SPRING FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING TRANSCRIPTS
TAMPA BAY, FL | APRIL 20 - 22, 2009

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

EASY AS FDL | http://www.fdlp.gov

PLENARY SESSION: COUNCIL/GPO WELCOME AND UPDATE

Monday April 20, 2009, 10:30 a.m. to 12 p.m, Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: (Gavel) I don't actually get opportunities very often to use my gavel, but I will use it if I need to.

I would like to welcome everyone this morning. I'm Tim Byrne, the Chair of Depository Library Council. I'm from the Department of Energy, Office of Scientific and Technical Information.

I'd like to welcome everyone this morning to the Spring 2009 Depository Library Council Meeting. It's known that these are some rough economic times for everyone, but especially for libraries. So I'm really glad to see all of you who have been able to come to this meeting.

I think the first thing I'd like to do is have everyone at the front table, Council and GPO folks, introduce themselves, so let's start with David.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library.

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

CARLENE INGSTROM: Carlene Engstrom, Salish Kootenai College Library.

JUSTIN OTTO: Good morning, everyone. I'm Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University.

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

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library.

BOB TAPELLA: Bob Tapella, Public Printer.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, acting superintendent of documents and director of library services.

LAURIE HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO.

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe in the corner, GPO.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, American Library Association.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Katrina Stierholz, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

KATHY LAWHUN: And last but not least, Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public Library.

TIM BYRNE: I have a few housekeeping things to get out of the way, first, before we get started. So first thing is to point out that in your detailed agenda, there is an error for Tuesday, April 21st. There's an error on the agenda that will be in the attendee books. Lunch on Tuesday is two

hours, from 12:00 to 2:00, and the sessions after lunch will start and finish 30 minutes later than are listed in the agenda.

We have several groups that are getting together for meals here, so I'll mention Florida Librarians are going to meet at noon at the Spain Restaurant on the corner of Tampa Street and Madison. Go right on Tampa for two blocks.

Sign up for the Law Librarians dinner -- Law Librarians and Friends dinner to be held tonight. The sign-up sheet is posted on the bulletin board. Please sign up before 2:30.

Very important: When you are speaking, especially when you go to the microphone to speak, please, say your name and your institution. And that especially applies to Council members.

The regional and selective lunches and the library-type lunches will have some post on the message board, also. If you have any questions, you can go to the registration desk. We will have breakfast foods tomorrow and Wednesday morning.

We did introduce all the Council. We have two members of Council who are not able attend this morning. Victoria Trotta and Denise Stephens both had health problems with parents, and so I hope that we can all take a moment and send good thoughts to Victoria Trotta, whose father had a

heart attack on Thursday, and Denise Stephens, whose mother is having surgery tomorrow.

This is the point where we traditionally do what we call "Council Aerobics," just to see who is here and who we are. So I'd like to ask everyone who is east of the Mississippi to stand.

(Audience members stand.)

TIM BYRNE: That looks like two thirds of the room. All right. West of the Mississippi?

(Audience members stand; applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: About two thirds of the room.

TIM BYRNE: If you come from an island somewhere.

(Applause.)

TIM BYRNE: Library types, let's see all the public librarians.

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: About five.

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: State Librarians.

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: Five again. Law and court librarians?

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: We got about ten of them. Oh, academic librarians.

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: And most of the room stands, yes. Then anyone that considers themselves special, and I didn't mention? (Laughter; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: We did issue an invitation to library directors to come to the meeting, and I'd just like to see how many library directors we have in the room this morning. (Audience members stand; applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, wow.

TIM BYRNE: About 20. Since we issued the invitation to library directors and some were not able to come, I wonder, how many people are here as stand-ins for their director?
(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: So we know some of these people. We will watch them to see if they behave differently.
(Laughter.)

How many people here were depository librarians before 1995, when GPO introduced this plan for a transition to a more electronic depository program?
(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: Just about 30, 35. These are the dinosaurs. (Laughter.) You new people, if you want to, talk to these people to find out what it was like when they received a lot of tangible materials. I see a lot of people talking today about trying to reduce the amount of processing

time that they have to do for depository materials. And I think back to the old days, and you don't understand.

(Laughter.)

One of the things we like to ask is funding, how you got here. How many people are fully funded by their libraries to come?

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: So looks like about 90 percent of the room. How many are partially funded?

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: How many are here on your own ticket?

(Audience members stand; applause.)

TIM BYRNE: About seven or eight, very good. We know that these are tough times, and so we're really appreciative of both the institutions that support your attendance, as well as those of you who pay your own way. All right. How many of you are tired of standing? (Laughter.)

Well, in that case, I'll then go ahead and turn the mic over to the Public Printer, Bob Tapella.

BOB TAPELLA: Thank you, Tim. Appreciate that.

Can you all hear me? I hate those microphones.

