Depository Library Council Meeting Minutes from 2000-2003

U.S. Government Printing Office

∾

Depository Library Council Meeting Minutes
2000 - 2003
Table of Contents

Introduction

This document presents the minutes of the Depository Library Council Meetings Minutes from 2000-2003. The minutes are in four sections sorted by year, then further divided by Spring and Fall. This document, along with the document titled *"Depository Library Council Meeting Minutes from 1994-1999"* replaces the minutes previously found on www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/minutes.html

2000

Spring Meeting — 2000

Summary of the Spring 2000 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Newport, Rhode Island
April 9 - 12, 2000

Sunday, April 9, 2000, 8 – 10 p.m. session

Following dinner with Michael DiMario, Public Printer, and other GPO staff, Council met in working session. Due to travel difficulties two members were not in attendance. Duncan Aldrich, Chair, welcomed and introduced Council members.

Organizational matters were considered as the first order of business. Mary Redmond was selected the new Council Secretary, beginning with the fall 2000 meeting. Committee assignments were discussed with the suggestion of a possible new committee on technology. The Depository Council Handbook will be discussed later in the week. A new host for the Council discussion list will be established. Recommendations will need to be completed Wednesday morning to allow enough time for photocopying of the draft for Council and the audience.

GPO responses to each of last fall's recommendations were discussed. Many GPO staff were present to answer questions or clarify responses. Reports were heard from Council Committee and Working Group Chairs on the various accomplishments and activities since the last meeting. A few reports were deferred until the Monday morning meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Monday, April 10, 2000, First Plenary session

Council members present:

Duncan M. Aldrich, Chair, Mary Alice Baish, Maggie Farrell, Linda Fredericks, Diane L. Garner, Robert A. Hinton, Sharon Hogan, Paula Kaczmarek, Donna P. Koepp, Gregory W. Lawrence, Mary Redmond, Andrea Sevetson, Fred B. Wood.

Sheila McGarr, Chief of the Library Division at the Library Programs Service and Program Coordinator, welcomed all to Newport on behalf of the Government Printing Office. Ms. McGarr noted that there was an excellent turnout for this meeting, with even higher attendance than last fall's meeting in Kansas City. She announced two special events taking place this week. There will be a reception for all attendees this evening at the U.S. Naval War College. Additional contributors to this event are The Consortium of Rhode Island Academic and Research Libraries (CRIARL), Government Publication Librarians of New England (GPLNE), Marcive, Connecticut Government Documents Round Table, Autographics, Inc. and Congressional Information Service, Inc. There will be a tour Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning of the Redwood Library and Athenaeum, a National Registered Historic Landmark celebrating its 250th anniversary in 2000.

Duncan Aldrich, Council Chair, welcomed everyone to the spring 2000 Depository Library Council meeting. Chair Aldrich provided some background information about the Council. Council is an advisory body to the Public Printer and members are appointed by him. Council, organizationally, lies between GPO and depository libraries. He continued by surveying the audience to determine how many people were representing the various geographic regions of the country and types of libraries represented. Chair Aldrich then asked members of Council to introduce themselves. He then asked GPO staff to stand and introduce themselves. Chair Aldrich extended special thanks to the Electronic Information Committee, chaired by Maggie Farrell, for their report on the Transition Plan. Ms. Farrell is also the Chair-elect of Council and will preside over the next two meetings. He thanked Donna Koepp, Secretary of Council, who will put together Council minutes for this meeting.

Chair Aldrich invited the audience to make suggestions to members of Council, or to write notes to Council and drop them in the "suggestion ice bucket" at the front of the room. He also welcomed everyone to Council working sessions. They are all open meetings.

Barbara Weaver, Chief Information Officer of the Office of Library and Information Services, Rhode Island Department of Administration, welcomed all of us to Rhode Island. She shared with us some of her experiences when she was a Depository Library Council member beginning in 1979. She also recognized Dan O'Mahony for his service in providing continuing access to public information for the State of Rhode Island. She also reminded all of us that Council has been working on revisions to Title 44 since 1979.

Public Printer Michael DiMario welcomed all of us to the spring Depository Library Council meeting, and expressed his pleasure at coming before us on this occasion. He especially enjoys Council meetings in the field where depository libraries are located since it helps him put faces together with various places. This is part of our national community. It is a remarkable partnership that is not recognized as much as it should be. The fact that libraries contribute most of the monetary support for the FDLP is also little known and recognized.

Financially again this year, there is a continuation of the gradual reduction in funding from Congress that has been going on for years. This is known as flat funding and in reality is a reduction in funds available. The first hearing, which was in the House, was held February 1. It was relatively uneventful. The Senate hearing was held February 22, and it also was uneventful, in fact quite friendly, starting off with praise for GPO's efforts at meeting the Y2K requirement, and in faithfully continuing the delivery of the Congressional Record and bills, etc.

The appropriations request that was submitted was for a 15% increase over last year's $29.8 million budget, or $34.5 million. This increase is entirely for the FDLP, and amounts to a $4.6 million increase. Of the total amount requested, $29.8 million is for the depository program, $3.3 million is for cataloging and indexing, $885,000 is for the international exchange program, and $509,000 is for statutory distribution. Some of the increase will cover five new positions, which will support the depository library program and the cataloging and indexing program. It was pointed out in the House hearing that this increase in positions for the depository library program was being offset by a decrease in overall staffing of GPO. They are still below their statutory limit in number of personnel.

An increase of $2 million is being sought to support the expansion of GPO Access, primarily hardware and software. This program has been extremely successful. There is also a very active outreach program with the Federal agencies, which will cause this program to grow even more. There is still a lack of understanding on the part of Congress that the electronic program costs money. Although the program can provide all of these publications free on the Web, the technology required to do so costs money. Expanded bandwidth is a necessity. GPO already has approval for the installation of a new T3 line, and this involves a $200,000 charge for telephone service alone.

The electronic program, however, has saved millions in the cost of paper and distribution of publications. The auditors, Booz Allen, stated in their report that any savings realized in the transition to electronic, should be used for the expansion of the electronic program. The request also includes a $1.26 million increase in the print program to cover distribution to libraries of large projects such as the new edition of the U.S. Code. The U.S. Code is revised every six years, and it is by statutory requirement that copies are printed and distributed to depository libraries, but Congress is resisting this anyway. Mr. DiMario paused in his report to extend a special thank you to Ridley Kessler for testifying as the ALA witness at the February House hearing in support of the appropriation request by GPO.

In addition to the S&E appropriation request, GPO is also asking for funding of Congressional Printing and Binding for $80.8 million. This is a Congressional appropriation given to GPO to cover the cost of Congressional publications. Some of this is for increased volume due to the production of the six year revision of the U.S. Code. This is not for distribution to the librar-

ies but the cost of production and distribution to Congress. GPO also looked at the production cost patterns of election years, which this year is, and factored in those increased costs. Congress scrutinized all this as well.

To cover the costs of major air conditioning improvements to the GPO building, $6 million has been requested. This was also requested last year and not funded. The House told GPO to cover the costs of these improvements over a span of years by cost recovery through their products. The last time the air conditioning was improved it was a line item in the budget. GPO believes that this is an extraordinary expense that Congress should cover and last year the Senate agreed and supported their request with $5 million, which was removed during the conference hearing. The Senate staff again seemed to react favorably to this request, but in the House it is a continuing issue. We'll have to wait and see what happens in conference.

There is continuing reduction of the size of the agency. GPO has asked that the ceiling on the number of employees be placed at 3,285. This will include the 5 new positions being requested. This level will allow essential hires, but no expansion in the program. This is the lowest level GPO has reached in the past century. In 1971 when Mr. DiMario came to GPO there were 8,500 employees. Staffs in all areas are very dedicated, and performance is nearly flawless, notwithstanding some problems that are beyond their control, such as when a contractor defaults.

With the current climate in the House, further cuts are anticipated. GPO's total request may not be honored, but there are allocations that have been made within the committee that have been approved. Markup within the House committee will occur sometime in May. Nothing has been heard yet from the Senate side.

Overall financial performance last year resulted, as in the past two years, in a shortfall of $5 million against a total budget of $765 million. This occurred despite a 1% increase, from 6% to 7%, in the surcharge to agencies. That part of the program, however, is in the black. The GPO Access program has helped to save money, at the same time the Sales Program has been adversely affected by the GPO Access program offering, online, many of the publications that might have been sold.

There is currently a study underway, to be reported to Congress, of the bookstore program and the distribution program at Pueblo, Colorado. GPO will be attempting to make the bookstore program more viable.

Mr. DiMario pointed out that concerning the NTIS closing issue, his position and that of GPO differed from that of the National Commission on Library and Information Science (NCLIS). He felt that it would be inappropriate for him, as a presidential appointee, to take the stand proposed by NCLIS. He understands that the Department of Commerce had the support of the Executive Office to close NTIS, and it would not have been appropriate for him to oppose that position. However, he has always believed that the material going into the NTIS program was appropriate for the FDLP. He wants to go on record as supporting the concept of bringing NTIS into the FDLP. If the decision were made to close NTIS, GPO would then look to incorporate this material into the FDLP, given the necessary additional resources to do so. He added that the depository community and he personally had lost a very good friend and supporter this past winter with the death of Jeanne Simon, Chair of NCLIS.

Mr. DiMario expressed his pride in the work done by the FDLP, as well as other elements of GPO. He said that this is an excellent program that deserves higher recognition from our Government than what it gets.

Mr. DiMario announced the new appointees to the Depository Library Council
(see Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00).

Fran Buckley
See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00

Gil Baldwin
See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00

T.C. Evans

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #6, 4/15/00

GPO Information Exchange, Council and Audience, Q & A

Council

Paula Kaczmarek, question for T.C. Evans: Referring to the numbers of databases disseminated total and last year, asked if this is a larger increase than the previous year.

Audience

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, asked a procedural question about when the responses to last year's recommendation would be discussed.

Council replied that that discussion had occurred in the Sunday night meeting as first order of business.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, addressed last year's recommendation and response number 3 on GPO Access Gateways. She reviewed the background and history of the establishment and development of Gateways, including the meeting of GPO and Gateway site representatives at the 1997 Council meeting in Clearwater Beach. She expressed her displeasure over GPO's lack of response to these first Gateways, and her regret that GPO would no longer offer them any support after September 2000.

Gil Baldwin, GPO, responded that LPS appreciated the great effort that has been made by Gateway sites since 1995, but that times have changed. His advice to Gateways is to look at how they can best benefit users today.

Maggie Farrell, Council, summarized what was discussed at the Council meeting Sunday evening. There was concern that thank yous be sent to Gateway sites and some official recognition made for their service.

Paula Kaczmarek, Council, asked how low end users would still be able to gain access to GPO Access. How do we in libraries direct the low end user? Perhaps an article in Administrative Notes would be helpful. This issue is a concern to Council, but Council also realizes that we must take what we have learned from the Gateway Project and move it forward to what we can do today.

Paula Kaczmarek, Council, asked a question of Cindi Wolff. Does Cindi have documentation on responses from the Gateways themselves?

Elizabeth Cowell, UC, San Diego, responded that a lot of this comes from a philosophical point of view. How can Gateways provide access to their users? They still need to be advised when new things come up, and they need to move away from dissemination toward an archive model.

Linda Fredericks, Council, expressed her belief that there was a feeling among the people there that the support received earlier wasn't needed any more, but that there is still a need for different kinds of support. There is a need for reference support, there is room for service partnerships with GPO and libraries to provide this help, and there still needs to be telnet connections for the visually impaired.

Fred Wood, Council, noted that there is still a need for partnerships with GPO, but the technology of the Gateways is in transformation. What the Gateways were doing before is now being done on the Web. We need to bring the program up to date.

T.C. Evans, GPO, responded that Telnet is still provided and GPO remains committed to that.

Andrea Sevetson, Council, stated that she was unclear about what the partnership requirements for consulting were before the dissolution of a partnership.

George Barnum, GPO, explained that there is a clause for ending a partnership, but he can't remember the documentation for the Gateway sites. He believes there were letters, but not a full partnership as we know them today. Gateways pre-date the service partnership concept. We only began talking about the Gateways as partners in Clearwater Beach.

Ann Miller, Duke, stated that although her institution has explored the opportunity, it has not been a partner or a gateway. She believes, however, that this is a good time to talk about these agreements as partnerships, looking at new and creative ways they could be used.

Duncan Aldrich, Council Chair, asked if there were questions on other issues related to the presentations this morning or other general questions directed toward GPO.

Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law Library, expressed her appreciation to GPO for the wonderful work they have done in making items available online. However, she is very concerned about permanent access and would like to hear more about what is being done to assure this.

Bernadine Abbot Hoduski, private citizen, noted that two depository librarians from LSU, Roberta Scull, retired and Council member in the 80s, and Jimmy Hoover, former Director of Government Documents Department who died recently, would be greatly interested in this discussion. Some way is needed to recognize and continue these Gateway relationships.

T.C. Evans, GPO, made the announcement based on a press release, just now received, stating that the Supreme Court, on April 17, 2000 will release their database for GPO Access. [Much congratulations and applause!]

Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico, as one of the original drafters of the FDLP service guidelines, expressed concern regarding GPO's Proposal #3 calling for depository libraries to provide service on all CD-ROMs distributed through the program. There is still difficulty in using and providing help with some of the CD-ROMs. He would like to have a clarification of what is meant by a reasonable level of service.

Andrea Sevetson, Council, expressed also that she would like to hear more on the meaning of "good faith effort."

Linda Fredericks, Council, would like to hear from the audience on how they are handling this situation, from stand-alone to network based. (A show of hands indicated that many others were experiencing the same thing.)

Greg Lawrence, Council, asked Dan Barkley whether or not he circulated CD-ROMs to faculty, thinking that perhaps he may have thought that this was against GPO policy.

Dan Barkely, UNM, stated that circulation was not a problem. It did, however, seem that GPO may be asking for a greater level of service on CD-ROMs than is provided in merely circulating them.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, asked if we needed to have a Mac? We do not have Windows NT. Do we need to instruct in SASS and SPSS?

Bette Siegel, State Library of Massachusetts, suggested that there be standard software on every PC.

Ridley Kessler, UNC, stated that the service guidelines are very different from the technical guidelines. He helped to write the service guidelines, and he likes the phraseology, "to the best of our ability." We should let sleeping dogs lie.

Nancy Ogg, Missouri Supreme Court Library, asked if there would be a response to the earlier question about permanent access.

George Barnum, GPO, stated that there would be permanent access procedures to archive and to the best of their ability, make electronic data available forever.

Monday afternoon, April 10, 2000, Plenary Session continued.

Chair Aldrich announced that we would continue with Council Committee reports on Action Items 1 and 2 and recommendations for Council action.

Maggie Farrell, Chair of the Electronic Transition Committee , presented "Report on GPO's Transition to a More Electronic FDLP" (see Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00). This report was made available to all attendees. This is not a draft, but a final report, unless there are grammatical errors or serious disagreements about it from Council. It is the hope of the Committee that Council can go straight into recommendations and action items as a result of this report. Maggie thanked all those on the committee.

In addition to the report, Maggie stated that the committee would also be looking at two GPO proposals, Proposal #2, Increase the Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries; and Proposal #3, Revise the "Depository Library Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Formats" to Establish a Service Requirement for Tangible Electronic Products. Comments on these two proposals given this morning are much appreciated. If there are additional comments, please talk to Maggie or another Committee member. This will be taken up in a Council Working Session sometime tomorrow.

Maggie asked for questions from Council. Duncan expressed thanks to Maggie and the Committee for their excellent work. This begins to push the electronic collection beyond the doors of the depository library.

Greg Lawrence, Chair of the Preservation and Archival Issues Committee, reported on his work on Action Item 6 from the fall 1999 Council meeting. This action item stated that Council recognizes the importance of preserving digital products distributed to the FDLP on tangible media. Accordingly, the Preservation Committee will examine issues concerning library cooperation in digital preservation activities, digital preservation training for depository librarians, and develop a draft assessment tool to list and describe at-risk titles distributed through FDLP. The Preservation Committee members will report to Council at the fall 2000 meeting and provide an assessment tool for review.

Mr. Lawrence has prepared a document "Risk Management of Digital Information: a Risk Assessment Workbook for Federal Depository Libraries," as a discussion draft. He presented some of his findings from the preparation of this workbook.

It is Mr. Lawrence's belief that any strategy will require procedures to preserve the information, and a management plan to organize and control the process. Key points in this process follow.

- A process must be established to regularly identify digital products that need preservation.

- Key to this identification process is content of the material being preserved.

- Since digital information is seeded with hazards, risk is always present in developing a strategy for preserving electronic content. Providing long-term access will require migrating data from one file structure or format to another and is more risky than refreshing data for shorter term access by periodic copying from one medium to another. Both strategies might be successfully employed in developing a national preservation infrastructure for depository materials.

- A general strategy of transferring data to an online environment with public access serves a purpose in that the continual use by the public would result in complaints if the data were no longer working, and in that way demand institutional attention to fix the problem. This avoids the out-of-sight, out-of-mind problem that has already affected certain files in National Archives and the Smithsonian Institution, among others.

- Remember to look to possible root causes for failures in preservation management, which are frequently organizational or fiscal in origin.

- The FDLP needs a successful risk management strategy that can be communicated effectively to many interested stakeholders. This includes non-depository colleagues, our library administrators, our organizational administration and our direct data users.

- We need to convey the idea that information is at risk, and we need to develop a way to quantify risk. The workbook that Mr. Lawrence has developed presents a risk management scale with two dimensions: risk probability and risk impact. The combined values are easy to map in a 2 dimensional decision matrix, using the probability and impact scales for x/y axis, giving an overall state of risk.

Mr. Lawrence's presentation was followed by questions from the audience and Council:

Connie Kyker, Indiana State University stated that training would be very important in implementing these measures. She also asked if GPO wasn't going to do all of the preservation for us.

Fran Buckley, GPO, replied that this is the whole emphasis of the partnership effort and cooperation with the agencies. GPO can not do it all. We will all need to work together. This is the focus of the electronic collection plan, but GPO just can't do it all alone. GPO will try to set up programs that can be implemented cooperatively through the Partnership Program.

Maggie Farrell, Council, emphasized that one of the concerns from GPO is the lack of resources. More effort in this direction would require diverting existing resources or asking for more. She offered the suggestion that inspectors could do some training when they are on the road. We must keep in mind the existing budget and prioritization.

Fran Buckley, GPO, said that they are trying to work smarter and are developing online tutorials and CDs to help with the training situation.

Maggie Farrell, Council, suggested that tutorials could be integrated into local training sessions which would be good.

Jyoti Pandit, SUNY at Stony Brook, asked about costs of preservation.

Greg Lawrence answered that there were direct and indirect costs. Costs escalate substantially when volume goes up. Floppy to floppy is easy and cheap. To standardize to a CD-ROM is probably more efficient. A read/write CD burner is about $1200 to $1500. Binders with special sleeves are $3.00. It is well worth it in the long run.

Jyoti Pandit asked Mr. Lawrence if he had identified librarians who could do this procedure.

Greg Lawrence replied that training is simple. Setting up the procedures requires a greater understanding of the process.

Fran Buckley, GPO, reiterated that there is no comprehensive permanent public access/preservation program at this time. They are still at the rhetoric stage with no firm program yet. NARA, whose mission is a little different, is also working on testing and developing the process.

The Plenary Session adjourned.

The Depository Library Council resumed in Working Session at 3:45 p.m.

Council members looked over the agenda for the remainder of the meeting and decided which sessions they felt it necessary to attend and to report on to other Council members.

Chair Aldrich reviewed the questions from the audience that had been put in the ice bucket.

Self-studies were discussed. 50% of self-studies result in a personal inspection. Gil Baldwin pointed out that not everything leading to an in-house inspection is bad. New staff or change in departmental organization is frequently the reason. In this case GPO acts as consultant.

Council suggested that this might be further discussed and assigned to the Operations Committee.

There was a discussion of the fact that bills will be moving from fiche to electronic, as well as the Federal Register and Commerce Business Daily. Digital signatures are an issue. More and more agencies will have to deal with official status. There is an ongoing group working on the authentication issue in Congress. One of the issues in the House is that they want control over all of the versions of a bill introduced into the House. The various versions are now in GPO. LC maintains a bills database that GPO helps with. The Law Revision Counsel is involved with this issue. The question of permanent availability was raised about all versions of a bill. It was suggested that we might want to get an expert to address this issue at our fall meeting in Washington, D.C. There is a GPO commitment to preserve all that is on GPO Access, which would include the bills. Authenticity remains a problem. This may be a possible recommendation.

Chair Aldrich asked for Council reaction to the discussion of Gateways at this morning's meeting. Ways we might proceed were discussed. The sense of Council was that there definitely needed to be thank you letters sent, and there was concern over the future role of these institutions that made an investment at the time of establishing their gateways. Many liked the idea of an evaluation. An action item or recommendation seems to be in order on this issue.

Service guidelines and core competencies were discussed briefly. These will be covered in more detail when Maggie Farrell's report on the electronic transition is discussed.

Mary Redmond reported on the Operations Committee in Julia Wallace's absence. Council will continue to work on the cost and value evaluation after this afternoon's session.

Donna Koepp reported briefly on the Partnership Working Group. There have been discussions with George Barnum on specific ideas for raising the awareness of partnership opportunities.

Mary Alice Baish reported on NTIS closing down at the end of this fiscal year, and the NCLIS involvement, since they had just done an assessment in mid-March based on meetings in Washington and private sector meetings. All of the NCLIS documentation is on the NCLIS website. There are very strong feelings for NTIS to continue; the program is greatly needed. GPO has similar functions of dissemination, etc., and NARA has expressed some interest in working with GPO or taking over some of the functions. This may be an opportunity for GPO. There is a timeline for NTIS, which is given at the NCLIS website.

There are many other functions that NTIS carries out that are important in the future outcome of this issue. There are some implications of privatization, which we should be carefully monitoring. There are real risks to public information here. The Depository Library Council's mission is to advise the Public Printer, who has already taken a public stand on these issues. The best Council can do now is monitor the situation.

Council members then listed possible recommendations, commendations and action plans to direct their discussions in tomorrow's working session.

Tuesday, April 11, 2000, Second Plenary Session

Disposition of Depository Collection to National Archives and Records Administration was addressed by:

George D. Barnum, Electronic Collection Manager, LPS

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Administration Branch, LPS

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Cataloging Branch Update was given by:

Thomas A. Downing, Chief, Cataloging Branch, LPS Cataloging and Locator Services

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Cataloging & Locator Tools Proposals were presented by:

Laurie B. Hall, *Supervisory Program Analyst, LPS*

See Remarks, Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00

Council and Audience Q & A

Bernadine Abbot Hoduski, private citizen, had several questions concerning the permanent protection of materials that go through GPO. Archivists have a different view of record retention. Sometimes archivists even weed their collections. Some of GPO materials are not cataloged separately, i.e., Energy series. NARA has said that they had no legal requirement to preserve government publications. She would like to see a common definition of what needs to be preserved. Perhaps there should be a program to bring these folks together to discuss this common definition. If this doesn't work, then we need legislation. What are we using for our oversight protection now that there is no Joint Committee on Printing?

George Barnum said that for tangible materials that they are following the records schedule defined by law.

Fran Buckley answered that there is oversight from both GPO and NARA, which are both attempting to follow the law. They are working to improve the situation, including creating better definitions.

George Barnum stated that they (GPO/NARA) are beginning to understand this as a set of relationships with interacting responsibilities. The paper products require much different practices than the electronic data.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, asked if non-tangible electronic preservation is on hold?

George Barnum replied that it is being worked on now. At this point no records disposition schedules are being changed, pending the outcome of the court cases. The practical answer is that the agencies are expected to do the best they can until there is written guidance. They haven't started into the frontier of electronic resources yet.

Cindi Wolff, LSU, stated that as she understands it, there is no backup copy of electronic web based products outside of what GPO is doing.

Duncan Aldrich, Council, asked a question about where the metadata reside, OCLC or GPO?

Tad Downing replied that CORC is not available through the catalog. They are examining how the software works. Some of the catalogers are currently evaluating this.

George Barnum explained that CORC examines the tagging at the site. It shows the user what metadata it has been able to find. Site designers need to learn more about what metadata needs to be there so that it can be successfully used. GPO staff are working with the staff at U.S. Institute of Peace to see what needs to be done and then work out a methodology to accomplish this.

Duncan Aldrich, Council, stated that CORC goes along with a body of data and a way of looking at the data. It can be viewed as a Dublin Core record or a MARC record. CORC is a database with the elements in it and they can be displayed in a variety of ways. They will investigate to determine how best to look at these records.

Andrea Sevetson, Council, stated that she was pleased to learn about the retro cataloging project in browse electronic titles, and asked when a PURL gets assigned.

Tad Downing explained that there was a weekly examination of records. A PURL is assigned when it is decided to make an item available through the New Electronic Titles (NET).

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, asked if there was any kind of connection for the user to go between the browse titles and the electronic titles.

Laurie Hall replied that this is what they are trying to do. They want to focus new electronic titles on current things. The On-line Monthly Catalog will represent everything.

Tad Downing explained that the intent is to make NET the current awareness tool, but that MoCat is comprehensive.

Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky, asked for confirmation that items being worked on in CORC will be in the MoCat, in some format, either MARC or Dublin Core.

Tad Downing confirmed that yes they will be represented in the catalog.

Sandy McAninch further asked if the Serial Set would be in the MoCat.

Tad Downing said that he assumed that they would be there. He stated that he would confirm that later.

Geoffrey Swindells, University of Missouri, stated that tighter links were needed between browse electronic titles and the electronic MoCat.

Laurie Hall responded that they have not yet talked about that, but that they will consider it.

The Plenary Session was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

The Depository Library Council resumed in Working Session at 10:30 a.m.

Chair Aldrich laid out what we needed to accomplish in the next 24 hours.

Andrea Sevetson led the discussion on cataloging and locator tools. She thanked Tad Downing and Laurie Hall for their work on this project.

A discussion of various points in the report followed. It was generally agreed that the service partnership idea was a good one for accomplishing the goals of the proposal. There was some agreement that phasing out the MoCat CD-ROM would be a good idea. There is a problem with the software that prepares this item. This is the best software to which GPO has a license but it has no compression capability, so they cannot get much on one CD. It may still be needed by some of the smallest libraries. They could probably do better with an annual cumulative edition. The law still requires a pamphlet edition, a monthly list.

The Committee will continue work on this issue and come up with a recommendation, which will then be reviewed by Council as a whole.

Maggie Farrell led the discussion on the Report on GPO's Transition to a More Electronic FDLP. Council discussed whether or not this required a recommendation or a response to the report. Ms. Farrell stated that she believed that GPO was seeking guidance from Council and it is her desire that we move on it to create a guiding document for next year. With a limited budget GPO cannot do everything that is asked for here, so there needs to be some prioritization. Council also understands that changing Title 44 is not an easy process. We need to find a way around the law that will still offer opportunities beyond the depository library community for influence. We need to find outreach opportunities for GPO.

Council adjourned at 12:10 for lunch.

Council resumed the afternoon Working Session at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Farrell continued the discussion of the Transition Report by stating that she would be willing to draft a general statement that will result in one philosophical recommendation stating that we are satisfied with the direction that GPO has taken so far and offering some direction on where they might go next.

Chair Aldrich asked for reactions to **Proposal #1** on Redefining Depository Library Size Categories. This is resetting the definitions of library size to reflect the historic growth of physical collections. Chair Aldrich suggested that Council write a quick recommendation that GPO move ahead on the proposal. Some discussion followed, pointing out that new baselines from which to measure would probably not last 5 years. We are at the point of having to consider electronic data sources. The old measure is based on volumes of books. Things like this need to be reviewed on a regular schedule. It was generally agreed that we needed a recommendation asking that there be a cyclical review on measurements.

Proposal #2 to Increase the Minimum Technical Requirements for Public Access Workstations in Federal Depository Libraries at Regular Intervals was discussed next. There was some concern expressed about the timing and length of the update cycle and how it would effect inspections of depository libraries. It was unanimously decided to recommend implementation of this proposal with the addition of a statement asking GPO to articulate their expectations for the inspection process.

Proposal #3 to Revise the "Depository Library Public Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Formats" to Establish a Service Requirement for Tangible Electronic Products, was discussed. After examining many pros and cons it was decided to not accept the proposal, but to make it an Action Item.

The GPO position on Gateways was discussed next. There was some sentiment that Council should not be in the middle of gateways and GPO, but since Council had asked GPO to respond to this situation last year, we must act in some way now. GPO will communicate with each of the Gateways in writing with a thank you and words of appreciation. The telnet or dial up will not be eliminated, because they must comply with ADA requirements for websites. It was pointed out that although the Gateways may now be considered service partnerships, the Gateways actually started before the partnership concept. They were retrofitted around the new program of partnerships. Council agreed to prepare a recommendation.

Mary Alice Baish brought up the issue of moving bills from microfiche to online. There is a problem of authentication if that is done. Until authentication can be provided we will need to continue with microfiche. Fran Buckley pointed out that this is the official source that Congress has been using, but there is no process yet for a digital signature. Ms. Baish added that this is the beginning of a much larger issue. There will be lots of documents that will need to be authenticated. Although there is a definite need to continue the microfiche bills, Mr. Buckley pointed out that there is pressure to eliminate all dual distribution. These bills are already online and they need to eliminate the redundancy in the microfiche distribution. This may be a very good argument for Congress to recommend that GPO utilize an authenticated digital signature. It was decided that Council would prepare a recommendation along the lines that Ms. Baish proposed.

The last item for consideration is our Census question recommending that GPO continue to distribute core materials in paper. Some of these products are distributed in paper and microfiche, as well as on the Web, resulting in duplicate dissemination. Mr. Buckley pointed out that specifying specific products would make it easier. This will call for a recommendation, which Council will work out.

Chair Aldrich went through the list of recommendations resulting from the prior discussions, and assigned Council members for drafting each.

Our list of possible commendations was reviewed and drafters assigned. The list of possible action items was discussed, narrowed down, and assigned to specific committees and working groups.

Council broke into working groups to commence drafting recommendations, commendations and action items.

Wednesday, April 12, 2000, Working Session, 8:00 a.m.

- Council completed its work on the draft recommendations that would be presented at the Plenary Session this afternoon at 2:00.

- The Council website was discussed. Paula Kaczmarek volunteered to be the Council webmaster/coordinator and will work with Joe Paskoski on any revisions or updates.

- Chair Aldrich asked for further discussion on the handbook. It was moved and seconded to accept the updates. Diane Garner will get the revised copy to Chair Aldrich and he will take it from there.

- The Electronic Transition Committee was discussed. Lacking any continuing assignment, this committee was dissolved.

- The new Chair and Secretary of Council were nominated and voted on. Maggie Farrell will be the new Chair and Mary Redmond will be the new Secretary.

- Maggie Farrell took over from Chair Aldrich the determination of Committee Chairs for the coming year.

- Electronic Preservation Issues Committee, Donna Koepp, Chair

- Greg Lawrence will continue as member until Fall

- Partnership Working Group, Donna Koepp, Chair

- Operations Committee, Linda Fredericks, Chair
  - Fred Wood
  - Mary Redmond
    - Working Group on Value, Mary Redmond
      - Paula Kaczmarek
    - Working Group on Core e-competencies, Bob Hinton, Chair
      - Diane Garner
      - Linda Fredericks

- Cataloging and Locator Committee, Andrea Sevetson, Chair
  - Cathy Hartman
  - John Stevenson
  - Dena Hutto

- Information Exchange/Communications Committee, Sharon Hogan, Chair
  - Fred Wood

Wednesday afternoon, April 12, 2000, Plenary Session

Chair Aldrich called the session to order. Copies of Draft Recommendations had been distributed to the audience. Members of Council reported on the spring 2000 Council Recommendations, Commendations and Action Items (see Administrative Notes, v. 21, #7, 5/1/00).

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

Chair Aldrich thanked all of the GPO staff who helped to make this meeting a success, thanked the audience for their attention and thanked the Council members for their dedicated work. Donna Koepp was given a special thank you for her contribution as secretary.

Maggie Farrell, as incoming Chair took over the meeting. She thanked all the outgoing members of Council with chocolates. A special thank you was expressed to Duncan Aldrich for his excellent leadership during this past year.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Koepp
Secretary, Depository Library Council

Fall Meeting — 2000

Summary of the Fall 2000 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Arlington, VA
October 22 - 25, 2000

Sunday, October 22, 2000, Council Working Session, 7:30 p.m.

Council Chair Maggie Farrell called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Council members and guests introduced themselves.

The Chair began by stating her goals for the meeting. She hopes for a provocative and productive meeting with the focus kept on what we want the future Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) to look like. This question should be kept uppermost in Council's minds in discussions, questions from the audience, and Council recommendations.

This is the second or third Council meeting on the "shortened schedule." It has worked well in the past but some discussions have had to be shortened. It is necessary to stay on track as much as possible.

The Chair added that she has a sense of a frustrated mood among the audience because of the issues of electronic transition. She wants to extract as much positive feedback as possible. Since she will be focused on the mechanics of conducting the meeting, she encourages other Council members to speak up when they feel that Council has heard enough on a particular issue to get a sense of the group, and that we need to move on to other issues.

