FEMALE VOICE: I ask that my comments be recorded anonymously, I'm a federal government employee and I speak on my own behalf, not for my agency. There's a lot going on at the individual information professional level, and there are enormous roadblocks to official collaboration and partnership. And I think it's important to continue to emphasize outreach and keeping the information professional community informed and ways for people outside the depository community, such as the vendors, such as producers, such as people like me, to help out.

I don't know if you want to have Friends of GPO or Friends of the Depository Community, but I'm here because I need the information but also I have a vested interest. And we are digitizing things, but I can't even get my agency to cooperate within the division, let alone with other agencies within a three block radius. But if somebody's looking for

something specifically, and I can do it informally, I'll help.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Well in fact I mean although we don't explain what we mean by some of these terms, that's what we meant by collaborative efforts. I mean we recognize that partnerships have a real meaning within GPO and it means MOUs and more formal relationships. But we did want to encourage as many other ways of collaborative work as possible. So that's absolutely something that this is intended to help support. Sandy?

SANDY MCANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I think it would foster more institutions coming forward to participate in partnerships, if GPO could oh create a place where someone could go see, oh they would like a partner to do. I mean I know they're looking for creative thinking out in the community and some are better at that than others. But if GPO has particular needs where they want partnerships, and maybe

there's something on the website that I just don't know about, but I think that would help. That would help some of us then go to our administrations and say, "See, this is where we could do something."

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Yeah, this is Katrina from St. Louis Fed. I could see that like you look at a wedding gift registry, where GPO lists big things and they list little things. And depending on your budget, you know you pick something that fits your needs.

SUZANNE EBANUES: Suzanne Ebanues, GPO. I am the partnership coordinator. And I don't know if you've all been to the FDLP desktop, but one of the first pages that rolled out was the new partnership page. It does have a lot more information than what was on the old desktop. While we don't come right out and said we'd like you to help us by digitizing x, y or z publication, we do have more information about the types of partnerships we're looking for, content, service or hybrid,

which is kind of anything you may think that doesn't fit into one of the other two categories.

We also have frequently asked questions. So how do I enter into a partnership? What does the MOU involve? What would be the requirements of me as a partners? There's also sample MOUs for both the content and the service partnership. And there's also a web form, so if you have questions or you have ideas, they'll come directly to me and then I'll be in contact with you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: The future of federal depository library program, I have to breath before I start this one. Council would like to work with GPO to prepare depository libraries for a digital federal depository library system that is not centered on collections. This may include such things as librarians supporting GPO through the development of reference services, digitization initiatives and web harvesting.

Tools and infrastructure developed by GPO and depository libraries would further both the library's and GPO's mission to provide government information to the public and allow for an informed citizenry. The purpose of the discussion at the spring meeting is to begin the process of coordinating the strategic planning of GPO with that of the depository libraries as all move forward into the digital age. Chris.

DR. CHRISTOPHER GREER: Maybe I can add a little bit too that. Chris Greer from the National Science Foundation. In the past there was a credible and sustainable for the FDLDP system in which GPO shipped artifacts out to the libraries and made it available for access at the local level. In that model there was a role for GPO, a role for the libraries that was sustainable. As a we move into digital access, I think that model becomes less and less relevant to some degree, and new models are required.

There are many of them. One of the ones I can imagine is that the depository libraries become, you know, an agent of integration of information. Taking GPO information with other information, local and regional and matching that up together in useful ways that serve the needs of their particular constituents and specialties. That kind of model makes a library that looks more like Google than it looks like your traditional library.

And I know the libraries are working hard on planning their own future. GPO is trying to plan its future in the digital age. And unless these two are coordinated, there's no reason to believe that they'll be complimentary and effective. And this will be an ongoing discussion, I think, for quite a long time, perhaps through the rest of our lifetimes as technologies and society evolves in response to the power of digital access.

So I think it is time to begin that discussion so that the libraries, as they plan, can anticipate what GPO is thinking. And the reverse is true. And to ground truth some of your strategies against one another.

LAURA HORN: Laura Horn, University of Richmond. Just to add a comment. I see this combining nicely with the assessment for library directors and other library oriented organizations, because I think the service component is a very compelling one. And I think when you can combine that with the collection you can emphasize the importance of the collection. And I would like to see those two things combined more fully. I think it's a better argument and I think it gives us some more leverage.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Other comments? I'm going to hit the button and it's going to go blank. Any other comments about anything else?

STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, LSU. Going back to one of the earlier discussions about lighting the directors know more about what's expected of a depository library, I would suggest that whatever communication was developed for that would be done very tactfully, shall we say.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Yes.

STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN: I'd hate to think that my director or my dean in my case, or a director, would feel as if this was some kind of a prodding reminder, rather than just --

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Informative, right.

STEPHANIE BRAUNSTEIN: -- informative.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: And I also think that to add to that, we'd also want to make sure that depository coordinators received that same, so they knew what their directors - the information they are getting so that they would understand the phone call they might get.



LORI SMITH: Good point. Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. Years ago I used to work with patents and trademarks and would attend the Patent and Trademarks Depository Library conference. And it seems to me like that might serve as a model for us in the future, because at those conferences it wasn't so much about your collections. You know, everybody had the same collection. It was making sure that the people who were providing the service knew how to use those collections. And it seems like that's the direction we're going to need to go, because most of it will be online, it's just that we need to be the experts in finding it and using it. So I think that's our direction.

JANE CANFIELD: Jane Canfield from Puerto Rico representing at least one of the United States Territories. As a first time attendee I'd like to say first of all that this has been a most informative and interesting experience for me. I'm a long term school

librarian, this is my first experience as an academic librarian and as a government documents librarian. What I can see is had I known about this world and what existed while being a school librarian, it would have made things I did with students amazingly different. So I see the service component and the access component as being critically important. I'm going back to Puerto Rico with the idea of going, "Okay, guys, there are five of us, six if we count the Virgin Islands, let's see what we can get together and accomplish." So I'm going back energized and excited.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: And maybe we should change Title 44 so we can designate school libraries, too, right?

JANE CANFIELD: Most school libraries would probably shoot you.

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: No, I know.

JANE CANFIELD: (inaudible).

GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Electronic depositories, there we go. Okay, any other discussion? Council? Well hearing none, I declare this meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned)

\* \* \* \* \*