Well, Tim, thank you for the nice short introduction. (Laughter; applause.) Okay. You can clap.

Well, Mr. Chairman, members of Council, friends, and colleagues, I am very pleased to be here in beautiful Tampa at

the Spring Depository Library Council Meeting. Now, I was down in Tampa this past January. I was actually in St. Pete's Beach on some other business, and we flew in and out of Tampa. So I made a little detour to the University of Tampa and the MacDonald Kelce Library.

And I know Elizabeth Barron is here somewhere, Elizabeth, are you here? I saw you this morning. She's hiding almost in the back row. And she's the depository coordinator at the MacDonald-Kelce Library, and Marlyn Pethe -- who I don't think is here this morning -- she's actually covering the fact that Elizabeth is playing hooky at the library. Apparently, this is a busy time for them. The students -- what are they, in finals or just about there?

We had a great visit, and they shared some -- a lot of time with me and some insights. And they also shared that they were pretty excited about having the DLC here. And I think as we saw with last night's reception, they have been very hospitable to us, and I think we owe them all a great thank you. So, Elizabeth, thank you.

(Applause.)

BOB TAPELLA: Now, I'm going to digress just a bit and perhaps go off script, which I know probably makes Ric and a few others out there nervous, but something interesting occurred. And that is GPO has a two-year leadership development program, and its participants rotate through

various locations throughout GPO, all our different business units. And there's required course work and classroom time, and, of course, there is required reading.

Now, I'm not involved in the curriculum, but I have read or I'm in the process of reading all of the required books. I thought I ought to know what we're teaching. And one of them is called What Everybody Is Saying, an ExFBI Agent's Guide to Speed Reading People. Now, imagine my surprise when I was reading the acknowledgments on, what is that, Page 16.

And it reads: "Others contributed in their own way to this project, and I must recognize them, individually." Now, this is Joe Navarro, the author. "My dear friend, Elizabeth Lee Barron, at the University of Tampa, is a Godsend when it comes to research."

I thought that was pretty cool, and I think, you know, every now and then people actually do appreciate what all of you do each and every day in your jobs. And that's a good testament. Congratulations, Elizabeth. It actually is a pretty good book by the way. (Applause.)

Of course, I want to congratulate Ric Davis and his staff, wherever they are, for another great conference. And, in particular, I'd like to thank those who are involved in the logistics. You know, we spend so much time on content, and most of these folks up here are dealing with the content piece

of this conference. But these conferences don't go on without the logistics and everything that we have.

And so I want to, personally, thank a few folks, who were involved in logistics. Kathy Brazee. Kathy, are you in here, or are you working? Kathy? Lance Cummins, Lance?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's by the door.

BOB TAPELLA: Lance is guarding the door. Nick and Yvonne Ellis. I see Yvonne. Where's Nick?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's at the very back.

BOB TAPELLA: He's at the very back, Nick Ellis. (Applause.) Bridget Govan. Bridget? She was behind the registration desk, right? Michelle Hawkins.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not here.

BOB TAPELLA: Not here. Marian McGilvray.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not here.

BOB TAPELLA: Not here. Debbie Smith. (Applause.)

You guys have done a great job, once again, and I think we all owe you a great thank you.

Now, as I have been traveling the country, meeting with so many of you, one question keeps popping up, or at least has been popping up since January 20th. And that is, "Are you still the Public Printer and for how long?" Now, let me reassure you, I am Bob Tapella, and I am the Public Printer.

Now, I did submit my letter of resignation to the

President at the end of the Bush Administration; however, it was not accepted. And I was retained by the Obama Administration, although, I'm not sure for entirely how long.

Now, I've told the White House and Congress if I have my choice, which I may or may not have, I would like to stay through March of 2011, so that I can be certain that many of the projects we've begun in the areas of technology investment, plant investment, and people investment, are complete.

What I did pledge to all of our senior managers and our Union leadership is one, that regardless of the timing, we will have a smooth transition; and, number two, that I intend to work until my last day. And I think as you look at the agenda and some of the other things going on, you'll see that in this area we are moving forward.

Now, another question that is regularly asked is "In these uncertain economic times, how is the financial health of GPO?" Well, let me take a minute or two and talk about our entire enterprise. As most of you know, GPO is the largest industrial manufacturer in the District of Columbia. In terms of printing companies and what we do in our factory, last year GPO had plant revenue of approximately $159 million, plus another $300 million from the production of passports.

Now, if we were a private enterprise, ranked by Printing Impressions Magazine, on their top 400 list, we would

rank in the top 20 printers nationwide. And, perhaps, we're one of the largest print buyers, as we purchased nearly half a billion dollars worth of product from over 2,010 printers from around the country, printers in every state, plus Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Mariana Islands.