Council's job is to listen, encourage open dialog with participants, and foster feedback about ideas on where the program should be heading.

There was some discussion about the impact of the Superintendent of Documents letter to depository library directors and the subsequent mood of the audience. The letter has made it clear that the electronic transition is really going to happen. Sharon Hogan mentioned that some directors have put together task forces to study the future of government information in their libraries. This can have profound impacts on the jobs of the people attending the conference.

The Chair recommends that Council members try to meet new attendees (160 at this meeting, or about 50 more than usual). In addition to welcoming them to the meeting, Council needs to be thinking about its recommendations for five new members who will be appointed next year. Some things to think about are special libraries (including law libraries), potential members representing minorities, and the possibility of a member or members with special needs (including a handicapping condition).

GPO Update and Concerns: Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer

The Public Printer said that his focus at the October 23 Council Plenary Session will be to suggest that it is time to hear from the community about their views on the program and how they want it shaped.

At the direction of Congress, the General Accounting Office will be doing a study of the transfer of the FDLP to the Library of Congress. The person doing the study will probably be attending the Council meeting. One of his questions is "Does the FDLP need to exist at all, given the state of electronic information?" The Public Printer hopes that Council deliberations and audience participation will answer this question. Only the depository library community can determine if the program is worthwhile to them.

Members of the Joint Committee on Printing staff have also been invited to attend.

The current appropriations process is not yet over. The bill has gone to the President, who had not signed it as of Friday, October 20. GPO has been funded by continuing resolution at the FY 2000 level of funding which goes through the end of the

week of October 27. When the President signs the appropriations bill, GPO will have the reduced appropriation passed by Congress.

Andrew Sherman of GPO will talk in detail about the appropriations process at the Council Plenary Session on October 23. Highlights include the attempt by the House to eliminate paper distribution entirely, the predetermined result of the study directed to be conducted by the General Accounting Office, ("tell us how the program can be transferred to the Library of Congress"), and the ultimate acceptance of the Conference Committee report. The appropriation for the coming fiscal year will be $27.9 million (reduced from $30 million this year).

Leadership in the Government Printing Office will be affected by the upcoming Presidential election. The Public Printer serves at the pleasure of the President. An appointment by the new President will probably occur in the spring.

There is also a study of the closure of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) being undertaken by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS). There is some overlap between this and the GAO study which is looking at both GPO and NTIS. The NCLIS study is due to Congress on December 15; the GAO study deadline is March 15, 2001.

GPO Update and Concerns: Francis Buckley, Superintendent of Documents

The Superintendent of Documents will speak to the October 23 Plenary Council session after Andrew Sherman reports on the appropriations process. Mr. Buckley will report on what will be done to live within the appropriations.

Congress has directed a more electronic FDLP in order to save money. GPO hasn't yet been able to quantify exactly how much money will be saved. During the transition, GPO will be looking for equivalent online publications instead of riding requisitions for more print copies. They are developing criteria for decisions that they are making. The bottom line is to keep information available to the public.

GPO wants feedback on their proposals and ideas. But it is not productive to try to go back to the program as it was before the budget cuts—the money is not there. And it is not just an appropriations matter—there is a general direction from Congress to go to an electronic program.

GPO is looking for what to do that works for everybody.

Mr. Buckley also mentioned FirstGov. The creators are looking for constructive criticism and help with making a better product. Despite some claims to the contrary, Firstgov does not supersede and replace GPO efforts. FirstGov is a broad-based product and not equivalent to all the cataloging that GPO does.

He also mentioned Government in a Digital Age, a new study by the Computer and Communications Association. The industry is very interested in opportunities to make money in this environment. By contrast, the depository library community speaks for public access. Librarians recognize and speak up for the private sector access and the right to increase value of government products, but do not support only fee-based access to government information.

Mr. Buckley mentioned that not all information products are available electronically.

GPO will have a chance to comment on the draft GAO study. There may never be a final version. GAO has a second letter from the House Appropriations Committee requesting further study of NTIS.

Judy Russell of NCLIS will be speaking at tomorrow's plenary session and there will be an opportunity to ask her what happens after the NCLIS report is released.

Council identified a possible action item for a Task Force to look at the NCLIS report when it is released.

Maggie Farrell asked if GPO would like Council to look at the GAO report. GPO replied that access to the text might be restricted before the report is released to Congress. But GPO hopes that Council talks to the GAO people.

There was a comment from the audience that the proposed all-electronic FDLP has a profound impact on public libraries. A large segment of their patrons are not computer literate and can't get information. Will public libraries have to add staff to provide this? There is a difference between academic and public libraries.

Mr. Buckley noted the irony in the fact that some publications, e.g., Social Security publications, are being produced in print by the agencies because they want to communicate to the public. But GPO can't get the money to distribute these publications to the very audience that the agencies want to reach. As an example, GPO is printing "Where to Write for Vital Records" for their sales catalogs.

Public Printer DiMario stressed that the depository library community must inform agencies of our concerns. It is good to talk to the GAO person conducting the study, but we need to go beyond that.

Committee Reports

Maggie Farrell announced that the reports should cover activities done, what the committees hope to accomplish at the Council meeting here, and potential action items or commendations.

Preservation Committee

Chair Donna Koepp reported on behalf of members Cathy Hartman, John Stevenson, and Mary Redmond. Former member Greg Lawrence has continued to share his experiences over the summer, and Ms. Koepp has consulted with other people. She identified two goals:

1. Raise awareness of the government documents community about the importance of preservation and seek a dialog to clarify issues. She believes the best way to do this is to tap experience to get ideas.

2. Make people aware of technological answers as efficient and affordable. There is a need to develop an understanding of electronic methods and it is necessary to advise GPO of this direction.

John Stevenson is the Preservation Committee liaison to the Permanent Public Access (PPA) Working Group. The Preservation Committee believes the PPA Working Group's efforts to be important for the preservation of government information.

Ms. Koepp anticipates action plans coming out.

The Partnership Working Group meets Tuesday, October 24, 2000 at 11:00 a.m. There is no report yet. Donna Koepp and Cathy Hartman are members, and new Council member Greta Marlatt has also expressed an interest in being on the Group.

Operations Committee

Committee Chair Linda Frederick said that the committee needs focus from the group on which way to go for action items.

There is a question about what workflow for FDLP operations means for everyone working on this. It is impossible to separate operations from the Cataloging/Locator Committee headed by Andrea Sevetson. That is our "shelflist."

The Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC), cataloging and PURLs are important. Identification of electronic products and publications and how to get at them is another issue, as is the core list of titles in the FDLP and the format for them.

She also mentioned special collections on the web and cooperative things going on. Communication with libraries and GPO is important to know what is going on.

Old business: Congressional bills in microfiche have been discontinued, Decennial Census products issued has been resolved (publications will come out in the format the Census Bureau decides), the draft SOD policy (Operations Committee seems the best place to land in or should it be a Committee of the Whole discussion?). The draft SOD has been posted on GOVDOC-L and is also available for all attendees at this conference.

Core E-Competencies Work Group

Bob Hinton is Chair. Linda Frederick and Diane Garner are members, and Paula Kaczmarek has expressed an interest in joining.

Creation of this group arose out of Proposal 3: "Revise the 'Depository Library Public Service Guidelines for Government Information in Electronic Formats' to Establish a Service Requirement for Tangible Electronic Products" (April 2000). Given the GPO response, the Group will continue.

A core list of 15 documents has been identified, including Instructions to Depository Libraries, Internet Public Access policy, etc. (basically all electronic formats). Information will be gleaned from these to point toward core competencies. The Work Group is working on the list from what has been identified so far.

By end of this conference there will either be recommendations or a firm action plan. Issues are:

1. E-competencies

2. Recommendations or requirements?

3. Just public service or technical services/support staff?

4. Implications of rollover specifications becoming minimum standards and any e-competencies needed.

5. Circumstances—various depository scopes, sizes, etc.

6. Impact on self studies and inspections

7. Other competencies and how they relate to e-competencies

Paula Kaczmarek asked if these were competencies for librarians or libraries. The reply was that the focus seems to have been on staff. But Ms. Kaczmarek wonders about the focus and impact on libraries as institutions.

For the focus, it might be good to go back to Proposal 3.

The Core E-Competencies Work Group will meet Tuesday, October 24 at 11:00 a.m.

Value and Cost of Depository Collections

Mary Redmond chairs this Work Group. Pauline Kaczmarek and Debbie Madsen (Kansas State University) have also worked on this project.

Depository librarians have been asked by their administrations for replacement costs of depository materials in case of disaster. Council wants to gather and make available information on this question.

Ms. Redmond distributed copies of a study prepared by Michael Cotter of East Carolina University. Figures need to be updated but the methodology is a good one. A request for information posted to GOVDOC-L did not yield much more information. Ms. Kaczmarek will supply additional information from her files. The revised material will be posted on the Depository Library Council Web site.

Cataloging/Locator Committee

Andrea Sevetson chairs this committee. Other members are Dena Hutto, Arlene Weible, George Carlson, John Stevenson, Julia Wallace, Nan Myers, Tim Byrne, and Maggie Farrell.

The Committee has been talking about goals. Dena Hutto put out the committee goals and more things to study.

Communications Committee

Sharon Hogan and Fred Wood are committee members. Their job is to "watch and look."

There was some discussion of commendations for GPO's partnership with the National Library of Medicine for permanent access to some publications, the new PubScience search engine which can search across multiple databases, a comment that FirstGov should think about what they don't have yet, how GPO should work with FirstGov (not a GPO product but if it goes through GPO should work with it). There was a comment that GPO offered the opportunity to take GPO Access and rename it, but the offer was not accepted.

Permanent Public Access Working Group

John Stevenson is Council's liaison to the Permanent Public Access Working Group because of his interest in preservation and his close proximity to Washington, DC. He attended the June 19 PPA Working Group meeting and has informed Council by e-mail.

The PPA Working Group has enhanced agencies' ability to create memos of understanding.

The next PPA Working Group meeting is scheduled for the afternoon of November 2.

Francis Buckley added that GPO has put up a Web site (http://www.gpo.gov/ppa/), and is posting minutes from PPA Working Group meetings to get people involved and agencies to come together. The PPA Working Group is a springboard for many projects and the sharing of information. In addition to agencies and Congressional committees, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has been invited to attend but there has been no response to date.

Depository Library Council Manual

Paula Kaczmarek is in charge of this project. She took the manual that Diane Garner had produced in order to put in more editorial comment. She did not have the opportunity to do this, but has brought copies of the manual to this meeting.

She needs to send a message to GPO staff member Joe Paskoski about the update of the Council pages.

Her new e-mail address is paula5201@hotmail.com.

Other

Fred Wood said that work needs to be done to state a framework on why there needs to be a depository program. Andrea Sevetson replied that the book Fulfilling Madison's Vision and various fact sheets were intended for that purpose. They need constant updating.

Mr. Wood thinks that Council has to take a role in this, and that the concerns need to be conveyed to GPO, GAO, and wherever else would be appropriate. This might be a proposal for an action item.

Draft Superintendent of Documents (SOD) Policy

Maggie Farrell asked Council to read the draft SOD policy which was sent ahead of the meeting. Council will discuss on Monday, October 23 at 3:50 p.m. in the working session.

Library Programs Service (LPS) FY 2000 Annual Report to Council

There was a review of the LPS Fiscal Year 2000 annual report to Council.

Andrea Sevetson has marked several possible commendations in the annual report.

There was a question about a commendation for the fixing of the problem with the boxes arriving. Other suggestions for commendations were the FDLP Desktop, New Electronic Titles, and the U.S. Institute of Peace (GPO says this is still in process).

Andrea Sevetson mentioned that the bottom of pages "Mail to" in GPO Access are not always the places to which she would send comments. She requested a review in GPO of statements at the bottom of their pages. T.C. Evans replied that the comment she had mentioned was forwarded to the proper place.

Paula Kaczmarek noted that in September GPO received 42 notifications about fugitive documents from GPO's SPA (Simplified Purchase Agreement) partners. The SPA process provides streamlined procurement procedures for Federal agencies to acquire printing and information products and services up to $2,500 in value from local commercial sources in one month. The number of notifications is very impressive. She recommended monitoring this until April with the possibility of a commendation if the situation continues.

Someone asked if there has ever been a commendation about the Conference which runs concurrently with the Council meeting. The reply was that there has not.

Paula Kaczmarek had a question on LPS Outreach (page 8 of the annual report). She suggests more templates and downloads of materials for depository librarians. Given the electronic atmosphere, might there be more of this nature for end users?

Sheila McGarr says LPS needs to have more public relations material printed before opening it up. Stock would be exhausted if it were opened up now.

New handouts for Ben's Guide Web site are at the printer. They are very colorful.

There is also an impressive list of places where LPS staff have spoken about the FDLP.

Audience member Earl Shumaker suggested more contacts with service clubs in the community, e.g., League of Women Voters.

John Stevenson suggested a variety of formats for public relations material (PDF, text, etc.). Ms. Kaczmarek said that text is more flexible for her and she can customize it for her library.

Francis Buckley said that staff from the Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services have prepared an article on GPO Access. If it is text file, we can use and edit. Mr. Evans has a section on the Federal Bulletin Board in multiple formats.

Review of Spring 2000 Recommendations and Responses

Recommendation 2. GPO Access Gateways. Paula Kaczmarek said that there is a problem with telnet numbers for GPO Access Gateways. They are hard to find. The user has to go through twelve pages in order to get to the list. T.C. Evans of GPO said he thought that had been changed. Ms. Kaczmarek and Mr. Evans will get together and investigate this.

Recommendation 4. 2000 Census Products. Former Council member Julia Wallace had a concern about the availability of Census products in paper. Gil Baldwin said that the Census Bureau might not have as many choices as we might think. Paula Kaczmarek and Donna Koepp will look into this and see if more can be done to help communicate the need for Census products.

Recommendation 6. Electronic Transition. Fred Wood suggested revisiting this in light of issues on the whole question of the need for a Federal Depository Library Program.

Recommendation 7. Cataloging/Locator Services. John Stevenson asked if the online Catalog of U.S. Government Publications could be substituted for the printed version. Sheila McGarr responded that a printed catalog is required in law (Title 44, section 1710, 1711).

Recommendation 9. Congressional Bills. These are no longer going to be available in microfiche format. There was discussion of the "official" status of the online product. GPO should go through whatever necessary steps (as they do for the Congressional Record) to be able to state the official nature of this version. Francis Buckley said that there is a difference between this and the Federal Register/Code of Federal Regulations situation because there is a FR/CFR Advisory Committee which can declare something to be official.

Andrea Sevetson expressed the concern that librarians will be "hassled" because there is no statement saying that electronic Congressional bills are official. She suggested some language along the lines of "Electronic bills are produced from the same source files as the official printed versions." Officers of the court, etc. will be able to point such a statement. The statement would also take librarians "off the hook."

Maybe GPO should work with other agencies on authentic versions of the agencies' information. There is concern about users being assured that electronic information is the same as what they would get in paper at depositories or by writing to the agency, e.g., the Social Security Administration.

Francis Buckley stated that GPO works to be sure that the electronic version is comprehensive and complete. If not, GPO will ride the print requisition.

A possible recommendation might come out of this.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Monday, October 23, 2000, First Plenary Session

Council members present: Maggie Farrell (Chair), Charlene C. Cain, Linda Fredericks, Cathy Nelson Hartman, Robert A. Hinton, Sharon A. Hogan, Dena Hutto, Paula Kaczmarek, Donna P. Koepp, Greta E. Marlatt, Mary Redmond, Andrea Sevetson, John A. Stevenson, Fred B. Wood

Sheila McGarr, Chief of the Library Division at the Library Programs Service (LPS) and Program Coordinator, welcomed a record setting crowd of more than 520. She noted that 160 were attending for the first time, up form 117 new attendees in 1999. Honors for the longest distance traveled go to librarians from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Guam. The audience also includes 24 former Council members.

Maggie Farrell, Council Chair, called the meeting of the Depository Library Council to order. She explained that Council serves at the discretion of the Public Printer, advises on depository library matters, and assists the Government Printing Office (GPO) in the direction of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP).

Ms. Farrell noted that this is a critical juncture for the program. There is a dichotomy of increased access to electronic information but also the erecting of barriers by technology. There is also the question of long term permanent access to government information which needs to be considered.

Council focuses on the FDLP future and the direction we want the program to take. Council looks forward to audience insights and comments. Council meetings are open and audience participation is welcome.

Council members then introduced themselves and mentioned the names of committees that they chair. At Ms. Farrell's request, Council member Robert A. Hinton presented an overview of Council's working session of the night before.

Remarks by Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer

Public Printer Michael DiMario welcomed the audience and thanked them for their support during the recent GPO appropriation process. He explained that Andrew M. Sherman (Director, Congressional, Legislative and Public Affairs) would cover that topic in more detail during his remarks.

Mr. DiMario was named Acting Public Printer on February 19, 1993 and confirmed in November of that year. He pointed out that the Public Printer's term ends after the Presidential election, and it is the prerogative of a new President to appoint his own team.

Mr. DiMario thanked the audience for their support and mentioned that a great deal had been accomplished during his term of office, beginning with the signing of the GPO Access law in June 1993. This was an early attempt to provide public access to electronic government information.

GPO Access has proven to be immensely successful, with huge numbers of downloads. Congress apparently looked with favor on this product, especially as a means of reducing the cost of paper products and paper distribution. Some agencies used electronic methods to accelerate the reduction of paper products even when paper is the preferred format.

Congress then directed GPO to transition to an electronic depository program, and GPO worked toward a seven-year time frame. That trend has continued.

During the Year 2000 Congressional session, the House Appropriations Committee eliminated paper distribution entirely in favor of a fully electronic FDLP. The final legislation was somewhat modified but the Conference Committee report did include a provision requesting the General Accounting Office (GAO) to study the FDLP and tell how it should be transferred to the Library of Congress (LC). The GAO investigator assigned to this study has also asked if there even needs to be an FDLP given the status of electronics.

Because of that focus and National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) study of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) closure issue (also being examined by GAO), the Public Printer is asking Council to focus on 1) do we need the FDLP? and 2) if so, what should the program look like? If the audience believes the program has a future, they should tell Council, the Public Printer, and the GAO investigator.

Many in the depository library community have focused on the reduction of GPO appropriations. But we face a greater challenge than that. This is a great opportunity to bring issues to the community.

Remarks by Andrew Sherman, Director of Congressional, Legislative and Public Affairs

(See Administrative Notes, v. 21, #15, 11/15/00)

GPO Update: Remarks by Francis S. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

(See Administrative Notes, v. 21, #15, 11/15/00)

Remarks by Gil Baldwin, Director of Library Programs Services (LPS)

(See Administrative Notes, v. 21, #15, 11/15/00)

Remarks by T.C. Evans, Assistant Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination (EIDS)

(See Administrative Notes, v. 21, #15, 11/15/00)

Audience Questions and Comments

Bert Chapman, Purdue University, said that the GPO budget and the letter to depository library directors are of acute concern. Eighty depository library community members met the previous evening and identified areas of concern, including electronic source files and tangible products.

Elizabeth Cowell, University of California at San Diego (UCSD), expressed great support for the program and protection of the public's right to know. She requested that Council consider a recommendation on making electronic source files available for selection as depository items.

Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin at River Falls, recommended that GPO continue to work on systems for cataloging and locator systems.

Sue Lyons, Rutgers Law Library (Newark), expressed the need for continuing some items in paper, e.g., those of enduring historical, legal, or cultural value. She would like to see such items added to the core list. GPO should continue to make a minimum number of copies in paper to ensure permanent public access.

Karrie Peterson, UCSD, said that all in attendance are responsible for the plan. She urged Council to reject the proposed plan, and encouraged the FDLP community to "send a message" to Congress and to fight for the program we have.

Cindi Wolff, Louisiana State University, reminded the audience that an earlier SOD policy document (#13) changed from its original version. We don't know who will be reviewing or enforcing provisions of the new proposal. She urged an examination of SOD #13 to see what has not been enforced.

Hays Butler, Rutgers Law Library (Camden) asked about the prospects for GPO distribution of the 2000 U.S. Code in paper and electronically. Francis Buckley replied that, absent a budget prohibition, GPO plans to distribute in both formats and has budgeted accordingly.

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, asked for background on archiving of Federal agency Web sites. Gil Baldwin replied that there are several very successful partnerships with agencies, including the National Library of Medicine and the Department of Energy. These are positive outcomes of the meetings on Permanent Public Access (PPA). The Department of Energy, for example, has PPA built into its agreement with GPO. There is also work in progress on an agreement with the Census Bureau that Mr. Baldwin thinks the FDLP community will like.

Denise Davis, NCLIS (stating her own view) reminded the audience that libraries have connections to their legislators, and need to persuade their public officials that access to government information is important. There are issues connected with formats which make access difficult or impossible, for example, file size. The private sector is looking at formats, seeing sales opportunities, and is working with their legislators. The FDLP community needs to do the same, i.e., to communicate with their legislators.

Andrew Sherman, GPO, commented that Congress has expressed its intent for a move to an electronic system through the appropriation that they have authorized for GPO. The agency has to live within its budget.

Susan Tulis, former Council member and 20-year depository librarian, added that GPO has done an admirable job with available resources, and hard choices need to be made. The audience should offer a substitute plan rather than simply recommending rejection of the proposal. All of us have to be contact with our representatives about GPO and to show them the impact of the cuts.

Jim Jacobs, UCSD, expressed concern about the proposed plan's recommendation of setting up a new system for partnerships between GPO and agencies to assure continued access to electronic products. He pointed out that the current system goes back 140 years, and there are 1300 "partners" already in the FDLP.

Council member **Linda Fredericks** asked if Mr. Jacobs was suggesting that the FDLP be used as a distribution medium for electronic products. Is he asking for distribution in print or should depositories take on electronic versions? He replied that he favors distribution of electronic versions to depositories rather than having single copies at GPO and at agency partners. He doesn't object to other partners but doesn't want old "partners" to be left out.

Council member **Paula Kaczmarek** asked if current partners are depository libraries. Council member Sharon Hogan added that her library (University of Illinois at Chicago) has already entered into a partnership for access to some electronic information.

Mr. Jacobs said that the language regarding partnerships states that a partner may or may not be a depository library. He added that there have been many FDLP transitions in the past (paper, microfiche, floppy diskettes, CD-ROMs, etc), but the plan proposed by GPO doesn't specifically call for using the depository system for partnerships.

Superintendent of Documents **Francis Buckley** commented that this is not a brand new plan, but one that GPO has been implementing for the last two years. GPO had called for partnerships with libraries which could handle them. Based on feedback saying that not all libraries are ready for this, GPO has been exploring other partnerships. This version of the plan will be used to implement budget cuts.

Council member **Andrea Sevetson** asked if copies of GPO Access files are being sent to the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

Mr. Buckley responded that NARA is not accepting most electronic files (including CD-ROMs). All agencies must keep these files until NARA decides if NARA will take the files.

Ms. Sevetson said that she worries about the possible disappearance of files on agency sites. She mentioned the recent example of the World Fact Book as a case in point. She asked if GPO is permitted to distribute electronic files which it receives from agencies for printing to depository libraries.

Mr. Buckley responded that most publications for printing are received in camera ready copy because it is cheaper that way. Fewer than 20% are received electronically. Even if GPO gets an electronic file, the file can be changed. GPO would need a print copy to review to see if there have been changes.

Ms. Sevetson mentioned that 25% more files are being changed to electronic availability only.

Mr. Buckley said that GPO is copying digital files into a digital archive to preserve in case the agency digitizing the copy disappears. These are things unique to an electronic format.

Ms.Sevetson said she thought if the electronic file disappeared, GPO had to get in touch with the agency to get the file.

Jim Jacobs, UCSD, commented that he realizes this is not a new issue but hopes it will be possible to change and to make electronic information available to depository libraries. GPO Access is great but he hopes it won't "go away." He feels it is better to use depositories.

Barbie Selby, University of Virginia Law Library, mentioned that the Library of Congress Millennium Study has been charged to report on permanent access to information. She asked if GPO and LC have worked together on that issue.

Mr. Buckley replied that formal discussions have taken place, and they are building bridges at PPA meetings. GPO has had a long term relationship with LC in cataloging.

LC had asked for a review of its digital programs which led to the Digital 21 report. Now LC wants to take action responding to the issues raised in the report.

GPO provides Congressional Record and Congressional Bill files so LC can mount them on the Thomas system. LC has the same issues of permanent access to electronic government information as GPO does.

Tim Byrne, University of Colorado, said that the current FDLP is not the best it could be but it's the best we can get with the money provided. He believes it will be impossible for GPO to get partnerships, etc., without libraries. Electronic source files need to be distributed to depositories.

Karrie Peterson, UCSD, asked where people can get started to come up with another plan. She will be happy to work on an alternative.

Cindi Wolff, Louisiana State University, remarked that nothing has happened with respect to the records schedule from NARA for non-tangible products. She asked Council to follow up on this.

NCLIS Assessment of the Federal Government's Public Information Dissemination Policies and Procedures: Judith C. Russell, Deputy Director, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

(See Proceedings of the 9th Annual Federal Depository Library Conference. Washington, U.S. GPO, 2001)

The Plenary session was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

Monday, October 23, 2000, 2:00 p.m., Council Working Session

OCLC Archiving Program

John A. Hearty, Director, Business Development Division, OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., spoke to Council about the GPO/OCLC Electronic Archiving Project. OCLC has been working with GPO over the last year. They are aiming for a rollout of a pilot project in three to six months. The total project will take four or five years.

Questions of cost will be dealt with later as more facts are known. GPO's needs are not unique; there are other library issues. GPO hopes that enough people will use the same system so that burdens of cost structure can be shared. There was further discussion on issues of long-term access, spatial/cartographic data, and other formats.

Cataloging Committee of the Whole

Andrea Sevetson, Chair of the Cataloging/Locator Committee, led the discussion.

Among the issues covered were bibliographic information at the piece level, metadata cataloging standards and what role GPO should play in setting them, the future of cataloging in this transitional time (fear that some see cataloging tied to paper products and not needed for electronic products), size of GPO cataloging workforce and workload/priorities, integration of government information with other types of information, "discovery" of Web-based electronic resources, updating of older cataloging information, cataloging partnerships and cooperative cataloging, URLs and PURLs.

Review of Draft SOD: Dissemination/Distribution Policy for the Federal Depository Library Program

Before beginning the review of the draft GPO policy, Chair Maggie Farrell asked for Council's opinion on this morning's recommendation from the audience not to accept the policy. It was the sense of Council that the policy should be examined, then evaluated.

Council reviewed each section of the document, with discussions on wording of various provisions. At the end of the review, Maggie Farrell asked for Council's general "feel" for the policy and if Council was prepared to approve it. Council felt it could recommend that GPO go forward with the policy but that a comment period for the FDLP community should be requested. Superintendent of Documents Francis Buckley said that GPO is not moving to implement the policy immediately but cannot wait a long time for comments.

There were audience comments on issues of distribution of source files to depository libraries and of the value of having some paper copies of documents in depository libraries. Discussion ensued about how much money will be saved by the policy, and what the costs would be for printing fifty copies (for Regionals) of the approximately 30% of titles not available to depositories in paper.

The session adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Tuesday, October 24, 2000, 8:30 a.m., Council Working Session

New Council members were escorted to GPO for a tour and orientation during the morning.

The remaining members began discussions of the future of the FDLP in the digital library. The purpose of the discussion was to focus on what aspects of the program are most important to keep.

Issues covered included government's responsibility to make information available in perpetuity to all who want it, the role of the private sector, concepts of "dissemination" and "selection" in an electronic environment, finding tools for identification of government information, authentication of sources, legal requirements of Monthly Catalog contents (everything issued, not published—not based on FDLP), bibliographic control of scientific/technical information, Permanent Public Access (PPA), completion of superseded lists, GPO workflows, and PURL assignments.

Superintendent of Documents Francis Buckley said that even in the most draconian scenario both GPO Access and the cataloging/indexing program would be funded.

Council Chair Maggie Farrell said that she envisioned the discussion points being synthesized into a two-page (maximum) letter to the Public Printer. She asked Sharon Hogan and Fred Wood to work together on an outline for Committee of the Whole discussion this afternoon.

Committee Meetings

Council then broke into committees, subcommittees, and work groups to discuss issues and identify topics for further discussion and/or action.

Council recessed for lunch at 12:00 noon.

Committee Reports to Council

After reconvening at 2:00 p.m., the following committee reports were given:

Cataloging/Locator Committee. Andrea Sevetson reported that the Committee will have two recommendations: 1) a request for articulation by GPO of cataloging priorities and 2) PURL search enhancements.

Operations Committee. Linda Fredericks said her committee talked about the draft SOD. They recommend that GPO go forward with the statement along with the edits discussed by Council (refining some definitions, clarifications to various points). Other ideas, e.g., Instructions to Depository Libraries, can be deferred for a while. The Committee did not discuss NARA retention schedules.

Preservation Committee. Donna Koepp said that the committee is leaning toward two recommendations: 1) that FDLP work out best practices for preservation and methods for cost, and 2) that a group of volunteers keep track of documents by checking Web sites.

Communication Committee. Sharon Hogan identified one recommendation (full engagement in emerging new activities like FirstGov) and one commendation (National Library of Medicine partnership with GPO).

Core E-Competencies Work Group. Bob Hinton said his group has put together a short list of some core E-competencies and will try for more. This will be an ongoing action item between now and spring of 2001.

Value of a Depository Collection Work Group. Mary Redmond and Paula Kaczmarek will pool the information they have collected. They will review the action items from last April.

NARA Retention Schedules

Council decided to eliminate NARA schedules from its "to do" list. NARA and GPO are continuing to discuss this topic.

Outline of Future FDLP

Council continued discussions on the letter to be sent to the Public Printer about the general direction and future of the FDLP in the digital library age.

This letter will try to articulate a new vision of the FDLP, to build from the ground up. It will identify what libraries will need to select and disseminate government information. Finding tools, cataloging, indexing/abstracting, preservation, permanent public access, authenticity/security, and redundancy are examples of needs that libraries have for GPO to supply to the FDLP. The letter should also address the role of libraries in the new program.

Continued Discussion of Draft SOD

Linda Fredericks led the discussion of the draft SOD policy from the morning session. There was discussion of edits/clarifications of text in several sections.

The FDLP community should have the option to comment on the proposed list of essential titles (to be supplied in paper). Andrea Sevetson suggested a deadline of not more than two weeks from now for comments and/or additions to the list. Laurie Hall of GPO agreed to be the contact person for comments on the list from the FDLP community. Linda Fredericks will post a notice to GOVDOC-L directing that comments be sent to Laurie Hall.

Source Files

After a lengthy discussion about distribution of source files to depository libraries, Council decided to incorporate a reference to source files in the rationale of the recommendation on Permanent Public Access.

Synthesis of Recommendations, Commendations, and Action Items

Council reviewed the suggestions for recommendations, commendations, and action items, and assigned responsibilities for each before recessing at 5:00 p.m.

EVENING WORKING SESSION

Council reconvened at 7:00 p.m. to draft recommendations, commendations, and action items.

Wednesday, October 25, 2000, 8:30 a.m., Council Working Session

Final Versions of Recommendations, Etc.

Council reviewed the draft recommendations, commendations, and action items. A revised draft was produced for the afternoon Plenary Session.

Election of Incoming Chair

Mary Redmond nominated Andrea Sevetson as Incoming Council Chair. Greta Marlatt seconded the nomination. Ms. Sevetson was elected by acclamation.

Committees/Work Groups

Council committees and Chairs for the forthcoming year will be as follows:

- Preservation, Donna Koepp
- Operations, Linda Fredericks
- Cataloging/Locator, Dena Hutto
- Communications, Sharon Hall
- Work Groups (not part of committees):
- Cost and Value of Depository Collections, Mary Redmond
- Core E-Competencies, Robert Hinton

Council recessed at 12:00 noon.

Depository Library Council, Plenary Session, Wednesday, October 25, 2000, 2:00 p.m.

Council Chair Maggie Farrell welcomed the audience to the final session of the fall 2000 Council meeting. She noted that it was a busy session for Council, and that they accomplished a lot in a short time.

She added that Council appreciates the audience input, especially at the Monday planning session, written comments, discussions with individual members, and attendance at Council working sessions. She appreciates the dedication to the FDLP and to the work of democracy.

Acknowledgement of GPO Staff

Council decided to use the money donated at the meeting to buy flowers for Conference Coordinator Sheila McGarr, Council contact Willie Thompson, and all present GPO staff members in appreciation for all their work on behalf of the program.

Condolences

Council member Charlene Cain announced the recent death of Veronica MacLay of the Hastings College of Law Library,

former Chair of the Government Documents Interest Group of the American Association of Law Libraries. Ms. Cain invited those present to sign their names to sheets which will be inserted into a card to be sent to Ms. MacLay's family.

Andrea Sevetson reported that Marty Mehlberg of GPO died this week. He had been instrumental in GPO Access. Council members have signed a card for his family.

Reading of Recommendations, Etc.

Maggie Farrell explained that Council recommendations, commendations, and action items would be read through in their entirety in order to let the audience see Council's work in its entirety. There will be a chance for audience comments after this initial reading. The drafts will be finalized and printed in Administrative Notes.

Council members have agreed to take responsibility to act as lead persons for each recommendation, commendation, and action item. They proceeded to read the text and (where applicable) rationales for each. (See Administrative Notes, vol. 21, #16, Dec. 15, 2000, pp. 3-7, for texts of recommendations, commendations, action items, and rationales.

Maggie Farrell then invited comments from the audience on each of the recommendations, commendations, and action items. They were as follows:

Recommendation 4.

Permanent Public Access. Bert Chapman of Purdue University asked if there had been Council discussion on GPO providing depository libraries with source files. Donna Koepp said that source files were included in the list of documents in the rationale.

Ellen Sweet, National Library of Education, recommended that Council encourage the two work groups (on Permanent Public Access and on fugitive documents) to talk to each other. Donna Koepp said that was the intention of Council and noted that both of these recommendations came from the Preservation Committee.

Sheila McGarr, GPO, mentioned that the next Administrative Notes will be published on November 15 and suggested that Council might want to change the deadline for comments on the core list. Linda Fredericks replied that Council knows GPO has to move forward and wanted the opportunity for public input. Maggie Farrell said that Council does not see this as a static list and it could change as technology changes. Council's feeling is that GPO would be open to change the list as necessary.

Andrea Sevetson added that if the list is not produced right away, it might not happen. She reminded the audience that the suggestions for titles will not go to Council, but directly to Laurie Hall at GPO.

Sheila McGarr asked who would let the depository library community know about the request for suggestions to Laurie Hall. Council will post a notice to GOVDOC-L.

Ellen Sweet asked for a short extension (a week to ten days) to allow adequate time for comment. Council noted her suggestion and said members would discuss it. (Note: Council later decided to extend the deadline to November 10 instead of November 7).

Recommendation 7.

Fugitive Online Products. Karen Nordgren, Emporia State University, asked how Council will go about putting the groups together (volunteers or other mechanisms). Cathy Hartman replied that GPO will establish a working group for fugitive online products but thinks that other people can volunteer if they are interested.

Coleen Parmer, Bowling Green State University, asked if by implication Recommendation 7 also covers materials "going away" from public access, e.g., proprietary software, agency changes, etc. Cathy Hartman replied that Council had not directly dis-

cussed those resources. Council was specifically addressing those posted to the Web, not sent to depositories, and taken down by agencies, leaving no public access.

Donna Koepp added that this question is a slightly different issue which should be considered but can't be considered under this recommendation. Council member Fred Wood hopes that Council takes this issue up as soon as possible.

Commendation 3.

Jim Veatch, LibraryHQ.com (Nashville) said that he would like to add the attendees' appreciation to Sheila McGarr and Willie Thompson.

Action Item 2.

Value of Depository Library Collection. Ramona Reno, Nevada State Library, asked if this was connected to what happens when depositories decide to drop their FDLP status. Mary Redmond replied that it was an insurance-related question related to the cost of replacing a depository collection in the event of a natural or man-made disaster.

Action Item 3.

Maggie Farrell explained that the letter to the Public Printer on the future outline of the FDLP was too long to compose in the short time of a Council meeting but was not conceived as a lengthy white paper.

Lori Smith of Southeastern Louisiana University asked if there was a group looking at statistics and giving guidance to depository libraries on what statistics they should be keeping, including hits on their depository Web pages. Sharon Hogan replied that this was not within the scope of the question of ideas for the FDLP in the digital age.

Paul Arrigo, Washburn University Law Library, suggested that Council take a look at the Dupont Circle document from 1992 and not "reinvent the wheel."

Other

Margaret S. Powell, The College of Wooster, commended Council for their hard work in capturing the spirit of the audience concerns and for rising above the "general gloom."

Sheila McGarr of GPO reminded the audience that she needs evaluations of the Conference.

Incoming Chair

Maggie Farrell announced that Andrea Sevetson has been elected as incoming Council Chair. She will assume that office at the conclusion of the April 2001 San Antonio meeting.

Council Committees

Council committees and Chairs are as follows. Membership will be posted on the Council Web site:

- Preservation, Donna Koepp
- Operations, Linda Fredericks
- Cataloging/Locator, Dena Hutto
- Communications, Sharon Hogan
- Work Groups (not part of committees):
- Cost and Value of Depository Collections Work Group, Mary Redmond
- Core E-Competencies Work Group, Robert Hinton

Closing Remarks from Superintendent of Documents

Francis Buckley thanked all for their Conference participation and their FDLP support. He noted that thousands of people are helped in depository libraries every day, and extends his appreciation.

Closing Remarks from the Public Printer

Michael DiMario joined the Superintendent of Documents in thanks. He said that Council recommendations help manage the FDLP, and GPO couldn't function well without Council's advice. He thanks all Council members during the last 7 ½ years (his term as Public Printer), prior Council members during his service as Superintendent of Documents, and all people who have ever served on Council. This is a service to the community and to GPO which goes beyond expectations, and is something we as a community owe as a debt.

Mr. DiMario thanked the attendees for allowing him to serve and thanked the President of the United States for the great honor of serving in this office. He hopes to continue beyond the November Presidential election in public office.

The audience responded with a standing ovation.

Maggie Farrell remarked that we wouldn't be here today if it were not for the positive leadership of GPO, and that we hope to see Mr. DiMario at the April Council meeting.

The meeting of Council adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Redmond

Secretary, Depository Library Council
January 7, 2001

2001

Spring Meeting — 2001

Summary of the Spring 2001 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, San Antonio, Texas
April 1-4, 2001

Sunday, April 1, 2001, Council Working Session, 7:30 p.m.

Council Members Present

Charlene C. Cain, Louisiana State University; Maggie Farrell (Chair), Montana State University– Bozeman; Linda Fredericks, King County Library System, Bellevue, WA; Cathy Nelson Hartman, University of North Texas Libraries; Sharon A. Hogan, University of Illinois at Chicago; Dena Hutto, Reed College, Portland, OR; Paula Kaczmarek, Detroit Public Library; Donna Koepp, University of Kansas; Greta E. Marlatt, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA; Mary Redmond (Secretary), New York State Library; Andrea Sevetson, University of California, Berkeley; John A. Stevenson, University of Delaware Library; Dr. Fred B. Wood, National Library of Medicine

Robert A. Hinton, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, was excused.

Remarks by Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

Superintendent of Documents Francis Buckley was the first speaker. He reported that GPO is continuing its day to day operations while awaiting the transition to a new administration. When a new Public Printer is appointed, current Public Printer Michael DiMario and Buckley will be expected to resign.

In Congress, members have not been appointed to the Joint Committee on Printing. The Appropriations Committee will address GPO's budget request next month. The General Accounting Office (GAO) is about to issue its report on the transfer of the Superintendent of Documents to the Library of Congress (LC); the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) has issued the second volume (legislative proposals) of its study on government information. GPO is keeping a close eye on the appointments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

 The NCLIS report has been sent to the President and to Congress. At OMB's direction, the report includes a disclaimer that this is not an official administration-endorsed proposal. GPO will ride the appropriation and have paper copies of the report sent to depository libraries. At this point, GPO does not know how many of the study's proposals will be adopted by Congressional committees.

The Public Printer has responded to the first version of the GAO report. He and his staff have also relayed to GAO 109 points they think need to be corrected, and are awaiting GAO's response.

GPO believes that the GAO study does not show what benefits there may be, either to the public or for internal administration, of transferring the Superintendent of Documents to LC. The Library of Congress also mentioned the lack of a cost benefit analysis and the reliance on old data.

The Library of Congress requested that any implementation of the recommendations be delayed until after LC completes the planning process for development of a master plan for digital information preservation. But they are confident they can take on this responsibility if required to do so (with additional appropriations).

Buckley said that GPO is continuing to work with LC on the strategic plan, as well as on FirstGov ™ and operational activities. He is looking forward at this session to focusing on operational issues since nothing concrete has happened yet. GPO wants to see how the studies are used before reacting to them.

Chair Maggie Farrell told Council that their job is to listen to depository librarians with respect to what GPO should do in light of the issues (especially electronic issues). Members should circulate, attend the coffees, and meet new people during the lunch breaks.

Committee Reports

Preservation Committee. Donna Koepp reported that this committee took responsibility for Recommendation 4 from last fall. Members of the working group were chosen after the fall conference and met at ALA Midwinter. Members decided to look at existing preservation models.

GPO has incorporated a further charge in their response to Recommendation 4. They have asked Council to look at the recent upsurge in activity with special attention to local and consortial projects to digitize older information. The Preservation Committee will do that and will report at this meeting.

Operations Committee. Linda Fredericks said that not much had happened (in terms of committee issues) since the completion of the Superintendent of Documents statement on "Dissemination/Distribution Policy for the FDLP" (SOD 71). There is no other pending business from the last meeting.

The committee activity at this meeting depends on what comes along. Possibilities include the basic collection revision, askLPS, and the Biennial Survey. There might also be audience concerns about the physical condition of items arriving in depository shipments.

Cataloging and Locator Committee. Dena Hutto reported that there are three issues on their list: 1) discussion of GPO cataloging priorities as outlined in the GPO response to last fall's Recommendation Number 1, 2) the possibility of cataloging partnerships between GPO and other institutions, and 3) PURLs on GPO Access for hearings. Maggie Farrell suggested that Council also talk to GPO about what the depository community wants to see in the projected GPO Integrated Library System.

Information Exchange/Communications Committee. Sharon Hogan said that the Public Printer had asked for a letter on what the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) should look like in the future. The committee will write the letter to the new Public Printer. The letter will be held until the new Public Printer is appointed.

Working Group Reports

Costs/Value of a Depository Collection Working Group. Mary Redmond posted a message to GOVDOC-L with various sources in January. She now has some updated information. If Council approves, she will get this information to GPO to post to the Council Web site.

E-Competencies Working Group. Charlene Cain reported for Working Group Chair Robert Hinton. At issue is whether the working group should continue to work on the issue or let the American Library Association Government Documents Round Table (ALA/GODORT) and others do it. She advocates an open forum at the fall 2001 Council session to see if the discussion can generate input for the structure of guidelines.

GODORT Chair Ann Miller pointed out that ALA round tables cannot promulgate guidelines. If Council can come up with guidelines, GODORT could have programs on the subject.

Existing guidelines, e.g., by the American Association of Law Libraries, are very general. It is hoped that Council guidelines would be useful for letting library directors know what kind of training needs to be provided.

Sharon Hogan chairs the ALA Task Force on Core Competencies. There is a general core set (seven items), a kind of "umbrella." The ALA divisions have more specific guidelines. Maybe there can be general competencies for government documents which are somewhat, but not excessively, specific.

There is still uncertainty if this is a topic appropriate for an advisory group to GPO. The issue will come up again on Monday afternoon during working group meetings.

Other Reports

Permanent Public Access. John Stevenson said that November 2 was the date of the last Permanent Public Access (PPA) Working Group meeting hosted by GPO. The summary of that meeting is not yet available on the GPO Web site. He hopes that GPO will continue to moderate and assure PPA.

Council Manual. Paula Kaczmarek has new materials. The manual will be ready before the newly appointed members begin their terms. Andrea Sevetson suggested that an updated list of recommendations and commendations be added after every conference to help avoid repetition of recommendations.

GPO Access. Council will see what happens on this topic on April 2. Some issues might be response time and speed of transmission.

Fall 2000 Recommendations and Responses

The Group reviewed GPO responses to the Fall Recommendations.

The Preservation Committee will work on the additional charge that GPO has added in its response to Recommendation 4 (digitization of older materials). GPO's Gil Baldwin says that George Barnum (also of GPO) is ready to work on it when Council is ready.

Charlene Cain asked about the official status of online bills and the security afforded by public key infrastructure (PKI) technology. T.C. Evans will discuss the subject at tomorrow's session. Cain is concerned about the possibility that judges will still require a paper document.

Maggie Farrell commented that she is glad that Council is working with GPO on solutions. She added that this is the fastest that Council has ever reviewed recommendations and responses. Paula Kaczmarek said that the work had already started at the last meeting.

Council adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Monday, April 2, 2001, 8:30 a.m. Plenary Session

Council Members Present

Charlene C. Cain, Maggie Farrell, Linda Fredericks, Cathy Nelson Hartman, Sharon A. Hogan, Dena Hutto, Paula Kaczmarek, Donna Koepp, Greta E. Marlatt, Mary Redmond, Andrea Sevetson, John A. Stevenson, Dr. Fred B. Wood

Opening Remarks

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief of Depository Services at GPO, welcomed a record-setting number for a Council session outside of Washington, D.C. She gave introductory remarks and outlined logistical details for the next three days.

Maggie Farrell, Council Chair, called the meeting to order. She asked Council and GPO staff to introduce themselves to the audience.

Farrell said that the emphasis at this meeting will be on operational issues, especially how the transition in Congress will affect GPO. Council wants to lay the foundation for a strong relationship with the new Public Printer. There will be opportunities for the audience to observe, talk, and give suggestions to Council.

Charlene Cain gave a summary of Council's Sunday night working session.

Remarks by Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

[See Administrative Notes, v. 22, #7, 5/1/01]

Remarks by Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Programs Service

[See Administrative Notes, v. 22, #7, 5/1/01]

Remarks by T.C. Evans, Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (EIDS)

[See Administrative Notes, v. 22, #7, 5/1/01]

FDLP Electronic Collection Update: George D. Barnum, Electronic Collection Manager

[See Administrative Notes, v. 22, #7, 5/1/01]

Questions from Council:

Charlene Cain asked George Barnum to elaborate on the statement that some information is disappearing from the Internet but it is not an everyday occurrence.

Barnum replied that link checking is a very "person centered" operation. It shows only that a link has been broken, not why. Staff are not finding an overwhelming number of irreparably broken links.

Sometimes links "fix themselves" or need only minor changes to redirect a URL. Not surprisingly, serials are the hardest to figure out.

Cathy Hartman asked T.C. Evans about the public key infrastructure. Is it only for legal resources or for all resources?

Evans said that the hope is to extend it to all GPO online resources. The first projects will be submission of notices for the Federal Register and Congressional bills.

Fred Wood asked Evans about referrals to GPO Access from the Library of Congress and other Congressional sites, and if these figures account for more referrals than FirstGov ™.

Evans responded that there are sizable referrals from THOMAS, House and Senate sites, and more and more from Congressional committees (for example, there were 12 thousand referrals from one committee in a month). Congressional referrals are far more numerous than those from FirstGov ™.

John Stevenson asked George Barnum if URLs from the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (CGP) are link checked.

Barnum said no; that is why GPO wants to get them rounded up and archived.

Tad Downing, GPO, added that people report broken links and GPO brings resources under PURLs. This is going well.

Audience Questions

Duncan Aldrich, University of Nevada at Reno, asked if GPO is thinking of partnering with FirstGov ™ or Google ™ Uncle Sam to replace the former Pathway Indexer.

Francis Buckley responded that GPO is anticipating working more with FirstGov ™ staff. The initial FirstGov ™ publicity presented it as if it were the only service for people to use; now there is more interest in cooperation. Buckley sees FirstGov ™ as a complement to GPO services to replace the Pathway Indexer.

T.C. Evans mentioned four things; 1) he and Gil Baldwin have discussed Pathway Indexes; exciting things are happening and FirstGov ™ is one; 2) products are being "Akamaized", expanding the routing of GPO Access files previously only accessible by

direct connection to GPO-centralized servers; 3) people are comfortable with whatever they use; some of these are getting better; 4) some paid ads are masquerading as hits and inflate the figures returned by commercial search engines.

Ann Miller, ALA/GODORT Chair, mentioned that there is a small subgroup of GODORT's Government Information Technology (GITCO) Committee to advise FirstGov ™. The subgroup is chaired by John Hernandez (New York University) and would be happy to hear from Council.

Sharon Partridge, Jefferson County Public Library (Colorado), said that there seems to be a large discrepancy between the pre-PURLs (2500), URLs (2000), and the total number of 100,000. George Barnum will investigate; perhaps some are covered in other agreements and/or are serial issues.

Nan Myers, Wichita State University, asked about possible eventual additional products from OCLC, especially for assistance with discovery. Do GPO and OCLC have a timeframe? Also, will OCLC give an assurance that there will be free Permanent Public Access?

George Barnum said there is that assurance, and added that GPO would not enter into an agreement without a provision for free access. OCLC will be seeking other partners. They need to make sure that this product is marketable to other OCLC members in case of the very remote possibility that the product won't meet GPO's needs. The project is divided into three parts: 1) initial (basic CORC functions "plus") in July 2001, 2) function specifically related to the OCLC archive (October 2001-January 2002), and 3) "everything else", including discovery (early 2002).

Council member Andrea Sevetson had a comment for Barnum. She pointed out that the OCLC archive will be free to the public but not free to GPO. There might also be other public access through channels that are not free. She also mentioned the field work on a list of serials by agencies with time periods of retention on the issuing agencies' Web sites. The short "life" of serials (in some cases only three to six months) brought home the need to archive.

Barnum said that GPO is still in contact with Paul Arrigo (Washburn University) who did that project.

Julia Wallace, University of Minnesota, suggested that the discrepancy in the PURL figures mentioned by Barnum might be explained by documents in multiple formats. The smaller figures might be documents in electronic formats only. She also asked if there is something that we can do as a group or through consortia to leverage the money going to the Library of Congress and participate in efforts.

Francis Buckley said that GPO has expressed to LC and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) the role that GPO can play in archiving of, and access to, government records. GPO can be a NARA affiliate for these records.

Council member Donna Koepp added that the Cartographic Users Advisory Council (CUAC) has talked to the Library of Congress Geography and Map Division about CUAC's interest in preserving spatial and demographic data.

Lily Wai, University of Idaho, wondered if LC will be offering grants (similar to the National Science Foundation grant program) so that interested institutions can apply to participate.

Buckley answered that the emphasis of the legislative charge to LC is on projects in cooperation with other entities. LC has to raise $75 million in non-federal funds. He thinks that LC will be coming up with projects to get those funds.

Wai commented that this project seems like a good opportunity for the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) community to participate. Buckley says LC has to plan the project before dealing with the details of fund expenditures.

Barbara Levergood, University of North Carolina, commented that the "discovery" issue is fundamental in the process. Everything depends on this; information will be fugitive if not discovered. She asked what plans are in place regarding this issue.

Tad Downing, GPO, explained that GPO is working on improving the discovery percentage. LPS is cross training Cataloging Branch librarians in discovery, classifying, cataloging, PURLs, and archiving for things already in the program. They hope to expand this to more people. Discovery is a huge workload but does require a one-on-one partnership. Former Council member Diane Eidelman has organized a group of librarian volunteers to identify online documents for inclusion in the FDLP. The volunteers will evaluate titles and determine if there are records in OCLC for some format of the titles before submitting lists to the Cataloging Branch for inclusion in the FDLP.

Sharon Partridge, Jefferson County Public Library, thanked Julia Wallace for the suggestion about the URL discrepancies and thinks that this accounts for the vast majority of "missing" electronic documents. She also requested that GPO's Library Programs Service (LPS) prepare a list of questions to "askLPS" that have not yet been answered to avoid submission of duplicate questions.

Gil Baldwin said that GPO is checking Helpdesk software for use with "askLPS." He also asked that questions not be sent to individuals in LPS but rather through "askLPS." With a new system, we might be able to get answers ourselves and not have to ask GPO to search internally.

Duncan Aldrich, University of Nevada at Reno, asked who the GPO contact person is for libraries interested in volunteering for partnerships, and if GPO is actively soliciting for new potential partners (libraries and agencies).
George Barnum (gbarnum@gpo.gov) is the contact person. Currently there are more libraries with an interest and ideas than there are agencies.

Council member Fred Wood asked Francis Buckley about OMB efforts to update and revise OMB Circular A-130.
Buckley replied that OMB staff will be looking at OMB A-130, section 108 within the next 12-18 months. There will be an opportunity for public comments. The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) reauthorization requirement is also coming up. GPO is also watching with interest the developments in the nomination of John Graham to the OIRA within OMB.

Fred Wood followed up by mentioning that the depository library community has been an important player in past OMB A-130 efforts. He hopes the community will track upcoming events closely and avail themselves of the opportunity to be heard.

Council Chair Maggie Farrell outlined the agenda for the afternoon Council session.

The morning session recessed at 12:00 noon.

Monday, April 2, 2001, 2:00 p.m. Plenary Session
Continuation of Morning Plenary Session Question and Answer Period

Council member Charlene Cain asked T.C. Evans if the PKI (public key infrastructure) technology security will prevent hacking.
Evans replied that it is secure from the user side, i.e., once installed, the downloaded reader will know if anything has been changed from the original version. In response to Cain's question, Evans stated that it will not be possible for a hacker to make the reader say that every file is corrupted.

Council member Andrea Sevetson asked if people who have not downloaded the free reader onto their machines will be able to access the files.

Evans responded that they will be able to access the files but will not have the security aspects.

Council member Cathy Hartman asked if documents with multiple file types, e.g., HTML, etc., will all be accepted.

The answer is yes.

Stevenson mentioned that not all versions of Congressional hearings on the GPO server are the same. Because the text file versions of hearings generally lack any content presented to the committee in non-electronic formats, he asked about what is considered the official version.

T.C. Evans said that the testimony for hearings is submitted in many different formats and not always electronically. This is different from other GPO Access materials. GPO is working with committees and publishers to assure accuracy.

Cathy Hartman noted that Congressional bills and Federal Register notices have been selected as the first materials for this technology. She asked if GPO would like depository library input on what the libraries would like for priorities.

Evans said that GPO always welcomes input. GPO has to start now to meet the Congressional deadline of 2003 so they are going ahead with the first two applications.

At this point the members of Council left to begin their 2:15 working session.

Monday, April 2, 2001, 2:15 p.m. Council Working Session

Election of Secretary

Cathy Hartman nominated, and Charlene Cain seconded, Greta Marlatt for Council Secretary for the 2001/2002 term. Marlatt was elected by acclamation.

Discussion of Preservation Models

George Barnum, GPO, gave an overview of LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe) out of Stanford University. It is a Linux-based system focusing on journal articles. There is a central point and other cooperating libraries with copies.

After intake, copies of articles are distributed to caches at each remote site. All the caches check against each other and the original site. Caches can "overwrite" others if the content is different, e.g., if Cache Number 7 of 10 is different, the other 9 can overwrite. There have to be controls so that the other 9 can't "overtake" the publishing sites (this is more of a problem when the publishing site disappears). Barnum thinks the best possibility for LOCKSS is in serials for materials not already covered by GPO Access.

Another model discussed is a project to preserve Texas state electronic documents. The Texas State Library and Archives Commission (TSLAC) and two state depository libraries have a $1 million grant to capture electronic Texas documents, preserve them, and make them available to the public. The issuing state agencies now enter Dublin Core elements for their electronic documents into a database, and a system will then harvest the documents for preservation and permanent public access.

The State Library examines the documents and provides archival access, not directly to the public, but through participating libraries. The records are available to all depository libraries.

The TSLAC examines the documents for authenticity, adds preservation and access metadata, provides archival storage, and distributes the documents to the two depository libraries. Free public access is offered through the depository libraries. MARC records for all the documents are available to all Texas depository libraries.

Council's Preservation Committee is looking at a number of models to address the six issues identified for study in Recommendation #4 from fall 2000. They will use the information to create a model to meet GPO goals. Preservation Committee Chair Donna Koepp will check to be sure that all issues are covered. The real issue in all of this is authenticity.

Committee and Working Group Reports

Committees and Working Groups met throughout the afternoon. Chairs reported back to the full Council. They continued to discuss the issues laid out during the Sunday night Council working session (see minutes of Sunday, April 1 for details).

Adjournment — Council adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Tuesday, April 3, 2001

8:15 a.m. Plenary Session

Local Strategies for Ongoing Access to Electronic U.S. Government Information: Possible Solutions

George Barnum, GPO, introduced the next three speakers. Each discussed local solutions for making electronic government information available. Their experiences might serve as models for electronic transition.

University of Colorado Electronic Reading Room

Tim Byrne, Head of Government Publications at the University of Colorado, described his institution's program for providing ongoing electronic access to information about the Rocky Flats Nuclear Weapons Facility near Denver. This was accomplished by means of a 120 gigabyte Snap! server for network storage. Almost 300 reports in over 750 files have been made accessible. Byrne et al. are exploring future projects, including publications from Colorado State government, the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, and other Colorado Superfund sites.

Oregon State University: Redisseminating Government Data on the World Wide Web

Carrie Ottow, Government Publications Librarian at Oregon State University (OSU), talked about the OSU Government Information Sharing Project. According to the Project's web site, the "original goal of the Project was to demonstrate improved access to electronic government information, especially for remote users (such as rural Oregon residents) and the general public. Beginning in 1995, the Project developed World Wide Web access to a variety of Federal statistical information issued on CD-ROM and distributed through the Federal Depository Library Program." <http://govinfo.kerr.orst.edu/aboutus.html>. Contents include information from the 1990 Census and other sources. Additional information about the history and technology of the project is available in D-Lib, The Magazine of Digital Library Research, May 1996.

Indiana University Floppy Disk Project

Louise Malcomb, Head of the Government Publications Department at Indiana University (Bloomington), shared information about the Center for Instructional Cooperation (CIC) Government Publications Task Force Floppy Disk Project (FDP). The Project web site <www.indiana.edu/~libgpd/mforms/floppy/floppy.html> says that the Project "is designed to provide a central location through which Federal Data, made available on floppy diskettes, can be located and downloaded… FDP enables libraries to either fill in gaps to their collections, or provide immediate access point for patrons… the collection represents over 200 entries… A search will retrieve a title list from which individual titles can be 'clicked' and down-loaded." For more information, see the Project web site URL cited above.

Remarks by the Public Printer

Michael DiMario started by saying that he is a "holdover" awaiting word from the White House. According to an agreement between the White House and the new President's transition team, agencies headed by a statutory appointee can keep at least one such appointee until a new appointee is nominated, confirmed, and appointed. DiMario has no idea of the timeframe.

Meanwhile, GPO will continue its work, consistent with Congressional mandates to reduce agency size and to move to a more electronic depository program.

Thirty-two million publications a month are downloaded from the GPO website. This is part of a successful partnership with the Federal Depository Library Program community. Both GPO and depository libraries have used the partnership for the country's betterment.

GPO has lost $1.9 million in the program, including cataloging and indexing. There has been a 7% loss from the previous year and a 13% decrease in total funding over the last five years.

DiMario expects the downward funding trend to continue. The President has asked for a 4% across the board reduction, while Congressional committees want to increase their budgets by 11%. This will probably continue to squeeze GPO. GPO has asked for an increase in the forthcoming budget but the President's budget is embargoed until April 5.

Elsewhere in GPO, the sales program is losing money (more than $1 million per month) although the agency as a whole came in the black last year by a very small margin. DiMario has put together a letter with his comments on the General Accounting Office (GAO) report on planning for the transfer of the Superintendent of Documents to the Library of Congress; he understands that his letter will be printed in the report.

On another issue, the House of Representatives is now receiving direct funding for Congressional printing. GPO hopes that the House will choose to continue to use GPO to produce its publications.

In Congress, matters are complicated by the even split of the Senate. The Joint Committee on Printing will be chaired by the Senate this year. Senate representation on the Committee will be increased to six; the House will also ask for two more members.

Appropriations hearings will be held in the House in May (no date yet) and in the Senate on May 10.

DiMario announced the appointment of the following new members to the Depository Library Council: Paul Arrigo, Dan Barkley, Barbara Ford, Barbara Levergood, and John Kavaliunas.

The Public Printer ended by thanking staff and member libraries in the FDLP. He also added thanks to depository library directors and Council members for their contributions.

NCLIS Assessment of the Federal Government's Public Information Dissemination Policies and Practices: Update

Judith C. Russell, Deputy Director of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), updated the audience on the status of the NCLIS Comprehensive Assessment of Public Information Dissemination Reforms.

NCLIS is an independent advisory agency to the President and Congress on the information needs of the American people and how to meet them. The Commission was asked in June 2000 by the Senate Commerce Committee to conduct a review of broad reforms necessary for Federal Government information dissemination practices. The charges included: propose new or revised laws, rules, regulations, missions and policies; modernize organizational structures and functions; revoke National Technical Information Service (NTIS) self-sufficiency requirement; strengthen key components of the Federal information dissemination infrastructure. The deadline for the study was January 2001 (extended from December 15, 2000).

Volumes 1 and 2 of the report are in paper (sent to Federal depository libraries) and in electronic form. Volumes 3 and 4 are electronic only. Various study documents are on the NCLIS web site at <www.nclis.gov/govt/assess/assess.html>.

The report and the legislative proposal represent the opinions and recommendations of the Commission in its statutory role as an advisor to the Congress. There was not a consensus of stakeholders, and the report is not the position of the current or former Administration. The Commission recommendations are not the only way to reform but they are, in its view, the best

way. The Commission hopes its recommendations will be the basis for meaningful discussion that will culminate in reform that benefits all Americans.

Strategic recommendations:

1. Affirm that public information is a strategic national resource, owned by the people, held in trust by the government, that should be permanently available to the people except where restricted by law.

2. Establish the Public Information Resources Administration (PIRA) in the Executive Branch—consolidating NTIS, the Superintendent of Documents and other information dissemination responsibilities.

3. Include explicit public information dissemination responsibility in all government establishment missions and major programs.

4. Implement an Information Dissemination Budget to ensure funding for dissemination of public information resources—establish a Reserve Fund for dissemination of R&D results, especially STI.

5. Enact the Public Information Resources Reform Act of 2001 (Appendix 11).

6. Establish the Congressional Information Resources Office (CIRO).

7. Establish the Judicial Information Resources Office (JIRO).

8. Extend key provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act to the Legislative and Judicial Branches—comparable to 44 U.S.C. 3506(d) on information dissemination.

Other Recommendations

1. Develop a comprehensive inventory and database of public information resources –National Bibliography of Public Information Resources; National Database of Public Information Resources.

2. Partner broadly, in and outside government, to ensure permanent public availability of public information resources.

3. 30. Identify the public's most critical unmet requirements for public information resources.

4. Ensure coordination between PIRA and the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA)—Lower barriers to agency compliance by making one transfer serve for PIRA and NARA.

Next steps include obtaining feedback from stakeholders (inside and outside of government); working with the Administration to assist with development of its position; working with Congressional Committees to schedule public hearings; identifying congressional champions; working with the Judiciary to assist with development of its position; working with the Department of Commerce and the Congress on resolution of the NTIS status; and identifying relationships among the Government Paperwork Elimination Act (GPEA), the Government performance and Results Act (GPRA), E-Government initiatives, Paperwork Reduction Act reauthorization, and FirstGov/other portals.

Audience Questions

Penny Kyker, Indiana State University, asked Judith Russell why the Public Information Resources Administration is not envisioned in the legislative rather than the executive branch.

Russell replied that there has been tension from having the printing responsibility in the legislative branch. The Commission does not see much likelihood that the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) will move to the legislative branch, and believes that OMB would never approve a proposal that included moving NTIS to GPO.

Council member Fred Wood noted that while centralization is one point, it is also counter to the concept of checks and balances.

Russell answered that this proposal is intended to set up a coherent program so that agencies are not "pulled" by many different laws. Each agency will have responsibility for information in its mission, but there has to be something that pulls everything together.

Bernadine Abbott Hoduski asked if there was any study of the relationship between the national libraries' role in bibliographic control and how they could work better with the Superintendent of Documents.

Russell said that there had been discussion with the Library of Congress and other libraries.

Pre-Break Announcements

Prior to the morning break, Council Chair Maggie Farrell thanked the local arrangements committee for the Monday evening reception at the San Antonio Public Library. She added that Council would be continuing in a working session (open to all) at 10:45 a.m. in another room.

Tuesday, April 3, 2001, 10:45 a.m. Council Working Session

Council reconvened to begin working on recommendations.

Basic Collection Proposal

Council discussed GPO's Basic Collection Proposal. There was agreement on the currently available titles that depositories should select, but there was some uncertainty about the purpose, the relationship of this list to the core collection, and the meaning of the phrase "otherwise make available" (as in "select or otherwise make available") for electronic information. There was also a suggestion that the list be reviewed regularly.

Cataloging/Preservation Joint Project Concerns

There is interest in the cataloging community in working with GPO to share cataloging with the rest of the FDLP community. Rather than copy cataloging things one by one, it would be preferable to offer access to whole groups of records.

Further discussion ensued on points including setting up procedures for such cataloging projects, moving on to pilot projects in the future, and looking at existing partnerships in ongoing electronic access as models for this program.

Council recessed for lunch at 12:00 noon.

Tuesday, April 3, 2001, 2:00 p.m. Council Working Session

Council reconvened for its afternoon working session.

- Gil Baldwin, GPO, provided a list of Depository Library Council meeting sites from 1973 to 2003.
- 2001 Biennial Survey
- GPO has added several new questions to the 2001 Biennial Survey, e.g., Internet filtering.