Our size, however, does not make us immune to the economic storm facing everyone in this room. The demand for passports has dropped significantly. Last year he Department of State required 24.5 million e-passports. This year the demand is closer to 10.5 million.

Now, GPO is financially healthy and thriving, but I won't kid you. Our budget is tight this year. We are, however, weathering this economic storm. And we're weathering it because we have incredible managers and employees, who are dedicated to our mission.

And we're not going to get something like money in the way of providing free open and permanent public access to the documents of our democracy. We're just going to be a little bit more creative this year.

Now, tomorrow, Tuesday, you will have a full briefing on FDsys, but I really want to congratulate Mike Wash and his team for launching FDsys at the beginning of this year. Now, I know that there were at least a few of you who might have been a little sceptical about whether or not we'd actually launch FDsys.

Given GPO's track record in the not too distant past, and I know there's at least a few of you -- I guess, Tim was calling them the dinosaurs -- that remember the infamous IPS. What was it? I think it stood for the Integrated Processing System, otherwise known as, what, the $11 million sink hole, until Judy Russell pulled the plug.

And, actually, last night at the reception, Judy and I were kind of laughing about it, and just what a difference we have now at GPO. FDsys was launched, it is live, and it has been an incredible success.

Now, on March 4th, which is GPO's birthday, we celebrated GPO's 148th birthday. We brought the entire FDsys team up in front of the entire GPO family in Harding Hall, a room about this size. I was amazed at just how many people were involved in FDsys. Standing side by side, multiple rows deep, they filled this entire stage area.

Now, there's a few people from the FDsys team here, today, in Tampa, and I'd like to publicly thank each one of them. Selene Dalecky. Where are you, Selene? Selene is our program director. (Applause.) You can keep standing, Selene. Is Blake Edwards here? Oh, you're giving me bum advice there, Ric. Carrie Gibb. Carrie? (Applause.) And I'm guessing sitting in between the two of you is Lisa LaPlant. Lisa, come on. (Applause.) Thank you, all. You did a terrific job.

Now, on March 9th of this year, I sent a letter to

President Obama, and I indicated that his initiative on transparency and open Government was important to me and the men and women of the Government Printing Office.

I pledged our full support and indicated that we'd like to help him implement it. After all, we've been providing transparency since GPO was established in 1861, and it has been the intent of Congress since 1813, when the statutory antecedents to the FDLP, were first enacted.

Now, with the letter I attached five goals for the President's review, and, more importantly, accompanying anything actions the GPO is prepared to undertake to help him implement his initiative for transparency and open Government.

First, position GPO's Federal Digital System (FDsys) as the official repository for Federal Government publications.

Second, enable and support Web 2.0 functionality through FDsys, to support public comments on pending legislation.

Third, establish a demonstration project to apply Web 2.0 features to rulemaking documents.

Fourth, participate in and lead efforts to standardize electronic publishing formats;

And, fifth, link the White House Website to FDsys for public searches of Government documents.

Now, although we've tried to widely disseminate the

letter, if you haven't had a chance to read the details and the specific actions, we have copies available today. I also want you to know that Mike Wash, and some of his folks, have been working very closely with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, who is responsible for open Government initiatives, and the letter was very, warmly received.

We also have a GPO detailee, James Smith, at the White House Office of Management and Budget, who, among other responsibilities, is working in the area of open architecture.

It's hard to believe, but it is appropriations time, once again. Now, I'd like to begin by thanking all of you who communicated to House and Senate on last year's appropriation. Your help made a difference. Congress was quite generous, which is a tribute to the men and woman at the GPO, who every day work to keep America informed.

Now, Ric in his talk is going to go into detail about S&E Appropriation and what we got, so I'll stay focussed on the entire appropriation. The bill provides appropriations totaling $140,567,000 for GPO. Now, that is a 12.7% increase over the level of funding in the continuing resolution. This compares to an increase of 10.8% for legislative branch, overall, in the bill. We did very well.

Now, apart from providing for significant increases in funding for the GPO, the appropriations signal several

important policy initiatives.

First, it eliminates the shortfall in Congressional printing, which was one of my key initiatives. We were funding that through our revolving fund, which meant we had limited resources available for reinvestment in GPO.

Second -- and probably near and dear to your hearts -- after an extended period of relatively flat funding for the S&E Appropriation, it begins to fund several important projects, that GPO will focus on this fiscal year, for the Federal Depository Library Program.

One, data storage;

Two, outreach and online educational training;

Three, modernization of item selection systems, and other applications;

And four, additional funding for cataloging and indexing.

Now, our request for fiscal year 2010 will include funding to continue these and other projects. We also hope that as a takeaway from this conference, we will be able to build consensus on priorities, for future funding requests.

Now, more generically to GPO, the appropriation provides for funding for the new roof; I think that's about $3 million. And, approximately, $995,000 for elevator renovation and repair, reducing the pressure on our revolving fund to pay for critically needed building repairs.