Because there were so few responses to the optional questions on the 1999 Biennial Survey, Council discussed the possibility of recommending their omission in 2001. Council decided to recommend that the optional questions be tried one more time to see if the response rate improves now that institutions have had an opportunity to plan ahead and keep the appropriate statistics.

E-Competencies

Council would like to see a session at the Fall 2001 Depository Library Council on suggested baseline proficiencies for public service to government documents electronic resources. "Faculty" for this session might include a library science professor, a seasoned documents librarian, and a GPO inspector. Such an approach would eliminate the need for Council to come up with a program but would facilitate discussion in the depository community.

Judicial Information

Council had an extensive discussion of access to judicial information in electronic form. A draft recommendation regarding access to judiciary decisions was proposed but Council decided that the recommendation was premature and would consider such a recommendation in the future if developments warranted.

Overview of Issues

Council went over the list of issues and worked on draft language for resolutions, commendations, and action items. Council adjourned for the evening; members will examine the drafts overnight and come prepared to edit the language on Wednesday morning, April 4.

Wednesday, April 4, 2001, 8:30 a.m. Council Working Session

Recommendations, Commendations, and Action Items

Council completed editing of the language; copies will be distributed at the afternoon Plenary Session.

Assignments and Deadlines

Council Secretary Mary Redmond will send the draft minutes to members; members will return their comments to her by Monday, May 17.

Redmond will also send the information on the cost of replacing a depository library collection to GPO by May 1.

Maggie Farrell will send a letter of condolence to the husband of Debbie Ellis, former secretary at GPO; Farrell will also send the commendation of former GPO staff member Sheila M. McGarr to the editor of Documents to the People (the journal of the American Library Association Government Documents Round Table).

Greta Marlatt and Andrea Sevetson will share comments on the "otherwise make available" question by June 1.

Committees

The Depository Collection Replacement Cost and the E-Competencies work groups will be dissolved.

Cathy Hartman will take over as Chair of the Preservation Committee, incoming Council member Barbara Levergood will join the Committee, and Mary Redmond will switch from Preservation to Depository Operations.

Incoming Council member Dan Barkley will also join the Depository Operations Committee.

Dena Hutto suggested that non-Council members, including people in technical services operations, be added to the Cataloging and Locator Committee.

Fall 2001 Meeting Plans

There was discussion of the logistics of this meeting and plans for the fall 2001 meeting in Alexandria, VA. Council feels that a Sunday tour of GPO would be preferable for the new members rather than taking them out of the deliberations. The Sunday night dinner is useful for preparation. The timing of the San Antonio plenary and work sessions was good.

2:00 p.m. Plenary Session

Introductory Remarks

Council Chair Maggie Farrell thanked GPO staff for all the work on the conference. Special thanks went to Robin Haun-Mohamed and to Willie Thompson for their work with the hotel. Farrell also thanked the speakers and reminded

attendees that Haun-Mohamed is looking for ideas for topics at the fall 2001 conference. The Chair reiterated the audience's gratitude to the San Antonio and Texas librarians for their hospitality at the Monday evening reception and throughout the meeting.

Farrell announced the election of Greta Marlatt to serve as Council Secretary for 2001/2002. The Chair thanked Mary Redmond for her service as Secretary during 2000/2001.

Recommendations, Commendations, and Action Items

Council members read their recommendations, commendations, and action items aloud. The audience was invited to submit questions or comments.

Audience Questions

Jim Veatch, Library HQ Site Source, mentioned that there has been interest about the proposed GPO Integrated Library System (ILS), and wondered if Council had discussed it.

Council member John Stevenson said that Council was monitoring developments and would advise GPO where appropriate.

Council member Andrea Sevetson added that there had been a Council resolution on the ILS in Spring 1999.

Veatch asked if the next year's GPO budget request would include an item for the ILS.

Council Chair Maggie Farrell said that Council had not asked for that type of input. GPO has asked for Council's help in articulating what should be in the Request for Proposal (RFP) and in reviewing specifications. At this point, there is not yet anything for Council to recommend.

Daniel Cornwall, Alaska State Library, expressed concerns about Recommendation #3 and made a plea for item-level cataloging. He is concerned that simply pointing to GPO Access is not enough. He believes that GPO should catalog down to the item level because customers want immediate results and if they have to go to a finding aid/search engine, depositories will lose customers.

Andrea Sevetson said there had been a lot of discussion about what libraries are evaluated on in inspections and the meaning of "select or otherwise make available." Some libraries don't catalog government documents; it is hard to come up with a single process that will work for all depositories.

Cornwall asked if this recommendation referred just to the basic collection or if it was a wholesale project. It is just for the basic collection.

Bernadine Abbott Hoduski asked Council what they had in mind for cooperative cataloging.

Council member and Cataloging/Locator Committee Chair Dena Hutto said that the intention was to have libraries share their work on projects with other libraries. Council would like to see if it would be possible and worthwhile for GPO to distribute cataloging records created by partner libraries. Hoduski asked whether records created by partner libraries would be distributed as part of GPO's regular cataloging record output or distributed separately. Hutto responded that while Council had discussed inclusion in regular record distribution, separate distribution would be another possible option.

In response to Hoduski's question on how long GPO expects it will take to respond, Tad Downing answered that GPO hopes to have something for people to consider at the fall Council meeting.

Maggie Farrell added that the audience can contact the lead person for each recommendation if there are further questions. Council expects to deliver the final recommendation texts to the Public Printer in early May.

Closing Remarks from the Superintendent of Documents

Francis Buckley thanked Council members and all participants for the close working relationships between GPO and libraries for the benefit of all.

Closing Remarks from the Public Printer

Michael DiMario thanked all for their participation. Council and GPO staff work together to formulate the way the FDLP operates as a vital service to the American public. He hopes the program continues to survive and that the funders listen to the voices advocating for funding.

There might be more efforts to cut funds. Depository librarians and their customers might be called upon to defend the program.

DiMario presented certificates of thanks to the outgoing Council members: Fred Wood, Donna Koepp, Paula Kaczmarek, and Maggie Farrell. He gave a special thanks to Farrell for her leadership, wisdom, and sage advice as Chair of Council.

Farrell responded that it has been a pleasure to serve on Council. The relationship between Council members and GPO staff is built on trust and on work as equal partners in serving the American public.

Transition to New Leadership

Maggie Farrell passed the gavel to incoming Chair Andrea Sevetson.

Status of Committees and Work Groups

Committee chairs identified themselves, the titles of their committees, and committee projects.

Dena Hutto said that the Cataloging/Locator Committee is looking for non-Council members with cataloging management/technical services background. They do not have to attend Council meetings but can work via e-mail.

Cathy Hartman, Chair of the Preservation Committee, said that there will be more followup investigation on models for distribution of government publications. People who are interested in this topic should let Hartman know.

Sharon Hogan said that the Information Communications Committee will monitor activities and will lead if GPO asks for comments on the GAO report.

Linda Fredericks, Depository Operations Committee Chair, explained that her committee monitors GOVDOC-L between meetings. Issues also come to the committee from GPO staff.

She invited the audience to inform her of any concerns they wish to have addressed.

Two work groups are being dissolved. The E-Competencies Work Group will work on a session for the fall conference on proficiencies. The Work Group on the Replacement Cost of Federal Document Depository Collections will get its report to GPO for inclusion on the Council website.

Final Audience Remarks

Bernadine Abbot Hoduski thanked the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents for their commitment to open meetings and the inclusion of educational sessions. It is unusual for a Public Printer to attend so many Council meetings. It has been many years since there has been such a close relationship between GPO management and Council.

Jim Veatch, Library HQ Site Source, thanked Council and GPO on behalf of the audience.

The session adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Mary Redmond,
Council Secretary

Fall Meeting — 2001

Summary of the Fall 2001 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Alexandria, Virginia
October 14-17, 2001

Sunday, October 14, 2001

Council Working Session, 7:30 p.m.

Council Members present:

- Paul Arrigo, Washburn University;

- Daniel C. Barkley, University of New Mexico;

- Charlene C. Cain, Louisiana State University;

- Barbara J. Ford, Chicago Public Library;

- Linda Fredericks, King County Library System, Bellevue, WA;

- Cathy Nelson Hartman, University of North Texas Libraries;

- Dena Hutto, Reed College, Portland, OR;

- John C. Kavaliunas, U.S. Census Bureau;

- Greta E. Marlatt (Secretary), Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA;

- Mary Redmond, New York State Library;

- Andrea Sevetson (Chair);

- Roberta Shaffer, Special Libraries Association; and

- John A. Stevenson, University of Delaware Library;

Robert A. Hinton, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis and Sharon A. Hogan, University of Illinois at Chicago were excused.

Chair Andrea Sevetson welcomed everyone and had the Council members and audience introduce themselves. The new Council class was encouraged to spend some time together to bond.

Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

Mr. Buckley expressed Mr. DiMario's regrets that, due to another commitment, he could not be there but he would be there for the plenary session on Monday. He gave a report on the status of GPO. He indicated this is a "strange time" for GPO not only because of the September 11 tragedy but also because of the lack of any transition activities yet. There still has been no announcement regarding a new Public Printer or Superintendent of Documents. With the lack of a Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) there have been a number of holdups, since JCP has certain responsibilities in terms of operational activities within GPO. A number of things are pending due to the lack of purchase abilities, including the authorization for major purchases and labor contracts. Mr. DiMario has had to approve a number of things as administrative actions to keep things going.

He indicated that printing is down; the number of new tangible publications is down; and because of a loss of staff, the intake and cataloging of electronic documents is also down.

The recent article in American Libraries ("Government Documents at the Crossroads" by Karrie Peterson, Elizabeth Cowell and Jim Jacobs, American Libraries, September 2001, p. 52-55) raised some good questions about the preservation of elec-

tronic information, but the authors didn't acknowledge the work that GPO has done or look at GPO's relationship or communication with the various communities related to this. Gil Baldwin and George Barnum have written an article in response for American Libraries ("Government Documents for the Ages," December 2001, p. 38.)

Council members asked questions regarding the status of the budget and the Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents appointments. Mr. Buckley indicated the final budget has not been passed yet but that either the House or Senate version would be a good increase over last year. He also stated that no word has been received on the appointments and it was likely that there would not be any nominations until next year.

Committee Reports

Operations Committee – Linda Fredericks reported there were no pressing concerns to report. The same problems as always still exist, some shipments are still late or don't arrive but there doesn't seem to be a pattern. Concern has been expressed about GPO's lack of timely review of the self-studies. Robin Haun-Mohamed indicated that due to the loss of inspectors, they are making progress but are still backlogged and have not requested any new self-studies since 1998. No new self-studies will be requested until next year.

Cataloging and Locator Committee – Dena Hutto also indicated there was nothing new to report. Episodic concerns appear on GOVDOC-L about the ability to share cataloging information with GPO. Overtures regarding shared cataloging initiatives have not been favorably received by GPO.

Communication Committee – Charlene Cain, reporting for Sharon Hogan, indicated nothing new seems to have come out of the GAO study. Mr. Buckley indicated there has been no action; comments were sent back to GAO and GPO has not heard anything back, but that was expected, and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) report on NTIS has been overtaken by the recent terrorist events.

Concern was expressed about the taking down of web pages with documents considered a threat to national security. This will need to be monitored.

Preservation Committee – Cathy Hartman reported the committee had been charged with looking into the issues associated with Recommendation #4 from Fall 2000. The group had decided to investigate 4 models related to the issues of preservation of electronic information. The models evaluated were: LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe), the National Library of Canada Electronic Collection, the National Library of Australia's PANDORA Project and the Texas Electronic Depository Project. A handout evaluating and comparing these models was given out.

It is likely the new "Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by Federal Agencies" issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will also have an impact on this topic.

Other Reports

Permanent Public Access – John Stevenson reported there had not been a meeting since May 21, 2001 and there was nothing scheduled for the immediate future. Mr. Buckley gave a brief overview of this group for the new members.

Spring 2001 Recommendations and Responses

Council reviewed GPO's responses to the Spring Recommendations.

Paul Arrigo asked about the status of the GPO's acquisition of an Integrated Library System (ILS). Gil Baldwin responded that they were in the early part of the process and were still collecting input from the community. The government's procurement process is very complicated.

Monday, October 15, 2001, 8:30 a.m. Plenary Session

Council Members Present

Paul Arrigo, Daniel C. Barkley, Charlene C. Cain, Barbara J. Ford, Linda Fredericks, Cathy Nelson Hartman, Dena Hutto, John C. Kavaliunas, Greta E. Marlatt, Mary Redmond, Andrea Sevetson, Roberta Shaffer, and John A. Stevenson.

Opening Remarks

The Honorable Patricia S. Ticer, Virginia State Senator, welcomed conference attendees and encouraged everyone to explore the fine city of historic Alexandria.

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Services Branch, welcomed everyone and thanked them for their perseverance and willingness to attend despite the recent tragedies. She provided logistic details for the conference, gave the traditional statistical count, welcomed the newest depository libraries and encouraged everyone to network.

Andrea Sevetson, Council Chair, called the meeting to order. She asked Council members to introduce themselves. She thanked Robin Haun-Mohamed and Willie Thompson for their efforts in organizing a wonderful conference. She conducted the usual "Council Aerobics" including asking people to stand based on the time zone they were from and asked GPO staff members to introduce themselves.

John Stevenson gave an overview of the Sunday night Council working session.

Welcome and GPO Update by the Honorable Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer

Mr. DiMario welcomed and complimented everyone for having the courage to come despite recent events. GPO's desire to hold the meeting was paramount and in accordance with President Bush's wishes that we not let the terrorist acts stop us as a nation.

Mr. DiMario gave a quick update regarding the status of his appointment and the lack of any new information as to whom the White House plans to nominate to the Public Printer position. Various names have been floated but nothing definitive.

He also gave an overview of the effect of the changes in Majority and Minority positions in the Senate due to the shifting of party affiliation by one member. This shift affects oversight roles and specifically the appointment of the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP). The Senate finally put together a Senate Concurrent Resolution (SCR) to name people to the JCP and a new committee appears to have been appointed and will meet in the near future. There are a number of things that require their approval.

The appropriations bill, while not complete yet, looks like it will be very favorable. The GPO should get close to level funding. Current funding is from continuing resolutions until the new appropriation budget is passed.

He thanked everyone and their institutions for "carrying the day in keeping the program alive and well."

Remarks by Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

See Administrative Notes, Nov. 15, 2001, v. 22, no. 16 -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111501.html#6

Remarks by Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Program Services

See Administrative Notes, Nov. 15, 2001, v. 22, no. 16 -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111501.html#7

Remarks by T.C. Evans, Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (EIDS)

See Administrative Notes, Nov. 15, 2001, v. 22, no. 16 -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111501.html#8

Audience Questions

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System, NY asked if GPO could give an idea of what percentage of congressional hearings are online.

TC Evans answered no.

Jim Veatch, Library HQ, asked if, given the recent decision by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to pull their web site, and since GPO is archiving it, do they have a provision for retaining the information.

Mr. Buckley responded that there was no policy in place yet; but it is being worked on.

Ellen Sweet, National Library of Education, asked how a library can learn about and get hard copies of publications when FDLP is only distributing an electronic copy.

TC Evans pointed to the new listservs as a means of communicating. These will include the 6 most commonly requested SBs (Subject Bibliographies). Subscribers would be notified of new publications and have the ability to order them online.

Duncan Aldrich, University of Nevada, Reno asked about the mirror sites for GPO Access: what is currently used and what are the "regional offices" TC Evans mentioned in his talk.

TC Evans responded they have multiple copies in the main building and elsewhere. They want to get a more geographically separate backup completely away from the DC area.

Kay Collins, University of California, Irvine inquired about the future of the GPO Access gateways.

TC Evans' response was that the local levels know their constituency so some are configuring a more tailored "GPO access" but it's a value judgment each site will need to make.

Ursula Ann Ward, Metro Library System, Oklahoma City, OK asked if there would be future improvements in the Commerce Business Daily.

TC Evans responded that it was being replaced by Fed Biz Opps (http://www.fedbizopps.gov/). CBD will continue to be published until January 2002.

Bernadine Abbot Hoduski, Government Information Advisor, expressed concern about the need for multiple formats. The National Libraries are not getting paper copies and she would like to see a policy developed that would ensure the National Libraries would get multiple formats.

Fran Buckley commented that when a print order is received from an agency for material that GPO is not going to distribute in paper to depositories, they still ride the contract to get enough copies to cover the "by law" distribution. Therefore those agencies are getting their print copies – but they aren't necessarily keeping them. Library of Congress, for example, doesn't want them all.

Susan Tulis, Southern Illinois University, asked who was going to run the Fed Biz Opps and would there be free access.

TC Evans responded it would be run by the General Services Administration (GSA) and he didn't know if it would be free although it currently is free.

Nan Myers, Wichita State University, asked 2 questions. The first was regarding the response to Recommendation #4, cooperative cataloging. She felt the response was confusing and asked if there were plans to review it. Would a partnership possibly cause a greater backlog?

Dena Hutto indicated there is an interest in finding ways to allow depository libraries to share with GPO and others. She encouraged those who were interested to attend the cataloging meeting.

Nan Myers second question was to ask if any thought had been given to new depository initiatives that would allow librar-ies to be virtual depository libraries only.

Robin Haun-Mohamed responded they had been approached by a couple of libraries and the only steps taken so far have been to open conversations.

Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University, expressed concern about those paper items that are being superseded by electronic ones. We have not been given specific instructions that we can get rid of these. When should we get rid of those paper copies that have been superseded by electronic copies?

Julie Wallace, University of Minnesota, suggested we need to think about the "Monthly Catalog." Title 44 hasn't changed and GPO has always cataloged government products not just depository ones. She would like to see GPO catalog things in the tangible format even when they are only distributing the publications electronically. Some libraries may still want to obtain hard copies and would still need SuDocs numbers so the paper copies can be shelved.

Tad Downing agreed that nothing has changed in Title 44. The mechanics are always open to discussion.

Jill Moriearty, University of Utah, commented on the superseded issue. She agreed that there are no guidelines and stressed that this is a growing issue.

Andrea Sevetson suggested to GPO that this might be an excellent topic for an upcoming meeting.

Jo Anne Beezley, Pittsburgh State University, KS, suggested putting stickers on the outdated paper items. In doing a review of their catalog she has noticed there are still a large number of brief records for microfiche and wondered what the status of get-ting full records was.

Tad Downing indicated there isn't a great backlog of microfiche and asked that she or anyone else with the same concern give him the specific information.

Jill Vassilakos-Long, California State University, San Bernardino asked about the electronic archive – is there only one or do copies exist in other places?

GPO gave the same response as before, there is more than one but they need to move at least one to a location that is farther away.

Julie Wallace, University of Minnesota, spoke to the superseded issue and indicated we should be seeing a new superseded list soon. She suggested perhaps the introduction should address the policy of electronic versions of items.

Masako Yukawa, Long Island University, NY asked about the new workstation specifications, DVDs and the lack of abil-ity to use some of them since her university is now on an NT system but some products require the use of an older operat-ing system (e.g. Windows 95 or 98).

Gil Baldwin indicated that the GPO looks at what the current state of the art is and tries to be compatible with that, plus GPO does not control the specifications the agencies choose to put on their products, and sometimes they are not compatible with the hardware. GPO would appreciate information about those specific problems.

Robin Haun-Mohamed indicated this compatibility problem is specific to some Census products, and the Census Bureau is looking to see if there is an NT (operating system) they can use.

Nan Myers, Wichita State University, asked if there was a reasonable explanation regarding the discrepancies between the number of records in the Monthly Catalog and the Monthly Catalog production database.

Tad Downing replied that a distinction needs to be made – there really are no missing records from what people get from their tape loads. The missing records, and there are not thousands of them, are the records that are not in the Catalog of Govern-

ment Publications at the website, and this goes back to the "tortured data processing." They have reviewed their procedures and now have new ones in place where they check their records against OCLC and what is on the website so please let him know of the problem records.

Cindi Wolff, University of Wisconsin, inquired about the security of backups and if this is an argument for or against electronic distribution of information.

Monday, October 15, 2001, 2:00 p.m.

Council Working Session
Gil Baldwin asked Council to look at the issues associated with the scheduling of Council meetings, specifically the need to make time for new Council members to have time to tour GPO without it interfering with Council working time. A discussion ensued.

Council also began discussion on possible recommendations and action items and assigned them to specific committees.

The Committees and Working Groups then broke up and met throughout the rest of the afternoon.

Tuesday, October 16, 2001

8:30 a.m. Plenary Session

(see Conference Proceedings for presentations)

Tuesday, October 16, 2001

2:00 p.m. Council Working Session
George Barnum, Electronic Collection Manager, gave Council an overview of the CORC interface and how it works. He also discussed PDI (Personal Data Interchange) and what it does and does not do. It isn't like creating a bibliographic record and is not used for retrieval purposed but rather is metadata that will be placed in the digital archive along with the digital object. It indicates when the item was created, how, by whom, when it is modified and by whom. They have been able to stay on schedule pretty well so far and February 2002 is a solid date for implementation of Phase 2.

7:00 p.m. Council Working Session
Council members worked on writing the various recommendations, commendations and action items.

Wednesday, October 17, 2001

8:30 a.m. Council Working Session
Council reviewed the various recommendations and talked about the need for more revisions to the Council Manual. Chair Sevetson will work with the incoming Chair on this. The need for a possible meeting "lessons learned" or "after action" report was discussed so things could be passed on for the next meeting and hopefully eliminate the same problems occurring again. One item learned from this meeting was that our spontaneous decision to find other rooms for smaller breakout groups cost GPO extra money.

Nominations were accepted for the next Chair. Paul Arrigo nominated Charlene Cain and this was seconded by Roberta Shaffer. Greta Marlatt nominated Cathy Hartman and was seconded by Dena Hutto. Cathy Hartman was the winner by vote.

Committee make up is as follows:

Electronic Preservation
- **Paul Arrigo – Chair**
- Dan Barkley
- John Stevenson
- Greta Marlatt
- Depository Operations
- Linda Fredericks - Chair
- Dan Barkley – Chair Elect
- Charlene Cain
- Bob Hinton
- Mary Redmond

Communications & Information Exchange
- **Sharon Hogan – Chair**
- Charlene Cain – Chair Elect
- John Kavaliunas
- Barbara Ford
- Roberta Shaffer
- Cataloging
- Dena Hutto - Chair
- John Stevenson
- Paul Arrigo

Council discussed various ways to improve sessions for the future, including the kinds of documents we want to have in the packet. Listed were: Council Membership, Council Committees, the recommendations, responses, commendations and action items from the previous meeting, any appropriate older working documents, as well as a call to Council for other articles and documents to bring.

2:00 p.m. Plenary Session

Chair Sevetson brought the session to order and thanked attendees for staying for the final session. She thanked the secretary and announced that Cathy Hartman would be the new Chair in Fall 2002. Council members then read the recommendations, commendations and action items (Administrative Notes, v. 22, # 17, 12/15/01) and then entertained questions from the audience.

Mr DiMario made some closing remarks. He thanked Council for their hard work and the audience for their participation.

Chair Sevetson gave some final thanks to Willie Thompson and Robin Haun-Mohamed for all their efforts for bringing the meeting together and to Mr. DiMario and Mr. Buckley for all their support and for listening to Council.

Dan Barkley complimented Andrea for all her efforts.

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greta E. Marlatt
Council Secretary

2002

SPRING Meeting — 2002

Summary of the Spring 2002 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Mobile, Alabama
April 21-24, 2002

Sunday, April 21, 2002

Council Working Session, 7:15 p.m.

Council Members present:

- Paul Arrigo, Pennsylvania State University, Shenango;
- Daniel C. Barkley, University of New Mexico;
- Charlene C. Cain, Louisiana State University;
- Barbara J. Ford, Chicago Public Library;
- Linda Fredericks, King County Library System, Bellevue, WA;
- Cathy Nelson Hartman, University of North Texas Libraries;
- Doris Small Helfer, California State University – Northridge;
- Dena Hutto, Reed College, Portland, OR;
- John C. Kavaliunas, U.S. Census Bureau;
- Greta E. Marlatt (Secretary), Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA;
- Mary Redmond, New York State Library;
- Andrea Sevetson (Chair); and
- John A. Stevenson, University of Delaware Library;

Robert A. Hinton, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis was excused due to illness. Sharon A. Hogan, University of Illinois at Chicago resigned from Council in March 2002 due to illness.

Chair Andrea Sevetson welcomed everyone and had the Council members and audience introduce themselves. Doris Helfer is joining Council to finish out the term of Roberta Shaffer who resigned.

Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer

Mr. DiMario talked about the upcoming appropriation hearings and the September 11 supplemental funds. GPO has approval for the new Integrated Library System (ILS). The White House has indicated its intent to nominate Mr. Bruce James as the new Public Printer. Mr. DiMario, various GPO staff and Andrea Sevetson have had an opportunity to meet with him.

Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

Mr. Buckley indicated funding was requested and granted for the GPO Access backup and mirror site. The Pueblo, CO distribution center will be the site of the combined backup and mirror site.

Regarding the security concerns and requests for withdrawal of documents, the USGS CD-ROM is the only one so far, but GPO has asked for clarification as to what "sensitive" means. The Office of Homeland Security is working on this but it is unknown when this will be available.

Committee Reports

Electronic Preservation Committee – Paul Arrigo reported the committee planned to work on three things: GPO's response to the need for the geographically separated GPO Access backup, the geographic backups for Partners and the distribution of electronic publications. The committee compiled a list of requirements that would be necessary for entrance to a distribution program and discussed the need for a letter to go out to survey for interest before proceeding.

- Creating a retention schedule
- Creating metadata
- Preservation of metadata
- Harvest metadata automatically
- Handling the files
- Migration issues
- Refreshing the files
- Some geographic redundancy
- Storage in environmental controlled facility
- Must purge docs when requested by GPO for security
- Value added materials are no longer to be considered an official document
- Download information automatically

Operations Committee – Linda Fredericks reported they will be looking at several issues including the Documents Data Miner, a request to have all libraries display the FDLP logo on their websites, and a concern that was expressed about downloading information on to State level archives.

Cataloging and Locator Committee – Dena Hutto reported on three issues. GPO is having problems recruiting and hiring new catalogers due to the classification level they are required to use. The Library of Congress hires catalogers at a higher step than GPO has permission to. They are also looking into PURLs for serials and the need to keep them current. The third issue involves cataloging the tangible products which GPO makes available only electronically.

Communications and Information Committee – Charlene Cain indicated they had been asked to come up with a list of strategies for marketing. Their ideas were delineated in a draft letter to the Public Printer. In response to Recommendation #5, GPO has started to draft a marketing plan entitled "US Government Information: Make the Connection @ Federal Depository Libraries." They are also tracking the Lieberman bill (S 803) on E-Government.

Other Reports

Permanent Public Access – John Stevenson reported the PPA has not met so he had nothing to report.

Chair Sevetson talked about her expectations for members during the meeting. She also reported on her meeting with Bruce James and the draft letter to him regarding depository issues. She asked the Communications committee to review it.

Council also discussed GPO's responses to the Fall recommendations.

Monday, April 22, 2002, Plenary Session, 8:35 a.m.

Council Members Present

Paul Arrigo, Daniel C. Barkley, Charlene C. Cain, Barbara J. Ford, Linda Fredericks, Cathy Nelson Hartman, Doris Small Helfer, Dena Hutto, John C. Kavaliunas, Greta E. Marlatt, Mary Redmond, Andrea Sevetson and John A. Stevenson.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Spencer Watts, Mobile Public Library, welcomed everyone to the City of Mobile on behalf of Mayor Michael C. Dowd. He gave a brief overview of the history of the city. Two Azalea Trail Maids also extended welcomes.

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Services Branch, welcomed everyone and went over logistics.

Andrea Sevetson, Council Chair, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. Robin Haun-Mohamed, Willie Thompson and Vicki Tate were all recognized for their efforts in making all the arrangements and putting together the sessions. The usual "Council Aerobics" included asking everyone to respond by geographic areas – oceans, mountains and rivers.

John Stevenson provided the overview of the Sunday evening working session.

Welcome and GPO Update by the Honorable Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer.

Mr. DiMario expressed his pleasure at being at the meeting and commented on the partnership that exists between GPO and the depository community. He noted it is an uneven one with GPO acquiring and distributing the publications and the library community doing the majority of the work.

Mr. DiMario introduced Doris Helfer, who is replacing Roberta Shaffer, and the other new Council appointees. (See Administrative Notes, April 15, 2002, v. 23, no. 5 -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad041502.html)

Mr. DiMario read a letter from Senator Mark Dayton, current Chair of the JCP. This letter was in response to a GPO invitation to the members of the JCP inviting them to attend the meeting. Mr. DiMario was also pleased to be able to announce the approval by the JCP for the $1.9M request to purchase an Integrated Library System (ILS) to upgrade the current legacy system.

Mr. DiMario reminisced about his career within the Government Printing Office that began in 1971. He held several positions culminating with his current one. He announced that the White House has indicated their intention to nominate Mr. Bruce R. James as the next Public Printer. He has met with Mr. James and provided him with information and names of individuals who would help him have a better understanding of the Depository Library concerns. Mr. James is very familiar with the printing industry but not so with the library community and is interested in learning more about us. Mr. DiMario's best guess is that it will be several months before he is confirmed and sworn in.

Mr. DiMario indicated they have not heard anything on their request for funding. Congress was generous to GPO with the issuance of the supplemental appropriations after September 11. Included in GPO's request for the supplemental appropriations were the funds for a mirror site. These funds were approved and Pueblo, CO has been chosen as the location.

Regarding their requests for funding, Congressman Charles Taylor (NC) is still the Chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee and he is still skeptical of what GPO does although he has modified his opinion somewhat in recent years. Senator Richard Durbin (IL) is the new Chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee and he has expressed some concern about the Sales Program. The great success of GPO Access has caused significant declines in sales and the impact of agencies producing more and more in electronic format has also caused a decrease in printing, further impacting GPO revenues.

Mr. DiMario expressed his thanks for allowing him to serve and wished everyone well.

Mr. Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

See remarks, Administrative Notes May 5, 2002, (v. 23, no. 6) -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad050502.html

Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Programs Service (LPS)

See remarks, Administrative Notes May 5, 2002, (v. 23, no. 6) -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad050502.html

T.C. Evans, Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (EIDS)

See remarks, Administrative Notes May 5, 2002, (v. 23, no. 6) -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad050502.html

Information Exchange

Jim Veatch, Library HQ, asked if there was any information about the status of the Department of the Interior Web sites due to the lawsuit. He noted the National Park Service was now back online.

TC Evans gave an unofficial answer that he heard they were being allowed back on a service or bureau basis after review, and about half were now back. He didn't know what the timetable was.

Roberta Palen, Chicago Public Library, inquired about her concern that so many of the smaller depositories seem to be dropping. She wanted to know if they were giving notice or reasons for their decisions. She wanted to know if there was any coordination and who was going to pick up the slack.

Andrea Sevetson responded that Council was also aware of the problem and concerned and would be hearing a presentation later in the day from Claire Hoffman who has been studying this issue.

Gil Baldwin responded that GPO rarely gets advance warning, that usually the decision has been made and it is a matter of mechanics by the time they have been notified. They would very much like more notice. The State Planning process should address what to do when libraries relinquish their status.

Fran Buckley also indicated he wished they would consult with GPO as the program can be flexible and GPO would be happy to consult with them.

Linda Fredericks indicated that preliminary findings seem to indicate that they were generally small or medium, most are public or small liberal arts schools and some have been in the program for 100+ years while others are relatively recent entrants.

Andrea Sevetson indicated that Council has been following up and contacting those that are dropping to see why.

Paul Arrigo asked if there have been any new libraries added to the program.

Robin Haun-Mohamed responded with a brief overview of the newest participants.

Paul Arrigo asked if TC Evans could give an explanation of the PKI (Public Key Infrastructure) security software.

TC Evans responded that it was a phased approach since there are numerous issues. They will be conducting a pilot with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This will be their first foray into the actual use of PKI signing to start the assurance process of information that ultimately ends up in GPO Access. There is a vetting process as well, signing up those with the authority to sign.

Trisha Cruse, California Digital Library, asked if this was security for digital objects or was it for authentication.

TC Evans responded there were several levels. They want to make sure the proper person is authorizing and that they are not altered along the way. There will be a free reader so the user can access the information.

Julia Wallace, University of Minnesota, commented on the issue of libraries who were dropping. In her region, it was mostly small libraries. She thinks there might be more opportunities designating new libraries as new congressional redistricting occurs. She also feels that Regionals should be aware enough to get wind if a library is considering dropping though sometimes the decision is made at the director level and no discussions are held. She mused that GPO Access has been a little too successful!

Andrea Sevetson asked if GPO was looking for new topics. She suggested a listserv for what's new and maybe something like the table of contents for the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents or other similar serials.

TC Evans responded that they would welcome such suggestions (send suggestions to gpoaccess@gpo.gov) and that they could do a "What's New on GPO Access." Other serials are a little more complicated since they are agency documents and they are paid to do them (e.g. Federal Register and National Archives Records Administration).

Julia Wallace, University of Minnesota, asked about GPO's New Titles by Topic service. When a library wants to buy a copy of a publication that we will probably not be getting in a tangible format, we still need to know for sure before buying that we aren't going to get them and that they are available from the bookstore.

TC Evans responded that he would talk to the relevant parties to see if something could be arranged.

Jim Veatch, Library HQ, asked if there had been an increase in the usage of Ben's Guide since GPO began pushing it.

TC Evans indicated there have been incremental increases along with the various pushes. They do measure usage and it is generally busy in conjunction with the school year. They are trying to work with the education community to see what events are the catalysts for sending it up one month versus others. We are running at about 800,000-900,000 retrievals per month.

John Stevenson asked if, when an agency asked GPO to set up a Web site, does GPO provide a template or does the agency have a fully formed idea.

TC Evans responded they do work with agencies and they will do everything from building the site from scratch to just mounting it. There are certain "good practices" that they try to get them to work with and they try to make sure the design includes fast loading.

Cathy Hartman indicated she has conversations with GPO about migrating from WAIS databases and would GPO comment.

TC Evans indicated they were looking at which databases would be available to migrate next year.

Committee chairs gave brief overviews of their membership and major issues.
Dena Hutto – Cataloging and Locator Committee

- Support GPO cataloging staff to be more competitive with higher-level positions
- Maintaining PURLs
- Cataloging for tangible products which GPO is only distributing electronically

Linda Fredericks – Operations Committee

- Libraries leaving FDLP
- Electronic periodicals and the apparent disconnect between DAB, Web Tech Notes, the List of Classes and the Catalog of United States Government Publications.
- Mandate depository logos on websites
- Inspections and self-studies
- Superseded list

Paul Arrigo – Electronic Preservation

- Electronic dissemination and the requirements for participation in such a program

Charlene Cain – Communications

- Marketing and promotion of the program

Andrea Sevetson briefly talked about her meeting with Bruce James and the draft letter she gave him. This draft came from work that Sharon Hogan had done with Council in Fall 2000, to develop a vision for the Program of the Future.

Monday, April 22, 2002, Council Working Session, 2 p.m.

Mr. Buckley distributed and explained SOD 72 (Agency Request to Withdraw Information Products From Superintendent of Documents Program) and GPO's plans for procedures for implementing SOD 72. He indicated they previously had a procedure but not a written policy. There was a lively discussion about this issue as well as the memo written by Tom Susman regarding this issue (see "Removal or Destruction of Federal Depository Library Documents," http://www.arl.org/info/frn/gov/Susman.html).

Claire Hoffman, Head Librarian at Pennsylvania State University, Abington, gave Council a presentation on her research into the many reasons libraries are leaving the Depository Program. The data she was able to collect covered October 1992 through October 2000. She gave an overview of her findings which she plans to publish. During the targeted time, 104 libraries have dropped. Some of the highlights of her findings include:

State	Number
California	14
District of Columbia	9
New Jersey	8
Pennsylvania	7
New York	6

Type of Library	Number
Public	36
Academic	30
Federal Agency	10
Community College	8
Special	7
Law (Academic)	5

Information gleaned from letters, self-studies and inspection reports indicated many had various problems identified during inspections, and had been rated as noncompliant or unsatisfactory. Other issues included staffing problems, space issues, money, requirements, decreased usage, technical requirements, reorganization (changed priorities) and the perception that "everything is on the Internet."

Council members and the audience asked her questions about her findings and there was considerable discussion about the issue and possible solutions.

Council Working Session, 7-9:00p.m.

Council met and worked in small groups on committee work.

Tuesday, April 23, 2002

Council Plenary Session, 8:30 a.m.

Although Mr. DiMario's acknowledgement of the outgoing class is usually done on the final day, because he and Mr. Buckley needed to leave, Mr. DiMario spoke to Council and thanked them (and the audience) for their participation. He considers the program to be very important and is proud to have been a part of it for so long. He commended the dedication of the staff and GPO as well as the depository community for being "true professionals." He thanked Council for their "due diligence" and acknowledged the 5 outgoing members. He asked for a moment of reflection on behalf of Sharon Hogan who was gravely ill. Subsequent to this meeting, Council learned of Sharon's death on April 27. He presented certificates to Linda Fredericks, Mary Redmond and Andrea Sevetson.

Chair Sevetson presented Mr. DiMario with a small token of their appreciation for all his efforts.

Since the morning sessions were all very related to the issues Council was working on, the decision was to move the working sessions to Monday evening and attend the morning sessions.

Those sessions were:

- Value of Participating in the FDLP: How Depository Coordinators Can Effectively Convey this Message to Library Administration (a response to Recommendation #5, Fall 2001)
    - Barbara Ford, Assistant Commissioner, Chicago Public Library and Mary Prophet, Denison University.
- Web Documents Digital Archive Pilot Project
    - George Barnum, Manager, Electronic Collection, LPS
- USGS and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Information dissemination policies in light of changes since September 11, 2001)

- Tom Smith, Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- Hedy Rossmeissl, U.S. Geological Survey
- Sandy Schwalb, Defense Technical Information Center

Council Working Session, 2 p.m.

Committee Chairs reported on the committee discussions regarding the recommendations and commendations they would be responsible for. Council then discussed the recommended actions and made assignments for the actual writing of them.

Council Working Session, 7 p.m.

Council members wrote the various recommendation, commendations and action items.

Wednesday, April 24, 2002

Council Working Session, 8:30 a.m.

Council reviewed the draft recommendations, commendations and action items. TC Evans gave an overview of the prototype of the new GPO Access. Council gave some feedback and was favorably impressed overall.

The Freshman class opted to take Greta Marlatt up on her offer and announced that she would remain as Secretary for another year.

Cathy Hartman (incoming Chair) and Andrea Sevetson (outgoing Chair) have provided updated information for the Council website and it was decided that the Chair and Chair Elect will be the defacto Web committee.

Committee assignments were reviewed and updated. While some assignments were made in advance, the incoming class will be added in October when they are available to indicate their preferences. The assignments are as follows:

Electronic Preservation
- **Paul Arrigo (Chair)**
- Dan Barkley
- Greta Marlatt
- John Stevenson

Cataloging
- **Dena Hutto (Chair)**
- Paul Arrigo
- Doris Helfer
- John Stevenson

Communications
- **Charlene Cain (Chair)**
- Dena Hutto
- Barbara Ford
- John Kavaliunas

Operations

- **Dan Barkley (Chair)**
- Charlene Cain
- Greta Marlatt
- Michelle McKnelly
- John Phillips
- Mary Prophet

Wednesday, April 24, 2002

Plenary Session, 11:45 a.m.

Chair Sevetson made her closing remarks. She thanked Robin Haun-Mohamed for all her hard work and excellent programs and Willie Thompson for all his behind the scenes work. She also thanked Greta Marlatt for being secretary and announced she had graciously agreed to do it again next year.

Council read their recommendations, commendations and action items.

Chair Sevetson opened the floor up to the audience for questions and comments.

John Phillips, Oklahoma State University, indicated that the Regionals had met and they share some of the similar concerns about libraries leaving the program. They would send their list of recommendations to GPO.

Dan Barkley asked that the list be transmitted to Council as well.

George Carlson, Santa Clara University, asked about Recommendation no. 7, Retention and Recruitment of GPO Catalogers. He was concerned that it talked about online but didn't really mention tangible items.

Dena Hutto responded that the recommendation had been structured to address concerns that it not specify cataloging of only tangible items but others as well.

Chris Brown, University of Denver, had a question about Recommendation no. 8, Integrated Library System. He was concerned about the wording "own the source code" as he felt there might a problem.

Dan Barkley responded that he thinks GPO does need to own the source code and the most vendors are unlikely to have a problem. Making changes is very expensive.

Steve Sexton, Georgia Southern University, suggested that Recommendation no. 8 would work better if the wording were changed around.

Andrea Sevetson encouraged the audience to send other comments to Council. She thanked Vicki Tate for making local arrangements.

She thanked Mary Redmond and Linda Fredericks for their efforts as part of her class and presented them with small gifts. She also thanked Council for their hard work and good humor before turning the gavel over to Cathy Hartman.

On behalf of GPO, Gil Baldwin thanked the outgoing class for all their work and participation. He also thanked the rest of Council for a very productive meeting and the audience for their participation.

Cathy Hartman thanked Robin Haun-Mohamed and Willie Thompson for the great sessions and all their help. She expressed her appreciation to the Senior class and especially Chair Sevetson for including her in many things throughout the year so that she would be well equipped to take over as Chair. Both Chairs gave out gifts.

Meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greta E. Marlatt
Council Secretary

Fall Meeting — 2002

Summary of the Fall 2002 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Arlington, Virginia
October 20-23, 2002

Sunday, October 20, 2002, 7:15 p.m.

Council Members present:

- Paul Arrigo, Pennsylvania State University, Shenango;

- Daniel C. Barkley, University of New Mexico;

- Charlene C. Cain, Louisiana State University, Paul M. Hebert Law Center Library;

- Cathy Nelson Hartman (Chair), University of North Texas Libraries;

- Doris Small Hefner, California State University, Northridge;

- Dena Hutto, Reed College, Portland, OR;

- John C. Kavaliunas, U.S. Census Bureau;

- Greta E. Marlatt (Secretary), Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA

- Michele T. McKnelly, University of Wisconsin - River Falls

- John Phillips, Oklahoma State University

- Mary W. Prophet, Denison University

- Laura Saurs, Newark Public Library

- Lynn Siemers, Washington Hospital Center

- John A. Stevenson, University of Delaware Library

Barbara J. Ford, Chicago Public Library was excused due to a conflict and arrived Tuesday morning.

Chair Cathy Hartman welcomed everyone and the Council members introduced themselves. John Stevenson volunteered to take notes and give a brief overview at Monday's plenary session.

Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer

Mr. DiMario said he would continue as Public Printer until the nomination of Mr. Bruce James was completed. He announced that Senator Mark Dayton, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, would address the plenary session on Monday. Senator Dayton had been involved in hearings regarding the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) proposal that Executive Branch agencies do not have to use the Government Printing Office. Language requiring agencies to follow the provisions of Title 44 was added to the continuing resolution.

John Kavaliunas asked what the consequences would be if an agency did not use the Government Printing Office, and Mr. DiMario responded that the individual who authorized the outside printing would be personally liable, and that there was some thought about putting that specific language into law.

Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

Mr. Buckley addressed the issue of information security and said agencies were being encouraged to be cautious regarding the release of information. He said GPO was renegotiating the lease of a facility in Pueblo, CO, prior to creating a GPO Access mirror site there.

He spoke about marketing and the development of publicity for the FDLP, and about efforts to recruit new products and negotiate new services for the sales program. He said GPO was creating a backup production line at Laurel, MD.

Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Programs Service

Mr. Baldwin reported that the new annual report was out, and that LPS was recruiting new staff. They are working with consultants from RMG to develop the requirements for a new Integrated Library System (ILS). The new marketing campaign has been launched with the theme "U.S. Government Information: Make the Connection at a Federal Depository Library." He also encouraged everyone to sign up for the new email service GPO-FDLP-L. The Library Programs Service staff will post exclusively to this list to announce time-sensitive information.

T.C. Evans, Director, Office of Electronic Information Services

Mr. Evans indicated they now have the ability to authenticate bills and hope to have the technology ready for use at the beginning of the 108th Congress. They will use PKI (Public Key Infrastructure) technology to authenticate PDF files.

Committee Reports

Electronic Preservation Committee – Paul Arrigo provided Council members with copies of his report. The main issues that are being reviewed include:

- Congressional text files, some of which have portions of files missing

- Some PDF files are so large they take forever to load – if at all

- NTIS (National Technical Information Service) is now charging a fee to download electronic files

- The need to monitor the progress being undertaken by Delaware, North Carolina and Wyoming's Archival Electronic Documents program

- The need to monitor the National Archives and Records Administration's (NARA) redesign of their Federal records management program.

Mr. Buckley indicated that NARA is trying to encourage the archiving of more formats. John Kavaliunas asked about them not wanting to accept PDF files. Andrea Sevetson attended a meeting where they indicated they were beginning to accept all formats since they are not getting a lot of important information.

Operations Committee – Dan Barkley reported that the CRS microfiche problem has been resolved. The committee has been looking at the recruitment of new depository libraries and the standardization of procedures for withdrawal from the program. He also reported on the Subcommittee on Attrition and Retention (SOAR). 160 libraries have dropped in the past 12 years. The 4 groups within the subcommittee were each assigned various areas of responsibility:

Group 1: establish a profile of those most likely to drop from the program

Group 2: suggest ways GPO could facilitate a program to reach out to Regionals and library directors and provide training and mentoring and encourage housing agreements with Regionals

Group 3: establish a program whereby Council members would serve as liaisons to depository libraries within established areas and encourage support at the local level

Group 4: look at what vendors could provide as "shelf ready" and list which products could be leveraged since they are free only through depository libraries.

Cataloging and Locator Committee – Dena Hutto reported that the committee is evaluating the need to provide more education on cataloging depository materials. They are questioning whether there is any relationship between cataloging requirements and libraries dropping out.

Communications and Information Committee – Charlene Cain indicated the committee is waiting for the confirmation of the new Public Printer before making any more changes to the letter to welcome him. They are monitoring the Federal Enterprise Architecture Program Management Office (FEAPMO). The concept is to apply a business model or framework to improve government. <http://www.feapmo.gov/>

The committee is also revising the Council manual and website and considering whether to revise the old bylaws or incorporate them into the manual. They are also looking at ways to improve media relations and to give Council members guidelines for responding when approached by the media.

Paul Arrigo complimented Chair Hartman for putting together an agenda that didn't have overlapping committee meeting times, since many Council members are on more than one committee.

Chair Hartman led a discussion of GPO's responses to the spring recommendations.

Monday, October 21, 2002

Plenary Session, 8:30 a.m.

Council Members present:

Paul Arrigo, Dan Barkley, Charlene C. Cain, Cathy Nelson Hartman, Doris Small Helfer, Dena Hutto, John C. Kavaliunas, Greta E. Marlatt, Michele T. McKnelly, John Phillips, Mary W. Prophet, Laura Saurs, Lynn Siemers, and John A. Stevenson

Opening Remarks

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Services Branch, welcomed everyone and went over logistics. Chair Hartman called the session to order at 8:35 a.m. She thanked Robin and the GPO staff for putting together a wonderful program and thanked Willie Thompson for all his behind the scenes work. She encouraged the audience to talk with GPO staff and had them stand. Council members introduced themselves.

Chair Hartman announced that Senator Mark Dayton was expected and that it was the first time the Chair of the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) had been able to attend a Council meeting. She recognized Julia Wallace (University of Minnesota) and Joan Cheverie (Georgetown University) for testifying before the JCP. The usual "Council Aerobics" included first time attendees and a look at the "graying" of depository librarians by eligibility for retirement increments: those eligible in 5 years, 5-10 years, 10-20 years and those who will not retire for more than 20 years.

John Stevenson gave a brief overview of Sunday evening's meeting.

Welcome and GPO Update by the Honorable Michael F. DiMario, Public Printer

Mr. DiMario expressed his honor at being at the meeting. He confirmed that Senator Mark Dayton, a friend of the Federal Depository Library Program, would be arriving to speak. He recognized the devotion of the depository library community to the program and its willingness to attend the Council and Conference despite last year's September 11 terrorist attacks and this year's sniper attacks.

Mr. DiMario gave a brief overview of the status of the Appropriation bills. He also spoke on the status of the OMB's attempts to bypass GPO for printing. Mr. Mitchell Daniels, OMB Director, sent a memorandum to all executive agencies indicating they no longer had to use GPO for their printing needs as of 1 September. The JCP held a hearing on this proposal.

Regarding the status of Mr. Bruce James' confirmation as Public Printer, the Rules committee held hearings but had announced no action. Mr. DiMario will continue to serve until the confirmation and appointment of the new Public Printer.

Mr. DiMario thanked everyone for allowing him to continue to serve. He then introduced Senator Mark Dayton, (D-MN) Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Senator Mark Dayton, (D-MN) Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, Remarks

Senator Dayton expressed his honor at being invited to address this conference. He paid tribute to Mr. DiMario for being "extraordinary in steadfastness and loyalty especially in the recent trying times."

Senator Dayton talked about the importance of the government providing information to the public. He said the Founders of our country understood that power/knowledge needed to be protected and that a lack of information cuts off the democratic process. As citizens and taxpayers, we have a right to the information, and this should not be simply at the discretion of those in government, since the law requires wide distribution.

Senator Dayton also spoke about the OMB memorandum that seeks to allow printing outside GPO. He said OMB has made no attempt to change the law administratively or legislatively, but has presumed license to determine what is constitutional, and Congress has taken issue with this and made a pretty emphatic statement, an unusual consensus of Democrats and Republicans agreeing that "the law is the law."

Senator Dayton thanked Mr. DiMario and the GPO staff for doing a great job.

Mr. DiMario thanked Senator Dayton for his comments and support of GPO. He also thanked Matt McGowan, the staff director of the JCP, as well as Andy Sherman, GPO Public Affairs Office, for their support.

Francis J. Buckley, Jr., Superintendent of Documents

See remarks, Administrative Notes, November 15, 2002, (v. 23, no. 14)
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111502.html#5

Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Programs Service (LPS)

See remarks, Administrative Notes, November 15, 2002, (v. 23, no. 14)
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111502.html#6

T.C. Evans, Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services (EIDS)

See remarks, Administrative Notes, November 15, 2002, (v. 23, no. 14)
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111502.html#7

Information Exchange

Michele T. McKnelIy asked when Trade USA was going to be made available.

Robin Haun-Mohamed said STAT USA would be making an announcement later in the conference. [see this link for the announcement -- http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/adnotes/ad111502.html#3

Cathy Hartman asked T.C. Evans if it would be possible to get information on the number of hits from the PURL servers.

T.C. Evans responded that they would need to get the log files in order to be able to delve down.

Aimee Quinn, University of Illinois, Chicago, asked whether there will be interconnectivity between the ILS and GPO Access.

Gil Baldwin responded that the OPAC part would be presented on GPO Access and the Monthly Catalog as it is now will be replaced.

Nan Myers, Wichita State University, asked if we would be able to see the staff view of the MARC record and would serials be available at the piece level.

Gil Baldwin said it was being considered.

Julie Wallace, University of Minnesota, thanked GPO for the Electronic Sales announcements service and encouraged everyone to sign up for it. She also mentioned the new FDLP announcements service and encouraged everyone to sign up for it as well, since the purpose of GOVDOC-L was not for GPO announcements and they would not be using it to do that any more.

Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky, commented that old collections are deteriorating and need to be addressed. Some are going to need to move obsolete CDs due to format and software changes.

George Barnum said a partnership was in the works with Indiana University, Bloomington, which has been working on a floppy disk project to access the information that was distributed on floppy disk. However, they still need someone to volunteer to partner for CD-ROMs. [information regarding this project can be accessed at <http://www.indiana.edu/~libgpd/mforms/floppy/floppy.html>.

Ann Miller, Duke University, asked for an update on the status of inspections.

Robin Haun-Mohamed responded that they were back on the road. MN, VA, MD, CA, IL, MI, AZ and GA all have self study inspections coming due. She was not sure where the inspection auditors would go or what they would be looking at. If a library was not inspected last time, they should expect to be this time.

Dan Barkley asked if there would be notice given for the audit inspections and what was the reason for the visits.

Robin Haun-Mohamed said some would be given notice and others would not. She said the scope is wide open. Inspectors will focus on access and whether requirements are being met.

Sharon Partridge, Jefferson County Public Library, commented that some PURLs are not connecting and it is difficult to find the original documents. She thought GPO was archiving the documents.

George Barnum responded that PURLs were begun before GPO began archiving, so there are a lot that predate the archived ones. GPO is looking for partners to help make up gaps.

Tad Downing said there currently are 23,500 PURLs and to let the GPO know if we find dead links. LPS checks weekly, but the software only checks the link, not the content.

Nan Myers, Wichita State University, asked if the RMG ILS report would be made available.

Gil Baldwin said they had not planned to make it available and would have to check with the contract folks to see if it would be legal to release it.

Nan Myers then asked, since Phase I was mentioned, if other phases were being discussed.

Gil Baldwin responded that currently only Phase I was being worked on. Other phases would depend on what choices were made and what the software can or cannot do or provide.

Cathy Amens, St. Mary's University, San Antonio, asked how far the new catalog will go back.

Gil Baldwin said 1976.

Cathy Edward, Nevada State Library and Records, said her institution is concerned about performance indications and how many documents they add. The projected numbers have fallen off this year -- can we get a count of the number of serials?

Gil Baldwin said GPO reports statistics on a gross level. They report the number of copies and titles distributed but cannot give information at the item level.

Kay Collins, University of California, Irvine, asked about the GPO's cataloging of electronic only pieces. She asked if GPO would catalog the physical piece if libraries are able to get them, so there would be uniformity of the records.

Tad Downing responded that GPO can only catalog what they distribute. He said they are unaware of what is distributed by agencies other than what is sent to GPO, so he suggested that libraries will need to modify their own records.

Kristine McLonis, University of Detroit, Mercy, asked if there were any policies regarding unaccompanied children since her institution has concerns about physical safety and access to porn sites.

Sharon Partridge, Jefferson County Public Library, asked for a progress report on lost documents and new electronic claiming.

Gil Baldwin said there are lots of interesting submissions, and GPO is working with two groups (GODORT and AALL). Most submissions are clearly in scope, so these groups are doing a good job of evaluating. Tad Downing said they have cataloged 528 monographs and 262 serials.

Colleen Parmer, Bowling Green State University, asked about redistricting. As depositories move from one congressional district to another, who is responsible for reporting the change?

Robin Haun-Mohamed said the depositories are and asked everyone to please use the online form to report <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/tools/ldirect.html>. Anyone unsure of the correct district number should contact GPO and coordinate with the regional. Redistricting changes that result in more than one library per district does not mean anyone will be dropped, rather, they will be grandfathered in.

Council Working Session, 2 p.m.

George Barnum, Manager, Electronic Collections, spoke to Council about the OCLC Digital Archiving Project. The project has moved out of beta to production. One can put a URL into the system and return the information for the metadata. CORC functionality can help build a better bibliographic record. If they want to, they can use the record to create preservation metadata. There are currently 28 elements and they will likely have to make changes to the metadata set eventually. They can grab Digital Objects from agency sites and link preservation data with bibliographic data. The Digital Object will have an XML wrapper of preservation metadata in the archive (storage server). It can be disseminated via FTP to multiple locations.

GPO is considering ways to get this process into its current workflow, as it will not work with the ILS. LPS staff will have to use the records/products within the OCLC system, since they need to have a bibliographic record before they can grab the Digital Object.

Council Cataloging and Communication committees met to work on new recommendations and commendations.

Tuesday, October 22, 2002

Council Working Session, 8:30 a.m.

The Electronic Preservation and Operations committees met to work on new recommendations and commendations. The SOAR subcommittee, as well as the Committee of the Whole, met to discuss the problem of libraries leaving the program.

Council Working Session, 2:00 p.m.

Committees reported back to Council and discussed the potential recommendations and commendations.

Council Working Session, 7:00 p.m.

Council members wrote the various recommendations, commendations and action items.

Council Working Session, 8:30 a.m.

Council completed its work on the draft recommendations to be presented at the afternoon plenary session. Nominations and election of the Chair-elect position took place. Both Dan Barkley and Paul Arrigo were nominated for the Chair-elect position, and Dan Barkley won by majority. Chair Hartman thanked everyone for all their hard work. Charlene Cain thanked the Chair for all her work as well.

Committee assignments were reviewed and updated. The assignments are as follows:

Cataloging
- **Dena Hutto (Chair)**
- Paul Arrigo
- Doris Helfer
- Michele McKnelly
- John Stevenson

Communications
- **Charlene Cain (Chair)**
- Dena Hutto
- Barbara Ford
- John Kavaliunas
- Lynne Siemers

Electronic Preservation
- **Paul Arrigo (Chair)**
- Dan Barkley
- Greta Marlatt
- John Stevenson

Operations
- **Dan Barkley (Chair)**
- Charlene Cain
- Greta Marlatt

- Michele McKnelly
- John Phillips
- Mary Prophet
- Laura Saurs

SOAR

- **Dan Barkley (Chair)**
- Paul Arrigo
- Charlene Cain
- Greta Marlatt
- Michele McKnelly
- John Phillips
- Mary Prophets
- Laura Saurs

Plenary Session, 2:00 p.m.

Chair Hartman thanked Willie Thompson and Nick Ellis for all their work on the conference logistics, and she thanked Robin Haun-Mohamed for the great program and Marian MacGilvray for providing plenty of handouts. She also thanked Council Secretary Marlatt for her willingness to assume her second year as secretary.

A recognition statement in honor of Sharon Hogan, former Council member who passed away, was read. Council then proceeded to read the recommendations, commendations and action items [for final text, see <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa02.html>.

Chair Hartman opened the floor to the audience for questions.

Ellen Sweet, University of Maryland, asked for some background in Action Item #4 – what is FEAPMO?

Charlene Cain explained that it was created to examine the business flow within Federal agencies.

Julie Wallace, University of Minnesota, had 2 comments. She mentioned the CIC Floppy Disk Project and that the links needed to be added to the GPO record to make the link official. She wondered when this might happen, noting that once they are added it will helpful to have this information communicated to depositories so they can withdraw the floppy disks if they so choose. She also wanted everyone to thank Senator Dayton for coming to speak to us.

Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University, regarding Recommendation #6, suggested the 1994 Rare and Endangered report would be a good starting place.

George Barnum indicated it is still available from ERIC though it is out of date.

Ellen Sweet, University of Maryland, said the 6 months' notification requirement could be problematic and wondered what the intent was and how it was going to be enforced.

Dan Barkley explained that the intent was to try to provide lead-time for Regionals to try to persuade libraries to stay in the program or else to work with them on the disposition of materials.

Andrea Sevetson, Census Department, commented that since it takes effort to get into the program, it shouldn't be easy to leave the program. This notification requirement will open a dialog and bring in other players.

Mr. Francis Buckley expressed, on behalf of Mr. DiMario and the staff of GPO, their appreciation for the efforts of Council. He said it was a pleasure to see support and interest in being at the meetings and thanked everyone for being there.

Chair Hartman announced that Dan Barkley was the new Chair Elect and would take over as Chair in fall 2003.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greta E. Marlatt
Council Secretary

2003

Spring Meeting — 2003

Summary of the Spring 2003 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Reno, NV
April 6-9, 2003

Sunday, April 6, 2003

Council Members present:

- Paul Arrigo, Pennsylvania State University, Shenango;

- Daniel C. Barkley, University of New Mexico;

- Charlene C. Cain, Louisiana State University, Paul M. Hebert Law Center Library;

- Cathy Nelson Hartman (Chair), University of North Texas Libraries;

- Doris Small Hefner, California State University, Northridge;

- Dena Hutto, Reed College, Portland, OR;

- Barbara J. Ford, C. Walter and Gerda B. Mortenson Center for International Library Programs, University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign

- Greta E. Marlatt (Secretary), Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA;

- Michele T. McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls;

- John Phillips, Oklahoma State University;

- Mary W. Prophet, Denison University;

- Laura Saurs, Newark Public Library;

- Lynn Siemers, Washington Hospital Center;

- John A. Stevenson, University of Delaware Library

John C. Kavaliunas, U.S. Census Bureau was excused due to a conflict.

Afternoon and Evening Council Working Sessions

Committee Chairs gave brief reports of the work of each committee. Council reviewed GPO's responses to the Fall Recommendations and were pleased with the responses and the progress being made.

Some discussion was held regarding the letter from Tad Downing requesting Council's input on GPO's proposal to discontinue the printed version of the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications and the Serials Supplement. GPO indicated they do intend, however, to continue printing the U.S. Congressional Serial Set Catalog: Numerical Lists and Schedule of Volumes. Council was basically in favor of this but Dena Hutto wanted to seek some input from others before Council wrote it up as a recommendation.

The majority of the two sessions was spent working with facilitator Fynnette Eaton, Change Management Officer, Electronic Records Archives Program, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). She worked with Council to brainstorm on the question of "wouldn't it be nice if FDLP * * *". Council was asked to keep the discussion at a "50,000 foot level" since the purpose of the discussion was to begin to try to visualize the depository library of the future. A variety of ideas were proposed and considerable discussion took place. See the Envisioning the Future of Federal Government Information <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/EnvisioningtheFuture.html> document for more details of this and subsequent discussion during the meeting.

Monday, April 7, 2003

Plenary Session, 8:30 a.m.

Council Members present:

Paul Arrigo, Dan Barkley, Charlene C. Cain, Cathy Nelson Hartman, Doris Small Helfer, Dena Hutto, Barbara J. Ford, Greta E. Marlatt, Michele T. McKnelly, John Phillips, Mary W. Prophet, Laura Saurs, Lynn Siemers and John A. Stevenson.

Opening Remarks

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Services, welcomed everyone and informed them that the session was being video-taped <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/sp03dlc_videos.html>. She gave the usual logistics and announced that this was the largest registered number of attendees for a meeting outside the DC area. Chair Hartman called the session to order. She introduced Martha Gould from NCLIS (National Commission on Libraries and Information Science) who welcomed everyone to Reno and acknowledged the efforts of the staff of the Washoe County Library.

Chair Hartman welcomed everyone, and thanked the GPO staff, Willie Thompson, Robin Haun-Mohamed and Nick Ellis in particular, for all their hard work with the meeting arrangements. After Council introductions, Chair Hartman conducted the usual Council aerobics to see how many attendees came from each area of the country. Students currently enrolled in library schools were also acknowledged since library school deans were specifically asked by GPO to send student representatives. She also asked how many attendees planned to gamble while in Reno.

Chair Hartman then introduced the format of the session and the visioning process that was to follow. She also gave a brief introduction of Fynnette Eaton who would be facilitating the process. Chair Hartman then introduced the Honorable Bruce R. James, Public Printer of the United States.

Welcome and Remarks by the Honorable Bruce R. James, Public Printer

Mr. James began his remarks by talking about what an important time this is and that GPO is at the crossroads. He has talked with the over 3,000 GPO employees about the need to face the reality of the trend toward an increasingly electronic world and the need to change and "leap over the 20th Century into the 21st Century." He commented that depository libraries and librarians also need to think about what their future will be. As he outlined in his Senate hearings, he is proceeding with a 3-step plan, the first part beginning with fact finding. It is necessary to determine strengths and weaknesses as well as problems and opportunities and to get everyone to agree on them so they can then proceed to build a strategic plan to present a new vision of the GPO. He expects this to be done by the end of the year and said it won't be done in a vacuum. He wants to build the best strategic plan possible and then take it to Congress. The plan will include what we would like Title 44 to look like in the 21st Century.

He has been visiting libraries to see first hand what's going on and how things are done. He knows a lot about printing but didn't know much about depository libraries so wants to learn. He believes in the NCLIS (U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science) Principles of Public Information, especially the first and second ones:

1. The public has the right of access to public information; and

2. The Federal Government should guarantee the integrity and preservation of public information, regardless of its format. http://www.nclis.gov/info/pripubin.html

He indicated he doesn't have an end in mind, only a beginning.

Visualizing the Depository Library of the Future

Fynnette Eaton described to the audience the process she was going to use and gave a little of her background in facilitating workshops within NARA to move their records management process forward. As well as setting the ground rules, she indicated

the morning discussions were going to be kept at a high level, that is, at the 50,000 foot level, not at the daily or operational level. She read to the audience the information that had been compiled from Council's discussions from the previous day. See the Envisioning the Future of Federal Government Information document <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/EnvisioningtheFuture.html> and the video <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/sp03dlc_videos.html> for more details of this discussion.

Plenary Session, 2:00 p.m.

The visioning process continued and audience participation was encouraged during this session.

Plenary Session 8:40 a.m.

Chair Hartman introduced the various GPO staff members who gave updates in their respective areas.

Judy Russell, Superintendent of Documents

See remarks, Administrative Notes, May 1, 2003 (v. 24, no. 5)

Gil Baldwin, Director, Library Programs Service

See remarks, Administrative Notes, May 1, 2003 (v. 24, no. 5)

Ric Davis, Director, Office of Electronic Information Dissemination Services

See remarks, Administrative Notes, May 1, 2003 (v. 24, no. 5)

Information Exchange

Charlene Cain asked about the restructuring at GPO and for clarification about the merging of activities.

Judy Russell briefly described what was currently being envisioned and commented that the new organization was still in rough draft outline form. This plan will include groups that will do things such as management, marketing, web harvesting, agency outreach, cataloging, management of GPO Access, tangible collections, storage and shipment, etc.

Dan Barkley asked Gil Baldwin to expand on his comments about the "building the collection of last resort." How is GPO going to acquire it?

Gil Baldwin responded that GPO has a number of ideas under consideration and several things already planned. There are also several things already in motion, i.e., for the past several months they have been capturing a copy of everything that has been sent to depositories. They regularly transfer information/publications to the National Archives but are now holding discussions with NARA and GPO may take those publications that are waiting to be transferred and keep them instead of transferring them. Other ideas include: as depositories weed their collections, GPO make take some titles; GPO can use the Congressional Sales program and work with needs and offers lists; and as libraries leave the program GPO can take some of those collections back. GPO is also considering scanning some publications. These are just a few of the ideas GPO is exploring. GPO will also consult with Council on these and other ideas.

Paul Arrigo asked about the search engine results: are the documents themselves being made accessible or just the web pages?

Ric Davis responded that the HTML web pages are being indexed. Static PDF – those not resident in a database – are also being indexed.

Judy Russell indicated that the Department of Energy is working with Google to load its indexes and abstracts so that database information will also be searchable.

John Stevenson asked about the problem of large files. Many files are too big to download easily.

Ric Davis responded that anything over 750K poses potential problems and they will break them up and "akamize" them. (Akamai <http://www.akamai.com/> is a company that provides a service to make heavily used documents more quickly available. The document is saved in many places and the system knows to take the user to the quickest/closest site for downloading the document.)

John Phillips asked if GPO had collected statistics on the new regulations.gov site <http://www.regulations.gov/>.

Ric Davis said they are gathering them and they are getting a lot of hits. He will share the statistics.

Greta Marlatt expressed disappointment in the lack of fanfare regarding the launch of the new GPO Access website. It seemed like they would have wanted to really make a big deal about it and hoped that they would do more sooner for future releases.

Judy Russell indicated they didn't know if they were even going to be able to get the URL <http://www.gpoaccess.gov> until the week prior but wanted to go ahead and make it accessible as soon as possible. They do plan a formal rollout sometime in May and appreciated the comments.

Julie Wallace, University of Minnesota, expressed her excitement about the expansion of the Monthly Catalog. It is a big challenge and a good direction. She asked if it would be possible to add a visual representation (e.g., something like the black dot) for the existence of a physical document. She also thought the proposition of a GPO collection was exciting and cataloging of the pre-1976 documents would be great.

Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina, asked how GPO would be identifying libraries to participate in the economic development pilot.

Judy Russell responded that GPO was still working on it and they were still trying to refine the process.

Susan Tulis, Southern Illinois University, asked about the rules and regulations and GPO's discussion of doing different things for different types of libraries. Since we've always been told before that GPO couldn't do, how is it they can now?

Judy Russell responded that since GPO wrote the rules/instructions, they can change them. The process needs to be thought out and examined to see where there are excessive or unnecessary burdens.

Linda Fredericks, King County Library Systems, Seattle, WA, asked about the organization chart and where public services belonged.

Judy Russell responded that the existing nomenclature pushed them into specific directions that weren't necessarily what they wanted so they looked at making some changes that would be more suitable. They were trying to get away from historical titles so this will fall into the area of Managing Director for Public Products and Services (Judy's position) which will be responsible for taking government information out to the public.

Barbie Selby, University of Virginia Law School, wanted to reiterate Julie Wallace's comments about MOCAT and to ask that libraries and vendors be given adequate advance notice before large numbers of records for tangible formats are added into MOCAT which in turn will be added to library ILS's through vendor record loads.

Ridley Kessler, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, asked who he should talk to regarding giving input related to the FDLP Desktop website.

Gil Baldwin responded that it would be him.

Dan Veach, Atlanta University Center, suggested that the GPO web address should be something people can remember or guess at and GPO isn't it.

Judy Russell said GPO would look into acquiring relevant aliases.

Barbie Selby, University of Virginia Law School, asked if GPO can participate with the Library of Congress and the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program. See <http://www.digitalpreservation.gov/ndiipp/> for more information about this program.

Judy Russell indicated GPO is looking into it and that they had recently joined CENDI, an interagency working group of senior scientific and technical information managers from nine U.S. Federal Agencies. See <http://www.dtic.mil/cendi/> for more information.

Bernadine Abbott-Hoduski, Government Information Advisor, commented about the enhanced cataloging and that GPO should consider using the expertise of Federal libraries. She applauded GPO for taking back publications from the National Archives.

Gil Baldwin indicated it was a good idea to work with the Federal libraries and they would look into working with FLICC (Federal Library and Information Center <http://www.loc.gov/flicc/>.

Judy Russell said she was already talking with FLICC.

Tuesday, April 8, 2003

Council Working Session, 7 p.m.

Council continued discussions about the visioning process and the issues that were identified. These issues included:

- The need to change some of the existing regulations
- The need to develop partnerships with the private sector
- The concerns related to bibliographic control and cataloging
- The idea of a "library of last resort" (U.S. Library of Public Information was suggested as a name by Gil Baldwin.)

Committees then reported back to Council on their various meetings and on the status of draft recommendations.

Questions were developed for Wednesday's Breakout group sessions and Council members were assigned to each group to facilitate and take notes.

Wednesday, April 9, 2003, Breakout Groups by Library Type, 8:30 a.m.

Attendees were encouraged to participate in the breakout group that most closely fit their area of interest and/or employment. The groups were: Large Academic, Small/Medium Academic, Regionals, Public and Law/State/Special libraries.

Wednesday, April 9, 2003

Council Working Sessions, 10:30 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.

Council members reported back the results of the various breakout group discussions.

Council then worked through the draft recommendations and commendations. Michele McKnelly nominated and Lynne Siemers seconded Mary Prophet as incoming Council Secretary. She was approved by acclamation.

Committee assignments were reviewed and updated. Incoming members will be incorporated at the Fall 2003 meetings. Assignments are as follows:

Cataloging
- **Doris Helfer (Chair)**
- Paul Arrigo
- John Kavaliunas
- Michele McKnelly
- Barbie Selby

Communications
- **Laura Saurs (Chair)**
- Barbara Ford
- John Kavaliunas
- Cheryl Malone
- Lynne Siemers

Electronic Preservation
- **Paul Arrigo (Chair)**
- Chuck Eckman
- John Kavaliunas
- Laura Saurs

Operations
- **John Phillips (Chair)**
- Duncan Aldrich
- John Kavaliunas
- Michele McKnelly
- Mary Prophet
- Laura Saurs

Subcommittee on Attrition and Retention (SOAR)
- Michele McKnelly (Chair)
- Duncan Aldrich
- Paul Arrigo

- Barbara Ford

- John Kavaliunas

- Mary Prophet

- Laura Saurs

- John Phillips

Plenary Session, 2:30 p.m.

Chair Hartman thanked everyone for coming and participating. She thanked Secretary Marlatt for doing secretary duties for two years and announced that Mary Prophet would be the new secretary.

Dan Barkley summarized the meeting and the Operations committee discussions and encouraged everyone to communicate both with Council and the Government Printing Office regarding operations issues.

Council read the draft recommendations and commendations, (for final text see <http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp03.html>) then opened the floor to the audience for comments.

Elaine Winske, Florida International University, asked if the holdings of the U.S. Library of Public Information would be reflected in the online Monthly Catalog.

Tad Downing responded that they expected the ILS to be fully supportive of library operations and will include their holdings.

Julie Wallace, University of Minnesota, asked for clarification about the seemingly contradictory statements in Recommendation #2, (the U.S. Library of Public Information). If something is widely accessible and therefore circulating then isn't this contrary to being permanently archived?

Dan Barkley commented that widely accessible means this library as a "place of last resort" will make requested information available in whatever manner possible (e.g., electronic file, fax, photocopy or Interlibrary Loan). Permanently archived means there will always be a copy there and available.

Chair Hartman thanked all of Council. She commented that this was a particularly challenging meeting and she appreciated that everyone helped to keep the conversations going and stayed focused. She thanked her class and recognized each member with a gift and then turned the meeting over to Chair Elect Dan Barkley.

Chair Barkley thanked Willie Thompson, Nick Ellis, Robin Haun-Mohamed and the GPO staff for all their efforts. He also thanked Chair Hartman and Secretary Marlatt and presented them and the rest of the out-going class with gifts.

Superintendent of Documents Judy Russell presented the outgoing members with certificates and thanked Chair Hartman for all her efforts as Chair and for moving Council and the meeting forward. She also commented on the value of the meeting and acknowledged the efforts of the depository community. She looks forward to helping to move the program forward into the 21st Century.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Greta E. Marlatt
Council Secretary

Fall Meeting — 2003

Summary of the Fall 2003 Meeting of the Depository Library Council, Washington, D.C. October 19-22, 2003

Remarks by Representative Robert W. Ney, Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing and Bruce R. James, Public Printer of the United States, Tuesday October 21, 2003 insert contents of link in Tuesday area. http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/ney_james03conf.html. *Note: This link no longer exists. Content resides in the Appendix on page 106 of this document.*

Sunday Oct. 19

Council Members present:

- Duncan M. Aldrich, University of Nevada, Reno

- Paul Arrigo, Pennsylvania State University, Shenango

- Daniel C. Barkley (Chair), University of New Mexico

- Charles D. Eckman, Stanford, CA

- Doris Small Helfer, California State University, Northridge

- Barbara J. Ford, C. Walter and Gerda B. Mortenson Center for International Library Programs, University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign

- John W. Graham, Public Library of Cincinnati & Hamilton County

- John C. Kavaliunas, U.S. Census Bureau

- Cheryl Knott Malone, University of Arizona

- Michele T. McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls

- John Phillips, Oklahoma State University

- Mary W. Prophet (Secretary), Denison University

- Laura Saurs, Newark Public Library

- Barbara S. Selby, University of Virginia School of Law

- Lynn Siemers, Washington Hospital Center

Afternoon Council Working Session

The Council session opened with a welcome from Public Printer Bruce James. He expressed pleasure with the pace of the reorganization at GPO, and the negotiations with OMB, and informed Council that the GPO appropriation had been passed by Congress and signed by the President with the full amount of the requested funding.

Judy Russell, Superintendent of Documents, briefed Council on meetings with ARL Library Directors; presentations to library groups including American Association of Law Libraries, July 15, 2003 -- Seattle, Washington, Canadian Library Association AGIIG and American Library Association GODORT Joint Program, June 21, 2003 -- Toronto, Canada, and the Association for Research Libraries, May 15, 2003 -- Lexington, Kentucky; visits to depository libraries and other information gathering/public relations activities. She indicated plans to continue these efforts and encouraged Council to help her identify other opportunities.

The progress of the GPO reorganization was reviewed. It was noted that historically GPO has been organized by funding source. The reorganization seeks to create a structure organized by function. Reorganization by function should create a more

efficient GPO as operations that previously occurred in several different divisions of GPO are consolidated. The objective is to have the reorganization and physical rearrangement of offices finished by April. Interviews for some positions were scheduled for the week of Oct. 27. GPO has hired a Human Capital Officer.

Copies of "Print on Demand" projects were available for examination by Council and the audience. Currently costs for single copies of documents produced using "print on demand" are approximately 20% higher than the cost for a copy of a document produced using the traditional methods. However, overall costs are likely to be less as only needed copies are printed and there are no warehousing costs. Print on demand currently requires 48 hours. GPO hopes to reduce turn-around time for these materials to one hour. Congressional Materials are moving rapidly to "print on demand." Some GPO publications will continue to be produced in the traditional manner; for example, the Budget, the Government Manual, and the Statistical Abstract. This topic concluded with answers to questions concerning types of files required and mark-up procedures. A brief discussion of LOCKSS followed.

The three most important issues for Council to cover are:

1. Authentication

2. Preservation – Including management of the legacy collections in FDLP libraries, the creation of the GPO collection of last resort, and the number of tangible copies needed to ensure preservation.

3. Version Control – We may need to redefine what is a document. When are changes significant enough to determine a new edition? How often in the change progress do we need to preserve?

Council received handouts from the ARL meeting and from the regional meeting. Handouts were accompanied by a brief discussion of the ARL Prospectus.

For the remainder of the session, GPO asked Council to participate in an attribute analysis exercise conducted by Larry Jellen, a GPO Agency Expert. This was a closed exercise because the facilitator would be holding the exercise with others later in the conference and didn't want the response of others to be influenced by the responses of Council.

Evening Council Working Session

John Phillips reported on the meeting of the Regional Depository Librarians held Oct. 16-18. Committee Chairs gave brief reports of the work of each committee.

Council briefly reviewed a summary of the "essential titles" survey result.

Logistics, procedures, and issues for discussion in Monday morning breakout sessions by type of library were discussed at some length. Breakout session outlines included additional suggestions for the essential titles list, the tiered system concept, incentives and disincentives (also called carrots and barnacles).

Council reviewed GPO's responses to the spring recommendations. Considerable discussion followed on issues related to recommendation number two, on the United States Library of Public Information. These issues included the facility for print on demand, the relevance of the OMB contract with the concern over how many print copies is enough to ensure preservation, the importance of retrospective cataloging for materials included in the collection, the nature of such a collection ("light or dark"), and issues relating to regional libraries.

Council reviewed the three issues identified for Council consideration during the morning session and discussed a number of additional issues. These include: continuing up-to-date communication with GPO, Council participation in the strategic/vision plan; collection development; policy recommendations; issues related to training; dissemination of electronic information, particularly content/management; the impact of the reorganization on GPO and the FDLP; and the role of Council. This review of issues was followed by a brief discussion of matters related to training for depository librarians, including Web

based training, the possibility of partnering with library schools, and the possible use of graduate school students to assist in the development of Web based training resources.

Council extracted a list of top priority issues for Bruce James these are 1. Authentication, 2. Version Control , 3. Training/certification, and 4. Preservation. A brief discussion of preservation and digitization related issues ensued.

The meeting concluded with a review of the procedures and issues for the Monday break-out sessions.

Monday, Oct. 20, 2003

Plenary Session, 8:30 a.m.

Council Members present:

Duncan M. Aldrich, Paul Arrigo, Dan Barkley, Charles D. Eckman, Doris Small Helfer, Barbara J. Ford, John C. Kavaliunas, Cheryl Knott Malone , Michele T. McKnelly, John Phillips, Mary W. Prophet, Laura Saurs, Barbara S. Selby, Lynn Siemers and John A. Stevenson.

Opening Remarks

Robin Haun-Mohamed, Chief, Depository Services, welcomed everyone and gave the usual logistics.

Daniel C. Barkley (Chair) called the meeting to order. After the welcoming statement, introduction of Council and Council aerobics, Chairman Barkley stated the Council recognized the importance of the continuing discussions that will occur over the course of the meeting. This discussion continues the efforts begun in Reno and are focused on a new vision of GPO and the FDLP for the 21st century. Council's role will be to continue that visioning process with GPO and, of course, with the community.

Since we are quickly approaching Bruce James's 1st anniversary as Public Printer on Dec. 1, "it is therefore critically important that all of us here today begin to define and articulate what that vision will actually be. We have been in a fact-gathering mode. We have had a lot of discussions in Reno. There have been a lot of discussions, I know, within the state library organizations, local library organizations, GOVDOC-L and other exchanges. There are of course a myriad of issues that we face today. While many may focus on the tasks that may be performed at our respective institutions, Council's role is to provide focus and clarity to the major issues that have been defined at Reno."

Chair Barkley outlined the three major issues identified in Council's Sunday working session as authentication, preservation, and version control. He noted that there are obviously a great many other major issues which will arise during the course of the Council sessions, mentioning briefly digitization and the possibility of tiered service levels. Chair Barkley urged attendees to participate as partners in the development of the new vision for GPO and the FDLP. He urged veterans to network with new attendees.

Judy Russell, Superintendent of Documents

See remarks in Administrative Notes, Nov 15, 2003, Vol. 24, no. 13.

T.C. Evans:

See remarks in Administrative Notes, Nov 15, 2003, Vol. 24, no. 13.

Information Exchange

Diane Eidelman, Suffolk Cooperative Library System: Mentioned that last spring Ric Davis had a handout that showed the number of times GPOAccess received referrals from individual libraries. She understood that this information would also be

available for referrals from the OPACS and wanted to know when this would be available. T.C. Evans responded that this would be possible as soon as GPO could implement the new metric software for GPOAccess. This has been delayed by procurement setbacks. Diane suggested that GPO send out that information rather than wait for people to ask for information. Stressed that libraries need numbers to show that we are doing our jobs.

Jill Vassilakos-Long, California State University – San Bernardino: Suggested that having to have an entire separate collection for government is a barnacle. Judy Russell responded that documents could be integrated with existing LC or Dewey classed collections. GPO is having conversations with the Library of Congress about what it would require to include Dewey and LC numbers on Government publications as they are cataloged. GPO's retrospective cataloging could utilize work done by partner libraries in this area.

Where are you in the inspection process? Judy Russell: At the current time, we are working on the idea of consultants. In the short term inspectors are working on clearing all libraries that are on probation. After that is completed we will examine how we work the balance between consultants and inspections.

Julie Wallace – University of Minnesota: You spoke of 95% of the materials distributed through the program being electronic. In the past GPO has spoken of the electronic collection, which includes GPO making certain that there are permanent copies of all those things. You indicated that things that GPO is linking to at other agencies are indicated as being part of that 95%. Can we still be confident that there is still in place either a program of official agreements with those other agencies or that GPO is in fact backing up all of those things onto GPO servers so that they will be permanently available? Judy Russell: It is my understanding that if we do not have an agreement with the agency we are taking things into the electronic archive.

Julie Wallace: In relation to the new digitization of historic materials, I'm assuming that GPO is keeping in touch with the major players, for example LC and the Census Bureau, on what they are going to do to be sure we will not duplicate what they have done? Judy Russell: That is one reason of the clearinghouse. Part of GPO's new way of doing business is to work very aggressively with agencies to show them the opportunities to work with us on the digitization of their materials. The Office of the Federal Register has shown a strong interest in working with GPO and with the community in getting the CFR and the Federal Register digitized, and they will certify it as a true copy so that it can be used legally and can be substituted. A number of library directors have offered to look at already digitized materials and identify already digitized government publications that can be brought forward and begin to form a random collection.

Audience Member - Public Library: I have submitted a number of things to lost docs. I've never had any response. Is it a black hole? Judy Russell: We want people to be using lost docs. Betty Jones, GPO: The new e-service will alert you when your lost doc is received. At the current time there is a backlog of approximately 500 documents in lost docs. GPO hopes to have the backlog reduced by the beginning of the new calendar year.

Bernadine Abbott Hoduski: Expressed concerned about agreements covering collections which are arrived at when libraries are leaving the program. She urged that there be some written agreements and that the agreements be kept. Judy Russell: replied that in this new environment where GPO is looking at establishing a national library and consolidating collections, GPO is considering reclaiming these materials. Bernadine hoped collections would remain available within the state and stressed that it would be important that other libraries in the state have some way to know about depository materials still held in libraries which have left the program.

Cathy Hartman, University of North Texas: Inquired about GPO's efforts to include open source software in the GPO procurement process. Judy Russell: GPO is actively looking at open source software. They are increasingly working at identifying requirements and looking at the need to not lock up the publications with proprietary software.

Sandra McAninch, University of Kentucky Libraries: As we talk about digitizing and creating back-ups, are you considering a microfilm copy for back-up? Judy Russell: If it can be done at the same time as the digitization.

Duncan Aldrich, University of Nevada-Reno: A follow-up on the Eidelman question: in libraries these days we are having difficulty counting services we provide because of the Web basis. Are you working with any library group on this issue? TC Evans: GPO is working with the NISO on library metrics. Have set up a process by which you can register where your OPAC and your Web pages are, so GPO can collect data.

Paul Arrigo, Pennsylvania State University, A number of libraries are classifying their documents in LC from day one. Judy Russell: We hope that once the ILS is up, we can collect records from library partners, add them to the collection and distribute them to our library partners.

Barbie Selby, University of Virginia: Wondered how the legacy collection and National Archives collection fit together. Judy Russell: - GPO has talked to the National Archives about the set GPO sent to the Archives. At this point we have not discussed trying to take that set back to use as the collection of last resort or as a source for the digitization. With the Memorandum of Understanding between GPO and the National Archives, it is possible that GPO could look at that collection also as a part of the collection at GPO.

Charles Eckman, Stanford, CA: What format will the digital preservation master be in? Will it be in a proprietary format or some type of Open source file? Judy Russell: We are not yet far enough along to answer this question.

Dave Morrison, University of Utah: How will we know if the commercial products have met GPO's criteria? Once they change data to fit use, the change destroys the digital signature. Judy Russell: Once they massage that data they will interrupt the digital signature. This issue hasn't come up from the private sector. GPO is willing to work with the commercial sector on this issue.

Joe Milazzo, Southern Methodist University: Indicated that catalogers at his institution don't like GPO cataloging. Noticed recently a proliferation of new electronic records. Judy Russell: Suggested that he take this issue to the cataloging committee that meets at lunch. Also, suggested an effort be made to set up a meeting between ALA cataloging committee and Council's cataloging committee. Joe Milazzo: On a related issue, the library community, as a whole, needs to look at more closely at MARC. Can we expect to see cataloging in some of the Metadata formats? Judy Russell: We are looking at Dublin Core metadata as well as MARC records. We have tried consistently to deal with whatever the standards are out there in the community and respond to them. We are also looking at one of the characteristics of the ILS as the ability to both import COSATI records and export to COSATI because many of our agency partners, the Department of Energy and other sci-tech agencies are using COSATI instead of MARC.

Lynn Siemers reported on the Sunday Council session and John Phillips reported on the Regional meeting.

The remainder of the morning was composed of breakout sessions by type of library.

Afternoon Council Working Session.

The afternoon session began with reports on the Breakout sessions.

Small and medium public libraries breakout session report - Cheryl Knott Malone

Session resulted in ten carrots and a few barnacles. The barnacles included the level of detail required in collection development statements. There was concern about the level of knowledge of users needed for the statement. Another barnacle concerned the cumbersome nature of the disposal process. Suggested carrots included: IP identification for databases (e.g., STAT-USA or PACER) for both the designated depository and its branch libraries; support source for small non-depository libraries; depository library quota for print on demand copies, more information in the list of classes; guides in handbook; a collection policy template; smart barcodes that would come on the documents which could be scanned to produce discard lists; the Sudoc number printed on each document; training programs opened to branch and non-depository libraries; guidance as an incentive for initializing cooperation between libraries; funds for travel to remote training opportunities.

Large Academic Libraries breakout session report – Duncan Aldrich & Doris Helfer

Harvard suggested that map libraries might be under-represented in the discussions. Major barnacles mentioned were item selection system (people wanted to choose by title and/or have selection work more like an approval vendor), a pressing need for the item list to be cleaned up and inactive items removed, and the problems with PURLs for serials. Suggested carrots include the creation of a non-essential titles list, a discount on the price of the Serial Set for depository libraries, more frequent and free cataloging data and print on demand was considered a major carrot.

There was considerable discussion of digitization. It is important that depository libraries be included in the development of standards for digitization. Suggestions for materials to be digitized included the Monthly Catalog and documents included in an updated list of popular names of government reports. It was pointed out that ¾ of digitization projects are done by non-docs people in libraries. Reaction to the possibility of a tiered system was mixed.

Law Library Break out Session report - Paul Arrigo and Barbie Selby

The list of essential titles from the survey was handed to participants for comment and mark-up. The barnacle reported was the inability to discard ephemera. Carrots included print on demand, access to PACER, pushed MARC records, and a portal where law libraries would register their IP address and have access to a law page. Law libraries did not relate to the concept of levels. They prefer division by type of library. The law libraries provided an unranked list of priorities for titles/types of materials from the "legacy" collection to digitize.

Small & Medium Academic Libraries – Michele McKnelly and Mary Prophet

Most of the time was taken up by discussion of essential titles. Suggested carrots included: the World News Service. There was concern over the ability of small and medium academic libraries to manage the bibliographic control of electronic resources. It was suggested that GPO purchase Marcive's "Documents without Shelves" product for depository libraries. The discussions of tiered levels of service resulted in comments on the need for certified training and concern over how such a concept would fit with Title 44.

Dan Barkley expressed concern that people still do not understand the visioning process.

Doris Helfer expressed interest in the idea of providing a specialized portal as a model for small public, law, and medical libraries and thinks this would be a really attractive carrot and would make a big statement about government documents. This may be more important than the level of service approach.

Paul Arrigo asked if GPO is looking at content management software. TC Evans responded that yes, they were, specifically for use within GPO, but the investigation hasn't gotten to the point where GPO is starting to dissect this. Paul suggested that content management software could be used to help people design such a Web site. This would be a great carrot for depositories and it would really help GPO create a strong identity with its customers.

If we could get agencies to tell GPO in advance what they are going to publish we could try to do something like LC cataloging in publication.

In the electronic environment you can get away from the item or category selection. You are not required to keep electronic for 5 years.

Tuesday Morning, Oct. 21, 2003

General Session

Robin Haun-Mohamed welcomed attendees and made announcements.

Bruce James: It is my distinct pleasure as my first job today to introduce Robert W. Ney as Congressman from Ohio and Chair of the Joint Committee on Printing–also Chair of the House Administration Committee.

Joint Committee on Printing is responsible for oversight of the FDLP.

Congressman Robert W. Ney, Chairman Joint Committee on Printing:

It's a pleasure to be here.

I've been in office 22 years, serving in different levels of the legislature, and Bruce James is probably the most unusual human being I've ever met. He has kept to his word. When we met with him he said he would take a certain direction and he did it. And that's unusual sometimes in the U.S. Government. So I give him a lot of credit. Bruce James deserves a round of applause for the work that he does. The Superintendent of Documents, Judy Russell, also has risen to the occasion to provide service, and I think exemplifies how the government is here to help. Also Gloria Robinson, she's from Ohio, graduated of The Ohio State University, as I did. Obviously there are no Buckeye fans in here, probably a lot of Wisconsin fans. You are not real popular in Columbus this year but we'll forgive you. Council Chair Dan Barkley, who technically is from the University of New Mexico, actually is from the state of Ohio. How many of you here are from Ohio? How many were born in Ohio or lived in Ohio? Usually there are a lot more. Also on the Council somewhere are Mary Prophet from the Library of Denison University and John Graham of the Public Library of Cincinnati. So I just want to give a general welcome on behalf of the United States Congress and also of the JCP.

You know it's been in operation since 1813 and dates back to the age of James Madison and the founding fathers. The Federal Depository Library Program helps keep Americans informed on the actions of their public officials and is really a vital component of our system of government. It is something to be amazingly proud of.

The Joint Committee on Printing and Congress fully support the FDLP. Just recently the Congress approved, and the President signed into law, the Government Printing Office's full request for a 16.9% increase in funding for the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses appropriations, raising the budget to $34.5 million. The increased funding will be used to upgrade and improve GPO Access and provide the FDLP with needed resources. JCP will continue to support efforts to modernize the FDLP to provide access to Government information. And I mention this because the increase was obviously needed.

These are very difficult times budget wise in our country's history after the last two years. Obviously we have obligations to intelligence, to the military after 9-11, and also to the two wars that we have been engaged in. So acquiring the funding right now, believe me, is a very difficult thing to do. But I think because of the way the system has been run, people have faith in it and that is why the funding has come through.

The FDLP is doing a very commendable job in transitioning to a predominately electronic information system as Congress has directed it to. The JCP is confident in the leadership of Bruce James and Judy Russell, in full consultation with the library community, which is very important. The depository library program is making the necessary transition to continue to provide innovative, effective public access in the 21st century. Depository librarians are critically important partners with the GPO in the operation of this program and without them this program just simply could not function. The JCP and GPO regard librarians as essential in providing effective public access to government information to the entire world. In the Internet, the skills and abilities of librarians are needed more than ever to assist Americans in locating and using informational resources, including those provided by the government. Depository librarians should be commended for the great job they do in providing access to government information through their libraries.

You know, as you get older you appreciate things a lot more. I appreciate my librarian at St. John's in Bellaire, Ohio; you always could get help and assistance and direction. I think people have good visions in their minds of the library system and how much it can help. The current use of electronic information technology raises several issues of interest in GPO and the library community. The issues include assuring permanent public access to electronic collections; providing adequate security to ensure the integrity and accuracy of government documents; making the necessary technology and skills available to everyone who wants access to the government information; ensuring that the costs of providing public access to electronic information are distributed equitably; defining the role of librarians in an increasingly Internet based information culture where nearly every-one has access to information all the time, and determining the best model for the FDLP in the 21st century. These are a few of the goals I think will be exciting and challenging.

The development of the Federal Depository Library of the Year Award, by the way, which will be awarded for the first time, as I understand it, at this conference, is an excellent idea. It will provide long deserved recognition to this important program and help inform the public about what a great public resource the program has become. I commend you for doing it. People need to be recognized. Of course you are all important. Everybody deserves an award. But the recognition with an award is a good thing to start.

Let me close by saying you have done a wonderful job. When I first was elected to Congress, approximately 10 years ago, we did not have a way people could get to the U.S. House and the opening day of Congress. I think it was on January 5 that the switch was flipped and Thomas came into being. And it brought the world to the U.S. House, and it also it brought us to the world, and we have been able to communicate with more people than ever before. But is has been a challenge for Congress. The Committee on House Administration overlooks the technology, and we continue constantly to question ourselves on what direction we should go. I think the great thing about all of you is you also provide your bailiwick with direction, you ask the questions and you bring everything into the 21st century.

Let me just close by again commending everyone. Also I want to say this has been a very difficult two years for our county, after what happened to us on 9-11. We always think first and foremost of our American men and women who are in uniform, defending this great nation and providing the feeling of democracy and the seeds of the movement towards democracy for generations to come. But also during these difficult times, we continue to live and work, and our communities will continue despite attempts to stop us. Our way of life will be made better and more prosperous for future generations. That's what you are about. You are about providing something–people many not know your names or may not know what you do, but surely the effects of what you are working on today are going to be there forever, for future generations and for our country. So thank you for coming to Washington and God bless you.

Bruce James thanked the Chairman and then asked Ridley Kessler to step forward. Bruce James noted that in the 18 months since the president announced his intention to appoint him, he had met some truly outstanding people. He called Ridley Kessler the Dean of the Depository Library Community. Bruce James expressed the thanks of GPO for his 35 years of service to the depository community. He then read a copy of a letter of commendation and presented Ridley with a certificate of appreciation. The Chair of Council Dan Barkley presented Ridley with a Book of Remembrance from members of the depository community. Ridley thanked the Public Printer and the depository community. Ridley finished his remarks with the warning "Just remember I'm retired but not dead!"

Bruce James: After giving the Keynote address to GraphExpo, Bruce James was asked if he had renamed the Government Printing Office. GPO has not been renamed but a new GPO logo has been designed. A new logo that is more progressive, more in the 21st century, without ignoring the past. The head of the Congressional Printing Group, Charlie Cook, changed his group name to the Office of Congressional Publishing Services. This change was made without consultation with the Public Printer. The Public Printer feels that this is an excellent example of the transformation of GPO from a "command and control structure where everything started with the Public Printer… to the point where we are forcing decisions making lower and lower. This should result in a much better level of response to GPO's many customers. GPO is even beginning to look at the world in terms of customers."

GPO has made a lot of changes, and Bruce James appreciated Congressman Ney recognizing that. The President has signed appropriation bills for two of the many agencies requesting money from Congress. One of them was the GPO appropriation. GPO got every nickel asked for. Bruce James does not believe that many agencies will get every nickel asked for. Bruce James considers this support from Congress a tribute to the men and women of GPO and the faith Chairman Ney and the members of the committee have in what GPO is striving to do. Bruce James expressed special appreciation for the support shown by the members of the United States Congress and reminded the conference attendees to thank their Senators and Congressmen for that support.

Bruce James came to GPO knowing a lot about the printing industry, but with little knowledge and appreciation of the FDLP. In a speech in Chicago, Bruce James talked mostly about his role as guardian of government information. "The future of the GPO lies not just in the preservation but in the recognition, extension and expansion of the FDLP into the 21st century in a rational way."

Fact-finding has been done over past year about every aspect of GPO's business, not just about the FDLP, but also the information industry and all the publics served by GPO. If this were the private sector, the job would have been done quickly, but the public sector requires more time. GPO is right on schedule. The GAO is GPO's partner in this fact-finding process. GAO should complete its work at the end of February or the beginning of March. GPO will wait until all the facts are in before moving forward to develop a plan for the future. GPO expects to engage all of its publics (library community, printing community, information industry, GPO employees and Congress) in the development of a logical plan. Then it will move forward.

Bruce James updated some issues discussed at the DLC meeting in April and presented some ideas about where we need to go. Among the issues reviewed were the fugitive document problem, concern about authenticity and preservation of electronic information. These are mission critical areas.

Before updating attendees on these mission critical areas, Bruce James reviewed the problems and negotiations with OMB. He expressed gratitude to Mitch Daniels for signing the compact with GPO before he left. The essence of this is OMB's recognition of that the most important role that GPO has is to gather government documents from all sources, cataloging, organizing those documents and distributing them broadly throughout the United States and making certain that they are available to the public.

Regulations for public printing are outdated. Last year, 10,000 printers went out of business worldwide. Printers are looking in two directions to move their businesses. These are content management and distribution to finished product. The new plan will let printers talk directly to the agency, and will allow agencies to select vendors that will give the taxpayer the biggest "bang for the buck." GPO maintains the list of suitable vendors, and registers and qualifies them. If the agency has someone they want to use that is not on the list, GPO will try to get them on the list as quickly as possible.

In the past, GPO charged a 7% surcharge to the agency. Now the vendors must pay a 3% surcharge to GPO. In return, OMB will work with GPO to shut the agency shops so that they won't waste taxpayers' money, and to make sure an electronic manuscript comes to GPO. The Department of Labor was chosen as a test for this. Jim Bradley, in printing sales, has built a sales team to deal with the Department of Labor. This will help people directly interface with client and vendor.

Judy Russell is looking at issue of fugitive documents in the Department of Labor. How are digital documents created? How can these documents be transferred into GPO? GPO's Inspector General is also working on using resources to move the agency forward. His job is to look at building an effective enforcement mechanism for enforcing the rules and laws concerning getting materials into the FDLP system. GPO hopes to have a report on that by this time next year.

Permanent Public Access to Information

GPO is working on a project with a long-time partner, the Federal Register, on authenticating information. The National Archives has worked with GPO for 70 years to deliver the Federal Register and not one day have they failed to deliver. Together

GPO and the National Archives have initiated a pilot program to watermark each document, at point of origin, and at each stage throughout, until it is on the GPO site. This is a learning process on how to authenticate a document so that it can be forwarded several times and its validity can be assured.

Public access in perpetuity remains a tough challenge. GPO has had many meetings outside GPO to look at the development of technologies in the ability to maintain digital data. The Public Printer hopes to report on pilots in that area in the spring.

What is coming? Bruce James wants GPO to be a leader in these areas, with people whose primary job is to do this. He wants people whose paycheck at GPO is due to leading in these areas.

Challenges for Council

1. What constitutes a version of information? What constitutes a Government document today? What happens when agencies can update daily? In the old days, it was a print edition, what is it now? This will affect a lot of planning. This definition will be a matter of public policy that will be determined by more than the depository community, but the depository community needs to begin action on this issue now.

2. If from this moment on, the primary method of distribution is digital, then we will need to find a way to store this information in perpetuity. Also, what do we do with the legacy collections? Clearly we are going to need to digitize all of it – We can make it searchable or images. We will need to do both. We need to prioritize this information and make decisions on what is worth making searchable. What can we use as just page images?

3. How is GPO going to make money at this? We are here now because the GPO and FDLP were established with a sustainable model that was made many years ago. GPO is charged by law with recovering the expenses for what it does. That broke down several years ago. All of the money that GPO had to move forward has disappeared. GPO has lost tens of millions of dollars.

Bruce James seeks to make GPO work like a business. He never worked in a union environment before. The unions have been some the best partners management has, giving the Pubic Printer unbelievable cooperation, and they are working with management to make needed changes.

10 years ago, GPO tried to charge for information distributed on the Internet, but it cost GPO more to collect the money than was made. So GPO made it free to the general public. This cannot continue. GPO needs to create a business model and bring revenues in the door so it doesn't have to go to Congress all the time. Bruce James and Judy Russell have met with representatives of the information industry to discuss this issue. Bruce James suggested that GPO must find a way to partner with the information industry and that these partnerships have to protect the Federal Depository Libraries. "This means at the end of the day, whatever we do, they have to get for free." Industry representatives recognized this as a fact of life if they wanted to partner with GPO. Bruce James would appreciate recommendations from Council on ways GPO can do this that will be acceptable to the FDLP librarians.

Information Exchange:

Chairman Barkley established ground rules for the session:

- Every one needs to keep in mind the three main issues.
- Questions will be taken from Council first, then from the audience.
- Questions not on target will be moved to the question box.

Michele McKnelly: Other people beyond libraries need to come to the table. Who are we talking to? Bruce James: At the end of the day Congress must act on it. When you go to Congress and you don't have multiple groups to take up the issue nothing

happens. We need support from many different groups to get things done. Bruce James needs Council to examine who should be brought to the table to discuss the National Information Policy. Michele McKnelly: Agencies, scholarly groups, etc.

Barbie Selby: Money issue is very important. Doesn't necessarily think going to Congress is a bad model. Adobe Acrobat to those who are not Web providers is essentially free. Suggest that there might be model there that GPO could look into. Is there some value added service that could be provided to agencies, sort of like the overhead for printing, being the service bureau for the printing by agencies? Bruce James: Good idea.

Paul Arrigo: Has GPO considered providing competitive analysis, actually using the data for businesses? Bruce James: GPO does not create information. We process information in plain vanilla fashion. The recombining of information, annotation, etc., falls to the private sector and it should be left in the private sector. On the other hand, we do have some interesting things. One is the speed of GPO data acquisition. In addition, there are 2 other areas: data tagging and metadata. One would think that the GPO would have the ability to create government-wide standards for this, otherwise our ability to migrate materials into the future is negatively impacted. In GPO training we will focus on that. If GPO can provide that for private sector, very rapidly process information that is properly coded and has metadata properly imbedded, it will reduce their costs for handling that data. GPO would help to be able to share its profits with the agencies.

Other questions remain. How can we charge for what we deliver on the Internet? Can we build something where people have access to information on the Internet, but we could include certain things that they might be willing to pay for? What are those things, and how could GPO do that? Always understanding that there is a commitment to the free distribution of government information through what we call today the depository community. We must be careful as we define the depository community for the future and we must be looking at that too.

Dan Barkley: Question from a breakout session. When links come out to new agency report, PURL links are not necessarily linked to older reports. How can GPO provide links to back issues? Judy Russell: The issue there is largely through the partnerships such as we are establishing with the OMB compact as a model and through other outreach to agencies. We are going to have to provide tools for them that make it easier for them to publish. In essence giving them reasons to modifying agency behavior and letting agencies know how that affects the users. Must communicate with the agencies. Bruce James: GPO trains librarians but also trains people from agencies. GPO will need to modify this training to reflect new needs. Agencies do not yet know the job.

Grace York, University of Michigan: Grace represented the GPO a few years ago in Russia at a State Department conference. One of the selling points was that basic government information should be free to everyone on the Internet. GPO set a model by providing this information free on the Internet. Now most countries and states release their legislative information to the Internet. What GPO will do affects the world. Will GPO consider what people need for democracy? Bruce James: For many years we had a product called The Congressional Record. People were interested in it because it affected a lot of actions. GPO sent the Congressional Record free to depositories but had several thousand people who paid $1,000 each to subscribe to it because they thought it was very important. In the case of the Federal Register, 35 thousand people paid almost $1,000 per year for their own subscriptions. Today there are fewer than 2,000 people. What is going on here? Grace York: Now they get it free on the Internet? Bruce James: Why could GPO charge then and not now? Grace York: If GPO charged, they will go to Thomas or down load and distribute it for free. Bruce James: We need a model that will let us continue doing what we are doing today and more.

Doris Helfer: Clearly what people pay for or are willing to pay for in terms of government information is something that adds value to what they need. Interested in the most current information, last year's statistics on trade don't interest them. The ability to manipulate data, the advanced information, they will pay for that. These are not things we provide as government documents professionals. What business wants is how their area is doing economically. Something that is an investment on their part that will help make them a market. If we were the resource that would put them in touch with the expert in the govern-

ment agency; if we could provide a way for them to manipulate the data and put it in their spreadsheets, then we might have something they would buy. Bruce James: Appreciates comments.

Cheryl Knott Malone, Arizona: I appreciate the information about how the OMB compact was structured to shift from a 7% charge to agency to a 3% charge to vendor. Is there a sense of the market in the private sector for services from GPO to the vendors and how that might play out? Judy Russell: GPO has been having a series of meetings with a variety of private sector companies and is beginning to explore those issues to lay out the fact that GPO is seeking partnerships that would not violate Title 44 and the interests of the FDLP. These are in the beginning exploratory stage to discover where there might be a meeting of interests that might lead to product development that could produce revenue streams for both GPO and the private sector partners.

John Kavaliunas, Census Bureau: Agencies are going to want to be purveyors of their own information. Where GPO does have a strategic advantage is that GPO is in the unique position to be able to pull together data from a variety of sources and to add value to them. Bruce James: Just by the aggregation itself is what you are saying. This is an interesting question: is it to the agencies' advantage to purvey that data themselves, or is GPO in a position to provide enough value to the agencies that they would appreciate such services from GPO? I suspect this is a case of "one size won't fit all." GPO needs to design services to fit the needs of the customer agencies.

Michele McKnelly: I don't understand why version control is a public policy issue and business model is not a public policy issue. This group has an interest in this and there are other groups out there in government and in corporate America who will want to have input on the business model and selling this material back. We need to have this discussion with everybody. Also very interested in what Congressman Ney said. They were interested in universal technology skills being delivered and the costs would be distributed equitably, because I'm not sure this would be part of distributing costs to users equitably. It would be distributed to those who could pay.

Bruce James: GPO is not looking to take away from FDLP partners any advantages they have. GPO is looking at ways to increase that advantage. Congressman Ney did not say that it is the policy of the United States Government that its information is free. It is well established by custom, by rule and probably by law that we are going to distribute the vast majority of the government's information to the American public through the FDLP. There are two reasons for doing that: one is to be sure that citizens have access to the work of their government, and the second is to protect the record of that work in perpetuity. We are not looking at changing that at all.

What is being addressed is the change in shipping a publication by order to John Smith in Kansas and having John Smith downloading that same information for free. In the old days, we added up the costs of producing and shipping the material and that was the cost we charged. Those costs did not all go away when we stopped printing. They changed, but didn't go away. Now we are not in a position to collect any money from John Smith.

This is not how Title 44 started out. This situation just happened. GPO was slow to the gate; when we got there, we didn't have the business skills we needed. We abandoned the charges because of problems, but we need to address them. We have ways now to have different kinds of partnerships with the private sector. You need to give me some direction. It will be a year or more before we are ready to try our first model on this. We will solicit views from all sectors. Nothing we do today will last very long. It is the nature of the commercial world today. If GPO is in the commercial information business in some form or fashion, it must be prepared to change.

GPO is prepared to stay the course and make certain it finds a way to build the next generation of partnerships with the depository libraries, based on the GPO bringing to the table something of equivalent value to the depository libraries as in the old days of printed publications. I'm not sure we have the equivalent value in the mix right now. I think allowing you the same access to government documents on the Internet that John Smith in Kansas has may not be that equivalent value. GPO is committed to figuring what that equivalent value would be.

Michele McKnelly: Are you looking at placing restrictions on the repackaging of the back files of materials that fall under your purview, like the Congressional Record and the Federal Register. You used this New York Times model to give an example. Are you looking at that, because there are people out here who repackage things for their constituents every day? That's our job. We are not interested in any kind of restrictions on the back-file of any of that material and we will place it up on freely accessible Web sites and would not be interested in restricting it. Bruce James: That will narrow what you'll be able to have, won't it. We need a new way of looking at this. I don't have a model in mind. All I know is that we need to find a new revenue model that will help fund in the future and one that doesn't interfere with the mission that the depository library community has.

Paul Arrigo: In the past, GPO sold books that were freely available in the library. Why cannot GPO sell the things on the Web, for the convenience of it, that people could still walk to the library and get free? This could apply for both tangible products and for PDFs on the Internet. Bruce James: That's a very good point. The old way, of having books in the warehouse and fifty years later throwing them away, isn't going to work any longer. So GPO is looking at print on demand publications. I would also like to be able to offer agencies the opportunity to put their publications into a print on demand system. A system that would allow us to print on a regional basis to order for those that might want to buy them and to have that opportunity to have it available for a long period of time, fifty or a hundred years or more.

Barbie Selby: Hopes that Congress and Congressional appropriations are not out of this mix and also generating money. How much money are we talking about here, 10 million, 30 million 60 million? One of the value added things discussed is the authentic version of material. FDLP is the carrot. We get authentic versions available in libraries. If you want it in your law office you pay $9.95 by credit card for it. Judy Russell: Ten years ago the sales program had revenues of $84 million. This year revenue was $32 million. This may not be a goal to get back to, but represents the scale of change caused by providing all of this information free on the Internet. Bruce James: Would not be worth the effort if it didn't recover at least $50. Thinks the idea of selling authenticated versions very clever.

Duncan Aldrich: Encouraged everyone in the audience to meet with Council, if they have any ideas on this or other topics. Reviewed some of the ideas expressed during the session and in conversations on break:

1. Appropriated funds

2. Essential titles for free but maybe pay for other titles

3. Free at libraries but not free at other places

4. How much revenue will the print on demand generate

5. Where does the private sector come into this

6. We need to be in touch with the SIIA

7. Possible charging back to agencies

8. Most recent for free pay for older, or older free, pay for recent

9. Selling authenticated copies

Objective is to try to keep information as widely available as possible. The technology screams to have open access to government and other information.

Barbara Ford: We need a summit meeting where some of these various groups come together. Different groups will have different perspectives. We need a way for some of the key players to come together. Bruce James: Good idea. Include newspapers in that group too.

Charles (Chuck) Eckman: Suggested an addition to Duncan's list. Follow-up on the idea of selling authentic copies outside of the depository system as something that is a characteristic of enhanced or valued added services that might be sold, includ-

ing things like data manipulation and data extraction. Things that would be for users who wanted advanced use of content. There would be a core that would be freely available for viewing and use at a basic level. There would not be any chronological distinctions or comprehensiveness distinctions, but a suite of services would be available in depositories and for a fee.

Dan Barkley: Michele mentioned depositories mining things and putting them up, implying that there would be a smaller set of things available for depositories. Did I miss understand you? Bruce James: Warned people to be careful, just because he used the Congressional Record and the Federal Register as an example, not to project his thoughts and ideas onto those two publications. Those may very well be publications we agree need to be freely accessible forever. If we are going to partner with the private sector, how are we going to persuade them to furnish a product jointly developed by GPO and the private sector to the depository libraries for free? Early indications are they would not find that objectionable. They would be interested in supporting that program. The difficulty would be if they gave it free to depository libraries and the libraries chose to compete with them for the sales of that material, which would be a problem. Judy Russell: We have one example in the program right now: StatUSA. They could claim an exemption under Title 44, as it must be supported by sales. They value having it in depositories but they would not want libraries to put it up, thereby destroying their ability to be self-sustaining. Dan Barkley: Another example is the World news service where we get one user. If we want to distribute to all our users we may have to pay for it.

Bruce James: The government invested in the libraries, but the libraries put in an even bigger investment. If we decide that it is important to maintain this, we must decide what we can offer to make this attractive to you. Many of the folks I talk with are the people who hold the purse strings, mayors of communities or university presidents. It is a matter of not just convincing you but also the people who control the purse strings. We will never be in the position where we do not need some funding from Congress. Congress has been unwilling to make up the 50 million dollar gap. We at the GPO have to be the masters of our own future. You have made such huge investments over the years, I want you to feel it is worth going in that direction. But you must understand that everything has changed, if we don't do this we will be out of business.

Doris Helfer: When we make it available to our community, it has a greater value and a greater good, because people go back and do research that helps drive innovations. Information drives future analysis and development that comes back to industry in lots of ways that helps drive future innovation.

Ridley Kessler: Title 44 and the depository library program says no fee access to libraries. It doesn't mention anybody else. There is hardly an Academic library and some publics that offer free printing for anything, including government information. When we do that with electronics and a lot of distance even that is not available to people who don't have a library card. A lot of libraries are starting to cut down on their access even to government information. In the ARL survey, the biggest problem besides staffing is space. We have begged, pleaded, been far seeing about getting electronics. We cannot now start wailing and gnashing our teeth about how many print copies we can get of documents. If GPO can solve problems so that even fugitive documents are available on line and you can preserve it, then anyone who doesn't want it that way should pay for it. The old system where we sometimes got things 4 ways--print, microfilm, CD, on-line--won't work any more. We are in the electronic age. We have to learn to live with that and anything else I think we have to pay for.

Greta Marlatt, Naval Postgraduate School: Our role has always been to make the information available, but not to make it free to print. In this arena, the technology does allow you to post it without allowing people to download it or print it. Recommends a look at the National Academy press model, where you can look at a document page by page or down load it or print it page by page, but if you want the entire PDF you have to pay for it. If the public wants the convenience of having the whole thing they would have to pay for it. Bruce James: Interesting.

Christopher Dixon, St Josephs University, Philadelphia: We actually pay for government information a number of ways through the aggregators. Libraries pay for this because the access mechanisms are much better than some government sites. Some of today's proposals may be in competition with private industry as well. Bruce James: There may be real value in what the private sector is doing. Has asked Judy Russell to look at the development of two levels of searching. One would be a

general public level of searching; the other would be the development of very special data mining tools that would go only to depository libraries.

Steve Hayes: Mr. James, you have hit one of our core values: government information is free to all. Another is the life cycle information goes through from collection thorough dissemination. The community is going to be unwilling to chop off the dissemination portion. It has been no fee to depositories. How do you define coming in to a depository in a virtual environment? It would be interesting to develop a model that would say for a fee you will have virtual access to the depository and a pass through. There would be X number of free ports which you could try to get into. We are limiting by number of ports. If you want to ensure the availability of a port you have to pay a fee. If selling it to the depositories is going to increase the income stream of the private sector, we are going to kick on that. It is like we are paying for the privilege of serving the American public. There are studies on the dollar value of depository materials vs. how much the libraries are paying to provide access. Making the depository and its ability to serve part of the revenue stream is going to be chancy and a barrier. Take a look at the Harvard business school model. You may buy a copy of a case and you may print it as often as you want, but you cannot download it and you cannot append it or anything else. It is a per use model.

Judy Russell: The recent ARL survey had a mean and median figure 245,000 to 345,000 dollars.

Duncan Aldrich: With the idea of a bundled package, instead of buying piece by piece, you would go straight to GPO and buy the discounted bundled package for $500 to $1000 dollars per year.

Cass Hartnett, University of Washington: Industry partners you should talk to include Amazon .com, Adobe.com and Real networks. Both Adobe and Real networks offer one little thing for free and then offer enhanced and expanded services by fee. Also Microsoft, because of their office suites they would be the experts on the versioning. E-commerce is risky and scary, and we don't know how successful the commercial sector can be, so we certainly don't know how successful the government can be entering e-commerce.

Bernadine Abbott Hoduski: Joint Committee on Printing, retired. Applauded the pilot project with the Department of Labor and working with the actual authors. The Joint Committee and Printing and GPO are both awesome publishers. GPO has provided publishing services forever: editing, proofing, bringing information in, aggregating data. All those things have been done forever, since the birth of the Government Printing Office. The agencies have paid for those services, and in most cases, i.e., the Congressional Record and the Federal Register, they have gotten a return for every penny they paid you in spades.

You have to have a revenue stream, and that stream should come from the agencies and the authors, not from the public. When the GPOAccess act was written and passed, the idea was free data for every citizen in the United States, because that is what the depository program is all about. The sales program was included because the Democrats had to bring the Republicans in and the Republicans wanted that. Now the Democrats and the Republicans alike think that it is great progress that a Republican Congress is just as supportive of the program as a Democratic Congress was. There has been a revolution. The revolution has not been in the libraries, it has not been with the librarians, it has been with the users. They now expect to get government information free. That is where the revolution has happened. The users are now aware of the treasure they can get. We need to bring revenue in, but not at the expense of the users. LC used to sell catalog card. Such a good job was made of converting cataloging to electronic distribution that catalog cards are gone as a revenue stream for LC. It would not be the biggest tragedy in the world for the GPO sales program to go down the tubes. We have to totally rethink that. Title 44 provided free public distribution of the Congressional record to all public libraries. The Geologic Survey also sent stuff out free. Title 44 is very broad, it covers not just the depository libraries, but all the free distribution programs that have existed since the beginning of our country. This is a more diverse and complicated issue than it appears on the surface. Applauds GPO for exploring the issues and bringing them to us as a community, not just to librarians but also to the private sector and the public, and recommends the conversation be broadened. Bruce James – We will try to get a broader conversation in St. Louis. I appreciate your comments very much. Liked the point of trying to get the agencies who create the information to put some money into this.

Chris Brown, University of Denver: Building on what Bernadine was just asking, wondered what a cost recovery model, an agency charge back model would look like. If instead of charging 3%, the charge was 3.5% or 4%, with the carrot to the agencies being expedited positing on the Internet, and secondly permanent public access guaranteed. My thought being, how do you bring in smaller government agencies that produce fugitive documents? Can we tweak the numbers a bit to bring in extra revenue. Bruce James: Maybe it is worth taking a look at.

Mark Anderson, University North Colorado: Wanted clarification on the GAO report mentioned this morning. Bruce James: Congress has asked GAO in conjunction with GPO to look at some of the factors surrounding government printing and information dissemination. Some of those factors involve GPO, some involve the FDLP and some involve agencies. Attempting to see where government printing is actually taking place.

How much is coming through GPO? How much is going around GPO? Look at the changing requirements of agencies. What the printing requirements of agencies will be? GPO had a hand in planning and GPO is getting good support out of GAO. Thinks they really are trying to help us as best they can as they respond to the request of Congress. GPO will learn things about operations and about its customers. Mark Anderson: Is GAO looking at revenue enhancement? Bruce James: GAO is not looking at revenue enhancement – Mark Anderson: Would you expect the GAO representatives to share with us in St. Louis. Judy Russell: GAO representatives are here at this meeting. They have had a focus group. They are observing as well as interacting with the community.

Rich Gause, University of Central Florida: What constitutes a version that might be retained, in terms of a monographic report? If it has been 3 months, a corrected document may not need to be retained. If it has been 10 years, and there have been policy changes and/or changes due to research, then it may need to be retained: process documents like laws and regulations, where as it moves through the process each version of the bill becomes valuable in terms of looking back at it. The interim materials are things like daily and weekly reports that are cumulated at the end of the year, insuring that those daily or weekly figures are retained for continuing access to those smaller time periods. Data bases, data changing, where it is updated on a regular basis with the last 10 years' worth of data with actual figures and estimates for the next 5 years. Researchers need access to these estimates because they need to see how accurate these estimates were. Need to ensure access to those estimates. Asks Council are there other items that need to be identified. Bruce James: You are going in exactly the right direction. This is exactly what we need to be doing.

Tim Byrne, University of Colorado: In the hall we have two publishers trying to get us to pay for the Serial Set. Competition has good points and bad points. There is duplication. What troubles me is competition between two government agencies. What we are talking about here with GPO looking at creating revenues with the creation of electronic products is going to put competition with NTIS at a higher level. NTIS when they get in competition they are more desperate because they have to sell to continue to exist. In the past NTIS has undercut the prices at GPO. We need to include them in the discussion. Bruce James: Good point, I have been out to visit them.

Jill Vassilakos-Long, California State University – San Bernardino: On version control, even if a document is only a few days old when it is changed or corrected, would like to see GPO bring back errata sheets. To do an electronic errata thing like "It used to say this; we corrected it." Even if it has been up 10 minutes someone will quote it. After it is corrected, if someone goes back to check, it will look like as if it were misquoted. That is not right and it is not fair. The whole concept of errata sheets worked in paper and it is time to bring that into the electronic age.

Deborah Mongeau, University of Rhode Island: Struck by how everyone is talking about government information as one size fits all. It is not that way, we have monographs, databases, serials, etc. All of this information is structured differently. It has different costs in producing it and it has different uses by the end user. We need different models for different types of materials and different users. Two tiers of information but terms of licensing structures that would be tailored to other users. We need to look for a model that will take us through the next 10, 20, 30 years. Bruce James: We are not talking about something will last

us the next 5 minutes but something that will last. How do we organize this material so we can take it forward regardless of the technology for the next 100 or 200 years.

End of Information Exchange

Judy Russell, Superintendent of Documents: It is my privilege to announce the Federal Depository of the Year Award. Last spring we announced that we were establishing a Federal Depository of the Year award because we recognize that Federal depository libraries invest significant time and resources in their public services.

The award is intended to provide special recognition for a library that furthers the goals of the program by insuring that the American public has free access to its government information in the following ways:

- outstanding service to meet Federal Government information needs in the library service area,
- creativity and innovation in developing specific community programs for the use of Federal Government information or a dramatic increase in their community use of Federal Government information, and
- leadership in creating public service programs that can be emulated by other Federal depository libraries.

This morning it gives me great pleasure to announce that the Tulsa City-County Library is the first library to be recognized as the Federal Depository Library of the Year. (Library Director Linda Saferite, and Suzanne Sears, depository librarian, were presented to the audience.)

This library has been embracing new technology in its online efforts to make public access to government information more accessible. We are very impressed by the library's commitment to using the Internet and outside the box techniques to better serve the needs of the public. Not only is your library moving forward, introducing information access options, but you have also substantially increased circulation at the same time, and your staff has many effective programs for outreach to the public and you also serve as a liaison for local community officials. (Bruce James and Judy Russell presented a certificate to Linda Saferite and Suzanne Sears.)

Linda Saferite, Director, Tulsa City-County Library: Thank you, we are so honored and to be the first library selected is so sweet. Our collection may be small but we maximize every bit of it. Suzanne Sears sees her work as a calling. It is easy for her to be one of the future-thinking librarians who pushes the envelope, adapts quickly and develops new ways to fulfill her mission, connecting people and public information. Thank you.

Tuesday afternoon, Oct. 21, 2003 – Council Working Session

Meeting began with a reminder concerning the Federal Depository Library of the Year Award ceremony to be held that evening from 7:30 to 9:00. Dan Barkley announced that the deadline for anyone wishing to get facts and recommendations to Bruce James would be December 1, 2003.

Council committees reported on their afternoon meetings. The Operations committee suggested a possible resolution on the electronic substitutions list. The Education and Preservation committee wrote a draft resolution in support of the ARL prospectus. Barbie Selby noted that there were several burning issues, but that these could be addressed in a report rather than requiring a resolution. Council agreed that the issues before Council required a report rather than a recommendation, and Michele stressed that information on these reports should appear on the Council recommendations Web page.

Council discussed Bruce James' request for advice from the Depository Library Community on revenue generation for the GPO sales operation. Major points from the discussion include: Council must continue to stress the core values of the Federal Depository Community; Council needs additional feedback from the community to address the issues; the morning session was brain storming, and suggestions need to be carefully examined before any recommendations are made; some concern was

expressed over any implication that libraries should assist GPO in the actual sale of information; the need for sustainability, and T.C. Evans provided a brief history of the sales program. T.C. also noted that the sales program has been losing ten million dollars per year for the last six years.

Council established four writing teams and established some initial parameters for the reports.

1. Revenue – Barbie Selby /chair, John Graham, and John Kavaliunas, Michele McKnelly

2. Version/authentication – Duncan Aldrich /chair, Barbara Ford, Chuck Eckman, Lynn Siemers

3. Legacy/digitization – Laura Saurs /chair, Mary Prophet, Cheryl Malone, Dan Barkley

4. Carrots/Barnacles – Paul Arrigo /chair, John Phillips, Doris Helfer

The meeting concluded with an extended discussion on the creation of a Web-based survey for input from the community on the four issues to be covered by the writing groups.

Tuesday evening, Oct. 21, 2003 – Council Working Session

Options for the Council Survey were investigated and plans for the survey were finalized.

Wednesday morning, Oct. 22, 2003 – Council Working Session

Council began with a review of work to be done by the writing groups and group chairs were asked to integrate their work with the documents to come out of the visioning process.

There was a brief discussion of the essential titles list and titles suggested for digitization. The next step in this process is to compile, rank and submit both the essential titles list and the suggestions for digitization to the committee for review.

John Philips was elected Chair of Council for the 2004/2005 term.

Judy Russell: Apologized to Council for the surprise topic on revenue enhancements in Bruce James's address. This was a topic GPO has been talking about internally. Bruce James said, "I don't want to bring other groups in until you all have set the boundaries." He is looking for a healthy income stream because the sales program has in the past supported the revolving fund. He is concerned that GPO will always be behind on technology because they will have to go back to Congress for the funds.

The question is how can GPO increase the income stream without endangering the FDLP. There is no point in developing a wonderful economic model if it doesn't fly with the depository librarians--it will crash and burn. It was suggested that Council needs to understand Bruce James style. He likes to be provocative; he feels that he will get a more honest reaction. He has established very wide parameters for the development of a business model, and is hoping that the community will set the boundaries for the income stream a bit further out than the boundaries implied in conversations with GPO staff and others. If there is an economic value if you are not a depository, it is very easy to establish the value of being a depository library.

Michele pointed out that Council had never before been asked for advice on the sales program.

Judy Russell: The lines between sales and the FDLP have blurred. The revenue model has been changed because of the decisions that have been made on the depository model. GPO needs to redefine the lines. By the current pattern, public access has been dramatically improved, but the program has been damaged because we have lessened the visual value of the program.

The remainder of the discussion focused on the changing nature of the program and the concern expressed by Chuck Eckman that technology changes so quickly that we could unnecessarily restrict either public access or the business model.

Council broke into working groups.

Wednesday morning, Oct. 22, Closing Session

Chairman Dan Barkley thanked the attendees for remaining for the closing session. He noted that from 1988 to the present he could not recall a time when Council did not put forth some recommendation. This Council meeting was spent working on the charge put forth by Bruce James. Chairman Barkley called the attention of the audience to the drafts produced by Council writing groups and outlined Council's proposed work schedule for the next few weeks. The deadline for the final documents is December 1, 2003. Council should have rewritten versions of the Envisioning documents ready by ALA. Chairman Barkley informed the audience that an announcement for comments on the working documents from Council would be sent out in the next few days and requested their response.

John Phillips announced that the report on the regional meeting should also be out by December 1, 2003.

Chairman Barkley thanked Bruce James for his generation of some frank discussion over the past couple of days, Bruce James and GPO for the Library of the Year Award and the reception & ceremony Tuesday night, Bruce James for bringing Council in on the planning process in a collaborative partnership. He asked GPO staff to stand and thanked them for all of their efforts to make the conference a success. GPO staff was warmly applauded. Thanked audience for its diligence and hard work.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Mary Prophet
Secretary

APPENDIX for Fall 2003 Depository Library Council Meeting

The transcript in this appendix replaces the link *http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/mfa03.html* fromThe Fall 2003 Depository Library Council Meeting Minutes. The link no longer exitst.

Transcript of Remarks by Representative Robert W. Ney, Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing and Bruce R. James, Public Printer of the United States, Tuesday October 21, 2003

Transcript of Remarks by Representative Robert W. Ney, Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing and Bruce R. James, Public Printer of the United States, Tuesday October 21, 2003 was previously found on http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/mfa03.html.

Dan Barkley (Council Chair):

Good morning. I appreciate the several hundred phone calls I got this morning as a wake up. I am awake today. Probably earlier than I wanted to be. I just have one quick announcement, the Electronic Committee will meet in Salon D; and the Cataloguing Committee will meet in the Washington Ballroom over lunch today. We have a full agenda this morning. I don't want to take any more time. I want to get started, we have some very exciting speakers here this morning, so would you all join me in giving a warm welcome to the Honorable Bruce James, the Public Printer of the United States.

Honorable Bruce James (Public Printer):

Well, good morning everyone. It's a pleasure to be with you again. This is my second Depository Library Council meeting and those of you who were in Reno recall the stage that we set on and that square table and the hundreds of people in the audience which ended up being a huge surprise to me. This time I'm prepared for all of you though. Well, it's my distinct pleasure, as my first job today to introduce Robert W. Ney, member of Congress from Ohio. Now there are a number of very important people in this room this morning, but probably none more important than Bob Ney . Bob, as many of you know, has a long career in public service. First in Ohio, and then in 1994 he was elected to the United States Congress. He came to Washington and got interested in a number of issues, among which is the GPO, Depository Library Program, Library of Congress, and his role as Chairman of the House Administration Committee, he serves as Chairman in this cycle of the Joint Committee on Printing. And the Joint Committee on Printing is the group that is responsible for the oversight of the Federal Depository Library Program. And so, he is the one that makes sure that we at the GPO are keeping up our end of the bargain. He's the one that makes sure that the resources are there and available to continue this marvelous program which is gone on now for nearly two hundred years. So without further adieu, I would like to introduce Chairman Ney, and thank you Chairman Ney for all of your support for this program.

Chairman Ney:

Thank you, thank you. It's real pleasure to be here. Bruce James is probably not been in office 22 years and I think that the different levels I've served, legislature and out here that Bruce James is probably the most unusual human being that I've ever met. He actually kept to his word. When we met with him, he said he was going to take a certain direction and he did it. And that's unusual sometimes in the US Government. So I give you a lot of credit. I tell you Bruce James really deserves a round of applause for the work that he's done. And also GPO Superintendent of Documents, Judy Russell. She also has just really risen to the occasion to provide service. And I think exemplifies how the Government is here to help and not to hurt. Also, I'd like to thank Maria Robinson, she's from Ohio, actually originally, a graduate of the Ohio State University, well she attended there as I did, also. Obviously, there are no Buckeye fans in here. Probably a lot of Wisconsin fans-- there we go. Well, you're not real popular in Columbus this year, but you know we'll forgive you. And also, of course Council Chair, Dan Barkley, who's techni-cally from the University of New Mexico and actually is from the State of Ohio. How many people here are from Ohio? Okay. How many people were born in Ohio or lived in Ohio or there's usually a lot more? Okay. Also on the council somewhere are the two members from Ohio, Mary Prophet from Library of Denison, and also, John Graham from the Public Library of

Cincinnati. So, I want to give a general welcome on behalf of the United States Congress and to all of you, from the JCP. You know it's been in operation since 1813, and dates back to the age of James Madison and many of the founding fathers. The Federal Depository Library Program helps keep American informed on the actions of their public officials. And it's really a vital component of our system of government. It's something to be really amazingly proud of. The Joint Committee on Printing and Congress fully support the FDLP. Just recently the Congress approved and the President signed into law the Government Printing Office's full request for a 16.9% increase in funding for the Superintendent of Documents salaries and expense appropriations, raising the budget to 34.5 million. The increased funding will be used to upgrade and improve GPO Access and provide the FDLP with needed resources. JCP will continue to support efforts to modernize the FDLP to improve public access to Government information. And I mention this, because the increase was obviously needed. These are very difficult times, budget wise, in our country's history after the last two years. Obviously, the obligations that we have to intelligence, to military after 9/11. And also to two wars that we've been engaged in. So, acquiring a funding right now, believe me, is a very, very difficult thing to do. But I think that because of the way the system's been run, people have faith in it and that is why the funding has come through. The FDLP is doing a very commendable job in transitioning to a predominantly electronic information system as Congress has directed it to. The JCP is confident in the leadership of Bruce James and Judy Russell in full consultation with the Library community, which is very important. The Depository Library Program is making the necessary transitions to continue to provide innovative effective public access to information in the 21st Century. Depository Librarians are critically important partners with the GPO and the operations of this program, and without them the program simply couldn't function. The JCP and the GPO regard librarians as essential to providing effective public access to government information for the entire world. In the Internet age, the skills and abilities of librarians are needed more than ever to assist Americans in locating and using informational resources, including those provided by the government. Depository Librarians can be commended for the great job they do in providing public access to government information through their libraries. You know, as you get older, you appreciate things a lot more, and I appreciate my librarian at St. John's Central in Blaire, Ohio. You always could get help, assistance and direction. And I think that people have good visions in their minds of the library system and how much it can help. The growing use of electronic information technology raises several issues of interest at GPO. And the library community is actively working on such as insuring permanent public access to electronic collections, providing adequate security to ensure the integrity and accuracy of the government documents, and making the necessary technology and skills universally available to everyone who wants access to the government information. Ensuring that the costs of providing public access to electronic information are distributed equitably, defining the role of librarians in an increasingly Internet based information culture where nearly everyone has access to information all the time, and determining the best model for FDLP in the 21st century. These are a few of the goals that I think will be exciting and challenging. The development of the Federal Depository Library of the Year Award, by the way, which will be awarded for the first time as I understand it, I think Bruce at this conference, it's an excellent idea. It will provide long and deserved recognition to this important program and help inform the public about what a great public resource this program has become. I commend you for doing that, people need to be recognized. Of course, you're all important, everybody deserves an award, but the recognition I think will be something that is a good thing to start. And let me just close by saying that you've done a wonderful job. When I first was elected to Congress, approximately 10 years ago, we did not have a system where people could get to the US House. And on the opening day of Congress in January, I think it was January the 5th, the switch was flipped and Thomas came into be. And it brought the world to the US House and also it brought us to the world. And we've been able to communicate with more people now, obviously, than ever before. But it's been a challenge for Congress. Our Committee House Administration overlooks the technology and we continue to constantly question ourselves on what we direction should we go. And I think the great thing about all of you is you also provide within your bailiwick, the direction that you need. You ask the questions and you bring everything into the 21st Century. Let me just close by again commending everyone, also I wanted to say that these have been a very difficult two years for our country after what has happened to us and with 9/11. And we always think first and foremost of our American men and women who are in uniform always defending this great Nation to provide the feeling of democracy the seeds and the movement of the democracy for generations to come. But also during these difficult times, where you live and what you do is where America does her work. And our communities will continue despite attempts to stop us; and our way of life will continue to be made better and more prosperous for future generations. That's what you're about, you're about providing something that people may not know our

names, or they may not know what you do, but surely the effects of what you are working on today are going to be there forever and ever for future generations in our country. So thank you for coming to Washington and God bless you.

Bruce James:

Well thank you Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much you taking time to join us this morning. I really appreciate the kind words about the GPO, too. Now, next, before we start our regular program, I would like to ask a member of our community to step forward, Ridley Kessler, are you here this morning? Are you anywhere in the room? Could you step up here to join me, please? You know it's been since…, yeah, just be careful; I don't want you to be the first one to walk off the back here. I guess in the 18 months since the President announced his intention to nominate me for this job, I've had a chance to meet a lot of people in the community and learn an awful lot. And I've met some truly outstanding people and heard some truly outstanding stories, but I do believe Ridley, that you are perhaps in many ways, the Dean of this whole community. And we want to thank you for your 35 years of service to the library community.

Ridley:

Thank you.

Bruce James:

Now, I wrote Ridley a letter and I thought I'd share it with you all. We've selected parts we've X'd out, but let me read you what's official here.

Dear Ridley, I would like to offer my congratulations on your retirement and my sincere thanks for your energetic and effective efforts throughout your career to promote free public access to government information. You have been tireless in helping people to obtain the government information they need through the Federal Depository Library Program. The level of inspiration, mentoring, and training that you have selflessly provided to countless students, staff, and colleagues set the gold standard for those who will follow you. You consistently put your energy and ideas to work to help improve Government Document Librarianship and the Federal Depository Library Program serving on multitudes of councils, roundtables, associations, committees, groups, and panels. You've earned the admiration and affection of your colleagues and friends. Please accept heartfelt thanks for the vital service you preformed in helping provide access to US Government information. As a small token of our appreciation of the Government Printing Office, we're renaming our main building after you – No, I didn't, but it's not a bad idea). … As a small token of our appreciation of the Government Printing Office for your dedication to the goals of the Federal Depository Library Program, I am enclosing a Certificate of Appreciation, nearly as good. My very best wishes for a long and happy retirement. You will be missed.

Dan, I believe you want to add to this.

Dan Barkley:

As only Ridley would know, and he knows some things that I'm sure many of us don't want to know. You know any time the government or federal agency makes a proposal into law, or something like that, they advertise in the federal agency and there's time for public comment. Well Ridley, here's your public comment, don't mind the white out. I've gone through and X'd some comments out. But seriously, this is from your friends in the community and we want you to have a token of our appreciation.

Ridley Kessler:

Nicely done….

Dan Barkley:

Well, you can thank George Barnum (phonetics) for that. But, that's for you.

Ridley Kessler:

Thank you very much, thank you. Thank you Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents and all of you, but remember I just retired, I'm not dead. I hope to see you many times all around. So thank you so much.

Bruce James:

I suppose you come back next year, and people will say what are you doing here? Just, as if you don't belong. That's an interesting idea, isn't it. I'll share a little side with you. I was delivering a speech a couple of weeks ago in Chicago to Graph Expo, and Graph Expo is kind of the big show in the printing industry. You know they took over McCormick Place, and there are five, six, seven hundred vendors that are just displaying their wares from small table top machine, to huge multi-storage printing presses and there are tens of thousands of printers that gather, and I was giving the keynote address. I don't know why they asked me, but probably because I buy a lot of printing. And, then I opened it to questions and you know you always get some interesting questions. I had somebody in the back of the room raise their hand and say, now, I've read someplace that you have renamed the Government Printing Office, you've gotten rid of the word printing and you've renamed it. Is that true? And I said, well I don't think so. Said, I'll tell you that, we did change the logo. And we got the logo changed and we think we have one that is more progressive, feels more like 20th century, without ignoring the past either. And I said that was kind of cute. And somebody asked me, well, how did you get that done? Did it take an act of Congress? I said, no, no, we just changed it. They said, can you do that? I said, well nobody has told me I can't do it. So it's done. I said, I think what you're referring to is one of our middle managers who runs the Congressional Printing Group for GPO, and that's a pretty important group and Congress thinks themselves their most important customers as you might imagine. And that's Charlie Cook who runs that group for us, and has done a marvelous job for many years. And he's the one that's renamed his group from the Congressional Printing Office, to the Congressional Information Publishing Office, or whatever he decided to call it; and he did it without consulting with me first. And that I think is absolutely terrific tribute to where the GPO has come in a very short period of time. From a commanded control structure, where everything started with a public printer, every decision was made there, to the point we're getting decisions down into the organization. We're forcing decisions lower and lower and lower. And at the end of the day, that should mean we actually have much more, a much better level of response to our many customers, customers in this room and customers in government agencies. We're beginning to look at the world in terms of customers. We even look at our employees in terms of being customers of our personnel services. So we've made a lot of changes, and I appreciate Bob Ney recognizing the changes that have been going on at GPO. I will tell you that I commented briefly to the council on Sunday, when I was in to make a couple of remarks, that maybe the most significant thing that you all ought to consider is that of the many entities requesting money from Congress this year, requesting appropriations, at this point, the President to my knowledge, has signed two appropriation bills. One is ours. And we got every nickel we asked for, and I'm not sure any other agency or department this cycle will get every nickel they ask for. And I think it's a tribute to the men and women of the GPO, and just what faith Chairman Ney and members of the Appropriations Committees have and what we're striving together to do. And we're not there yet. I want to assure you that we're just starting to march in the right direction. We've got a long way to go, but I am particularly appreciative of the support shown by the United States Congress. I know many of you personally know members of the Appropriations Committees, and other members of Congress and if you have an opportunity to drop them a note, or see them in person, I would appreciate it very much if you share with them your appreciation of what they did for us. Now for you folks standing in the back of the room, this is just like church, all the best things are open in the front if any of you would like to come up and join us or all of you just specters in the back of the room there. We have some wonderful seats right up here. Well, let me talk to you a little bit about where we are from my talk six months ago. I'm going to presume that all of you were there, if you weren't there you probably read every word that I had to say. You recall that what I talked about was the fact that I came into the situation as Public Printer knowing a whole lot of about the printing industry and where the printing industry was going in terms of technology, but with little knowledge or appreciation for the Federal Depository Library Program, and so, I felt that it was my job to get out and listen. Man, I have visited so many different locations and talked with so many different people under Judy's guidance and leadership that I am now beginning to get my arms around the Federal Depository Library Program and the importance of that program to this nation. And, if you heard me talk to the group of printers in Chicago, you would have been amazed to hear me talk mostly about my role as the guardian of

government information, the collector/guardian of government information. Because I think that is where GPO starts. I know have a pretty good sense that 1813 really began the GPO. It was the 1860's before the government acquired a printing operation, but they acquired that printing operation because that was the technology of the day - putting ink down on paper. If it had been computers in those days, they might as well have acquired a computer information facility. So I think that I have come to the conclusion that the future of the GPO lies in, not just the preservation, but the recognition and extension and expansion of the Federal Depository Library Program in the 21st century in a rational way. Now, I told you that we were not just going to leave out and start to do things willy-nilly. We were involved back last April, in what I call the fact finding process, where we gathered information about every aspect of our business from the printing that we do, to the needs of our printing customers, the agencies and the government to your community and to the information industry. To all the various publics that we serve in some way or fashion to find out what the true situation was today and where folks felt the future was going to be. Well, I told you that if it was private sector we could get that job done pretty darn quickly and move on to the planning stage. But I felt that we needed to be a little bit more deliberative in the public arena to make certain that everybody had a chance to get there oar in the water. Everybody had a chance to interact with the fact gathering process. And I told you that I thought we'd be finished with our work by the end of this calendar year. Well, GPO is right on schedule, maybe we're just a little bit ahead of where I expected to be. But we've inherited a partner in this process, the Government Accounting Office, who is spending a considerable amount of their money, I guess it's tax payer money, it's your money, it's our money. It's a considerable portion of our money on part of the fact gathering process and they are running a little behind where they expected to be and it now looks like it will be the end of February, maybe even the beginning of March before they can deliver their portions to us. So I don't want to get the cart before the horse, and even though I'm anxious, very anxious to get moving here on development of plan. I think we'll just wait until all of this comes together very naturally. And then we'll be talking with you about the facts we're finding. But by the time we've finished this whole process we'll have talked with you thoroughly about what we see and what we believe the situation is. It is my hope that we can get everyone on the same page in regard to the facts. Everyone from the information industry to the library community these are the facts. And once we have determined what the facts are, then I think it will be easier to move forward and develop a plan for the future. And if you will, a strategic vision plan, whatever you want to call it. It's where we're going with our operation of the GPO. And you know, this is going to be a lot of fun. Judy and I are not going to sit down in the ivory tower and just create a plan, we certainly expect to engage all our publics- the library community, the printing community, information industry, our employees, very importantly, and of course Congress. And we'll engage all these groups in talking about what a logical plan would be based on what the facts are, not what we would like the facts to be, but what the facts are. And then we'll move forward. Now, I can share with you some things that we talked about in April, and I can tell you where I am on those today. I think I can share with you, some ideas where I think we need to go. Now none of this is going to be rocket science for you all. Because I think that you've discussed either in groups or large groups or committees part of GPO and part of other organizations, probably every single one of these issues. What I think is different now, is that the GPO is addressing these in a very organized fashion, where we intend on coming out of it with a plan. And we intend on providing leadership to the community in the electronic information age the same way we did when it was the age of printed documents. You know the issues that we talked about when I was here last are still in front of us. And that is to be able to electronically distribute information we're going to have to have. And this is back to the fugitive document situation. And, I think in April, I learned from you that you felt that fewer than 50% of government documents that were worth saving were actually in the Federal Depository Library Program. I found that number shocking. But, I can tell you that you're probably right about that. As we've gotten out and taken a look, and as I have had a chance to talk with secretaries and agency heads, I think you're probably exactly right about that, and I'm beginning to understand why. The second part of that is the authenticity of the information that we offer in electronic form, and I'm speaking specifically about downloading from the Internet. Today, as you well know, if you download information from the US Government Printing Office site, GPO Access, and it may be labeled as US Government Information, but you have no way of knowing whether that is an authentic replica of the information that the author originally created. And the third aspect- man, that paper is really tremendous stuff. You know you can save that forever. You know I think you can save a paper document for four or five hundred years, maybe longer, if it is not exposed to direct sunlight, and be sure that information survives. Well, you know, you heard me say that I don't have any confidence that ten years from now, that we'll be able to read this magnetic optical data that we record today. And it still may be on those disks, but will we even have equipment to read it? So those remain the big

challenges for the GPO. And some of them are technical in nature, but I think that what we're finding is that as much as there's technical challenges in this, that for the main part it is deciding from a business stand point what we need to do, how we need to address these issues and do it in a systematic professional way that's repeatable, reputable, over and over again. And so, those remain the three big areas. I can tell you a little bit about where we are in each of those. I guess Judy calls these mission critical areas. When it comes to comprehensive information delivery, the elimination of fugitive documents, the OMB compact, I think, is going to be a big step in the right direction. Now to refresh your memory, before I arrived on the scene, Mitch Daniels as a Director of the Office of Management and Budget had decided that the GPO was obsolete, unneeded and ought to just disappear off the face of the earth. And maybe from his perspective, he was right. I went to meet with him before I became Public Printer and listen to what he had to say, and I think if he'd been right with his premise set he probably would have been right to say that the GPO had become obsolete. Unfortunately, his premise set was incorrect because he thought that somehow that all the government's printing was going out on that red brick building on North Capitol Street, and you know, years and years and years ago during the second World War is when we found that you needed to have an efficient mix between doing work in-house and buying in the private sector. And by mixing that effectively we could reduce the cost to tax payers, we could extend the reach of the GPO very considerably. We could benefit from the best ideas from the private sector and the private sector could benefit from our best ideas too. It could be a good partnership. And that partnership has grown and thrived over many, many, many, many years. And last year we had 2568 printers throughout the United States, and I use the word printers to describe all of our contractors, who produced everything from pamphlets and booklets to CD ROMs and microfiche for us. So we have a wide range of interest and we have bought that material very competitively. Well, as Mitch and I talked about this, and as he got more information, and after I became Public Printer we continued to dialogue about this and basically we agreed we didn't want blow up the GPO and the Federal Depository Library Program, that made no sense whatsoever. That we needed to do is reconsider what was most fundamentally important and begin to look how we could recast all of this. And I will tell you, I am very, very grateful to Mitch Daniels, now a candidate for Governor in Indiana. I am very grateful that his last day in the job he signed a compact with us. I'd gone in a couple weeks, two or three weeks before he left saying, we discussed it, we discussed it, we discussed it, I need you to solve this before you leave because if we don't get this done, you know it could be years before we can get back and address this issue again. He was willing to do it. And the essence of this was the recognition by OMB that the most important role that the GPO has, is in gathering government documents from all sources, cataloguing, organizing those documents, distributing broadly throughout the United States and making certain they are available to the public. That is fundamentally what this document recognizes. We tried to address an area that when I was in the private sector I thought made no sense, and which Mitch Daniels and many of the agency heads thought made no sense, and that was these archaic regulations governing government printing. You know it wasn't so long ago that you couldn't put a photograph in the government publication because halftones were expensive. If you read the regulations literally today, you almost never could use color. I'm not talking about full color. I'm talking about a second color. And you know, we have these rules governing paper. We managed to create a series of rules that make it almost twice as expensive to create paper for the government as for the private sector. All this makes no sense whatsoever. And so we wanted to create some opportunities to open this up and give printers a chance, who as you might imagine is beginning to change how they look at the world, or they're going to be dead. Last year there were 10,000 printers world wide who went out of business and they're not going to be replaced. So, printers are looking at how they are going to recast their businesses, and they're looking two directions. They're looking into content management, and they're looking into distribution of finished products. We thought it would be wise to give these vendors an opportunity to go and talk directly with agencies of government about their services and about what they could offer. And let the agencies themselves write their specifications. It's their money, not our money. Let them write their specifications and what it is they would like to have in a communications device vehicle. And then to bid that themselves. Agencies would be able to select a vendor that would give tax payers the biggest bang for their buck, not necessarily the lowest price or quote on the job, but the one that would bring the best value to the taxpayers. We wanted a framework of rules surrounding this. We didn't want to run right out and open this up. So we decided that GPO will maintain the list of suitable vendors, and to become a vendor you have to register. And this of course is done all electronically in today's world. We will register vendors, and qualify them – excuse me – I didn't smoke a cigar this morning either. We will register those vendors and then, if an agency has somebody they want to use that is not on our list, we're not going to be an obstructionist here, we're going try to get them on the list as promptly as we can. And it's the new GPO, things don't take six months anymore. We get the stuff done right away. We'll get it on there and the agency can bid it out. Now in the past, we have put a 7% surcharge on top of printing, most printing. And that money has

come back to the GPO to operate our business. And in this case we will charge vendors 3% to participate in the program, whatever they quote the agency, that's what the agency pays. There is no mark up to the agency, but they will rebate 3% to us. The reason I know they are going to, is that we're going to pay the bills. And to me this is the most important part of this compact. In order to pay the bill, the printer must give us an electronic manuscript of exactly what was used to print the document as well as a couple of printed copies too. And we always have the opportunity to buy more printed copies if we need to through the SuDocs program. But, if we do this right, I ought to admit a couple of other things, in conjunction with this OMB has agreed to work with us on shutting down these rogue printing plants that have grown up in government. And maybe rogue is not the right word, because I'm sure at one point many of them made sense. Just as the private printer sector has watched volume fall, the GPO has watched our volume fall. Each of these agency shops, most of these agency shops have watched their volumes fall too. And of course it's a little more difficult when you have an in-house operation to contract it. So OMB is going to work with us on making certain that we don't have these facilities wasting taxpayers' money sitting around in various government agencies. They are also going to work with us to make certain that any document that is created by an agency, again an electronic manuscript comes to GPO. So you can see what we got here. I was so pleased to do this, because this could have taken us two, three, four, five or more years to address this subject. And I was so pleased that we were able to do it. Now, Mitch Daniels wanted to jump right in and say okay, let's start tomorrow. And I was sort of a little more temperate than that, I said, whoa, whoa let's slow down here. Let's try this, let's pick an agency and, or department. Let's try this for a year and iron out all the kinks, because we know there'll be kinks. And we know that we haven't been smart enough to figure out every detail and how this is going to work. So, OMB picked the Department of Labor, we thought that was an excellent choice on their part. And we're beginning to work with the Department of Labor. Now, it's interesting that we're coming at this from three perspectives. Jim Bradley, who is Judy's counterpart in running the sales side of our business to government agencies, they're at the same level; same rank. He's got about 500 people to deal with government agencies. And it's not just dealing with them, it's the procurement (phonetics) of whatever they need from outside world too. And, so, he's built the whole team- a sales team to deal with the Department of Labor, patterned after what we want to do in the future. To eliminate multiple layers of handing jobs back and forth, but rather have a small group of people who have a customer and everybody in that group - all three, four or five people in that group- would know everything there is to know about that customer. So when the phone rings, they can pick it up and they know the answer. They have the responsibility from the time the customer gives the order to the time the vendor delivers that order. This will help GPO employees so much, because they have felt so handicapped in being able to directly interface with the client or directly interface with the vendor to make certain that what was needed, what our agency and customer wanted, was getting done. So, we're looking for a mechanism that would be much more straight forward and will get the job done much better. We're doing that with the Department of Labor, that's our first one. We're examining how this work comes to us. Meanwhile, Judy is looking at the whole area of fugitive documents in the Department of Labor and trying to understand how those documents are created. You know, you only get one small department, but with only one department, you could begin to get your arms around it. Judy's also looking at how we can have a mechanism for transferring documents that are created that don't go through the GPO, and how they can be transferred into us. And the third person in this process is our Inspector General. And as many of you know, I've changed a lot of people in the organization and management at GPO since I've been there, and one of the most important changes is in the Office of Inspector General. And you know the Inspector General offices have only been around for about 25 years, and they're still trying to figure out what their role is. Our Inspector General, whom I appointed, serves at my pleasure, but he appoints, and he reports to Congress, and to me. Congress can call up, any member of Congress, and say, hey I want you to go look at this, or I want you to do that, and by law he has to do it. He's pretty independent. When you have a role like that, people, can get really confused about what their primary job is. I felt that the previous Inspector Generals at the Government Printing Office were just way off in left field. They were playing a sort of gotcha game, auditing to get you, as opposed to looking at where we could use those resources to move the agency forward. Well, by golly, we have a new situation today. Now we're looking at are things that are going to be very important to us in the future. One of which is the fugitive document problem. The Inspector General has put together a whole group to look at this issue, going to Inspector General to Inspector General, and General Counsel to General Counsel. So, we're going to look at building a mechanism an effective enforcement mechanism to enforce these rules and laws. We're looking at a number of things at the Department of Labor, and at the end of the day, some will work, some won't. And I'll be able to report to you by this time next year where we stand on this and how we're proposing, or how we have rolled it out to the rest of

the government, because I'm looking at trying to do it at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The next area, is the permanent public access of information. We are embarked on a program with our long time partner, the Federal Register, on authenticating information. When I say our long time partner, John Carlin, the Archivist of the United States, I'm addressing a meeting with me standing at his side, not so long ago, in which he talked about the partnership between the National Archives and the GPO in regard to the Federal Register. And what he said was that we have done this together for 70 years, and in those 70 years, not one day, have we failed to deliver the Federal Register. If that's true, and I assume it is, that's a pretty remarkable story. And it shows you the commitment to each other and the depth of partnership between the two organizations. They're in a building across the street from us and you know, they face all the problems that you do, and we do, with electronic information. They face the problem of getting electronic documents into the Federal Register and verifying those documents. So we've initiated a pilot program with them, that watermarks documents at the point of author origin, and carries them through the cycle into the Federal Register production, and then further on to our data base. We've just gotten that off the ground and going, shows very great potential. Our technicians are following this, and we have people in the outside world that are following it for us. We're not sure this is the end of the day technology, but we've learned a whole lot about how you have to think about applying the technology like this and all the steps that are involved from a business stand point. So, I would say that this is a huge move forward, and again we'll be working on this over the next few months as we learn more and more about how to authenticate documents. And again, what I'm looking at in my judgment, the ultimate is to take control at the point of author origin, seal that document and be prepared to deliver it by Internet. Have someone pick that document up forward it somebody else, who forwards it to somebody else, who forwards it to somebody else, and still make sure that document is an authentic US government document. So, that's what we're looking at there and as I say making some progress in that front. The aspect of permanent public access, keeping information in perpetuity, remains a tough challenge. We have ventured around the country and I don't want to make it sound like we sort of got in the car and drove willy-nilly. I have established a group called Innovation and New Technology that are managed by some very smart people, and it's their job to investigate and look at all these technologies. We've had more than a dozen meetings at locations outside of the GPO, where we've taken anywhere from 10 to 20 GPO employees, and we've gone for as long as two or three days to go very in depth to look at the laboratory level at what's going on with the development of technologies. Particularly technologies to do with the ability to maintain digital data in perpetuity. We're making progress in that front, and by the time we're back together, six months from now, I'll be talking about pilots that we're operating in that area too, I'm sure. So that sort of summarizes where we have been since I have met with you last. I realize that all of these subjects are being discussed by you and various groups in various ways. What I hope to do is put the GPO in a position of being a leader in these areas, and having a place where we can focus our efforts and having it managed by people day to day, who we pay to do that. People whose primary job is to stay on top of this and do these kinds of things. And so often, not just in this community, but in every community where you're trying to wear several hats, you know at the end of the day the guy that signs your paycheck gets most of your time. And you know, because of that I want to make certain that the GPO has people whose paycheck is depended upon their managing and leading in these areas. Judy is reorganizing the GPO to accomplish exactly that. Let me tell you what I think the Depository Library Council and all of us need to be looking at over the next few months. We need to examine the areas that are vitally important to the future of the program, and ones which the GPO does not have the magic answer. And the first is one I think that is of growing interest everyday, and that is what constitutes a version of information. If my job is to preserve all government documents in perpetuity, what constitutes a government document today? In the old days, of course, we had a first printing, a second printing, a third printing, a fourth printing. What happens with the Department of Labor where they can be updating data all day long on a database? What constitutes a version? What do we need to maintain? Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a matter of public policy. I've gone over and I've talked with some Members of Congress in both houses about this, people that should be interested in it, and who just rolled their eyes back in their head. So, we're not far enough along that we're going to get help on a Congressional level on this. So I think we're in need guidance from you as a council on where we should go with this, because at the end of the day, we've got to have an answer to it. We've got to have an answer to what constitutes a version. And this is going to affect a lot of our planning, so I need this answer sooner rather than later. I'm road mapping how we're going to get to this answer, but this should not be determined by the GPO. This should be determined as a matter of public policy, not just by the library community either, but you need to get going on this. Second, I think it's safe to say, that from this moment forward the primary method of distributing government information will be digital. We will need to find a way to store this informa-

tion in perpetuity safely, and have access to it hundreds of years from now. I know we can do that. The question is, what do we do with this legacy collection? And I know that almost everyone of you in this room has faced this and are certainly getting asked questions at every level, below you, on side of you, above you, about what's going to happen to all this paper. Well clearly, it doesn't take a genius to see that we're going to have to digitize a whole lot of it. And you know, when you digitize something I guess you've got two choices, you can make it a searchable database, or you can digitize images. Frankly, we're probably going to have to do both. And it's the prioritization of that material that is very important to us. We'll find ways to partner with the community to get this done. We're already at work with various constituents and looking at how we're going to partner to get the job done, but it is the prioritization of it, and the decision of what is worth making fully searchable versus capturing a page as an image, which is dependent on the nature of the material. And so, we need help in that area. Again, we don't want the GPO making the decisions in that area. We want that to be in conjunction with the community. And the third one, the one that is going to be contentious, of course it'd be the one that I like the most, is how are we going to make money at this? The reason that we're here, two hundred years after the fact, in some ways unchanged in mission, is because a sustainable model was built many, many years ago for what would work at the GPO. You know my friends outside of government are amazed when we talk about how we run the GPO. We run it like a business. We have revenues coming in; we have expenses going out; at the end of the day, we want to have money left over. And we want that money left over to invest in the next level of technologies. We're charged by law with recovering the expenses for most of what we do. And again, when that was paper, pretty easy. Well that old model was really great, wasn't it Judy? Any chance we can go back to that? That was so easy. You know, we'd print a document, we printed it for fifty previous years, and knew exactly how many copies we'd sell, so SuDocs would order 500 copies or 5,000 whatever was necessary. We'd stick them in a warehouse and slowly but surely we'd fulfill them, and at the end of the year, we'd have a bunch of money left over and had a big party. Or maybe decided how to invest it in the next generation of technology. Well that started to break down several years ago. And all of this money that GPO had in coffers for moving forward, for changing the mix of the business, has disappeared. When I think about it, it just saddens me so much. We have lost tens of millions of dollars. Money that I no longer have to invest in the future. Just lost it, because we didn't react quickly enough to the changing environment. Well, the good news is that we've reacted now. And we've got control of this business. And we're doing this, when I say we, I'm talking about every single one of GPO's employees, all 2700 of the employees, and we may have two, three, four or five that don't get it or don't believe in it, but everybody else does. And everybody is working together to make certain that we run like a business, that we eliminate the stuff that doesn't make sense anymore, that we reconstitute a lot of things. Everybody is working on this. I think it's pretty incredible that we have 23 bargaining units, and I don't know how many unions that is all together, close to 20 unions, and I never worked in a union environment before when I walked in the door. You know some of my friends in the private sector had, and of course, they hated unions and one of the first things I did, when the President asked me to do this job, was talk to the head of the AFL-CIO in Nevada. A fellow by the name of Danny Thompson, who runs the operating, president, or whatever his title is. And said, hey Danny, you know me, I know you, and it's really. My job here is not to eliminate unions. My job is to figure out how to get along with them, and I need your help. And so, he and his people spent the day with me and talked to me about how people would be feeling when I came in the door, and what I would have to do to form a good relationship. Well, I've tried to follow his advice. Some days I've gotten it and some days, I haven't. But in my opinion, our unions are the best partners that we have. And I mean that very sincerely. It's almost unbelievable the cooperation that they've given to management, particularly new management coming into the GPO and how they've worked with us to try to make the changes that are necessary to make. So, I commend the GPO Union, particularly Union leadership. They have just been phenomenal as we've changed many things. We now have righted the GPO financially, and we're real close to it, we don't have it right yet. There are a few more things that we need to do. But as you know, ten years ago when we started out, distributing information on the Internet, we tried to charge for it. And we discovered, that it cost us more money to try to collect the money than we collected. And, that went on for a year or so, and we finally said this makes no sense at all, let's quit it. And in those days, nobody could figure out how to make any money on the Internet, maybe they still can't today, I don't know, but we dropped it. And so we moved from charging for information to the general public to giving the information free to the general public. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I'm here to tell you it's not a sustainable model, it isn't going to work. And, we're going to have to invent a new way doing this, otherwise we'll be at the mercy of Congress forever, and I suggest to you that we won't be around two hundred years from now if we build a model that puts us at the mercy of Congress. Congress prioritizes the nation's needs. You know, Chairman Ney

said it very clearly, it's pretty unusual for me to get all the money I wanted in view of what's going on here. Well this is just an unusual set of circumstances- Republican Chairman, Republican President, Republican Public Printer, very unusual set of circumstances that came together right here. Wouldn't want to count on that ever reoccurring again. I think we got to go back and we've got to create a business model here that will allow us to once again bring revenues in the door and pay the expenses so that we don't have to go to Congress for a hand out. Now, I tried this idea in April on this group, and I just heard a large intake of breath, and I didn't get as many poison pen letters as I expected. In fact, I didn't get any poison pen letters. But I've had some people that were in that meeting talk to me and caution me that I was entering a mine field. And you know, hey, that is the reason why I'm here, I don't mind mine fields. I don't want to lose a leg on this, but I don't mind mine fields. You know we got to figure this one out. Not so long ago, Judy and I went and visited with some representative in the information industry and it wasn't a big group, a small group, about 20 people altogether. And we said to them, we got to figure out a way to do this, and I think that at the end of the day we got to partner with you. And we have to figure out how to create partnerships here that work. We got to figure out how to do partnerships that protect the Federal Depository Libraries, and it means what we do, they've got to get for free. And, you know, they didn't wince, they didn't cry, they sort of recognized that that was a reality of life if they wanted to find a way to partner with us. And, I don't know what all the ideas are, but I sure would appreciate your counsel on the on ways that we could look at this that would be acceptable to the library community and yet be realistic in terms of building revenue. You know, I'm thinking about going out to one of the big guys like McKenzie who does this for the private sector, say to them, you know, I'll pay you 10% of first year's revenue, build me a model. And I'm serious. I'm thinking about figuring out how to do this in a way that really works, but I want to get some parameters and thoughts and ideas. I want to get this down a little more than we have right now, and I want to do it soon rather than later. So those are my three charges and issues to the Depository Library Council that I think are of importance. You know, like I said in the April meeting, most of you heard me say it one time or another that I just wasn't very impressed with the minutes of the Depository Library Council when I took this job. They were focused the focus not in the right areas. The focus was on yesterday, it wasn't on tomorrow. And one of the reasons that Judy Russell has the job is that I wanted somebody that clearly understood the future and would stay focused on the future. I wanted someone who would build the rapport within the Depository Library community, but most importantly create a council for us that really works in a collegial manner, and that I consider to be of real importance not just to GPO, but to you and the country.