It also provides a million dollars in new funding for continued development of FDsys. Though modest in scope, the funding for FDsys represents the first time Congress has appropriated new funding for GPO's online information dissemination mission to the revolving fund. In the past they've been very generous, in allowing us to carry prior year funds forward for the purpose -- first time for new funding.

What takes it even a step further is that funding for FDsys was emphasized by the House Appropriations Committee, in its press release on the bill when it said, and I quote, Government Printing Office: $141 million, including funds for a new digital system to preserve and to provide access to U.S. Government information. I think that is incredible. So thank you, all, who participated and helping us get that funding. I do appreciate it. (Applause.)

Well, on Wednesday I'm going back to the trough, as it were, and we have our House Appropriations Hearing this coming Wednesday. This year our total request, and you're getting a sneak peak of this, so don't go telling everyone until after Wednesday.

Our total request is $166,307,000 which will enable us to:

Meet projected requirements for GPO's Congressional printing and binding operations, as well as information dissemination during fiscal year 2010;

Provide investment funds for necessary information dissemination projects in the FDLP;

To complete the development of FDsys and implement other improvements to GPO's information technology infrastructure;

And, unfortunately, we still need it. Perform essential maintenance and repairs on GPO's buildings.

And I know at least one of you in this room was asked to testify on our behalf as well, and that's Mary Alice with the American Association of Law Libraries, so if you want to bend my ear, Ric's ear or Mary Alice's ear between now and Wednesday, feel free to do so.

And moving on -- as many of you know, during my travels as Public Printer, I've had the opportunity to visit a number of libraries around the country. Now, while I haven't gone out to specifically visit one library or another. As diverse as the job is of Public Printer, I'm on the road quite a bit, and I always try to fit in a visit or two with my other duties. Now, just last week I was in Minneapolis, at the University of Minnesota Wilson Library and Kirsten Clark, the depository coordinator was my gracious host.

Kirsten, are you here? I know you are. Kirsten, thank you. (Applause.)

I've also visited Tulane University, the Howard-Tilton Memorial Library. Now, no one from Howard-Tilton is

here, however, James Duggan -- James, where are you? Ah,
front row, right next to Mary Alice. James is at the law
library at Tulane. He also is the new president of AALL
(American Association of Law Libraries). Thank you, James.

One of the interesting things at Tulane is, I was
able to see the recovery effort, because unfortunately like so
many other depository libraries, it's in the basement, and it
flooded during Katrina. And all of the books were brought
out, and they have this process for bringing the books back
in. And I was able to see that recovery process and,
amazingly, while there was a lot of damage, the majority of
the collection is coming back.

And it was saved, I understand, because of the
compact shelving. They were like bricks. And so the water,
while it destroyed covers, didn't destroy content. And one of
the little benefits that's coming out of the disaster is that
they are now cataloging everything that's going back into the
library. I thought that was just incredible.

I also visited the Law Library of Louisiana, while I
was in New Orleans, and on a trip to Florida I visited the
Florida International University Green Library. I have also
have visited the University of Central Florida Main Library --
and, Rich Gause. Rich, are you here? Rich is standing in the
back. Hello, Rich.

And, of course, I mentioned I visited the University

of Tampa, the MacDonald-Kelce Library, and Elizabeth is in the back of the room. What is it with the back of the room and you guys?

Now, on a couple trips to New York, I have visited both the New York Public Library and the Brooklyn Public Library. I made it out to the San Francisco Public Library, and Kathy was my gracious hostess. Thank you, Kathy.

I also visited the Law Library of San Bernardino County, which won our "Depository Library of the Year last year." Larry Myer, I know you're here; again, the back row. (Applause.)

Within the past month or so, I visited the Philadelphia Free Library, and earlier this year I visited the University of Illinois at Chicago, John Shuler's library. Thank you, John. Goodness gracious, I guess this was -- last month I visited the Indianapolis Marion County Public Library and the Indiana State Library. This past summer I was at Cornell University, The John M. Olin Library. And near and dear to my heart, I happened to make it out to my Alma Mater, and that is the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo Robert E. Kennedy Library. So that's where I've been traveling so far.

I have visited one other library, and that's a non-FDLP library; however, they are considering obtaining FDLP status, and that's the Naval Oceanographic Library in Stennis, Mississippi. As some of you probably know, we have a

production -- a secure production facility on the John C. Stennis Space Center in Mississippi, and I was able to visit the Naval Library there.

Now, the SuDocs staff, especially Robin Haun-Mohamed, who is passing notes in the corner, (laughter) have done a great job arranging these visits and making certain that I'm visiting the full spectrum of different types, sizes, and kinds of libraries. One of these days, I will get to a travel library, Carlene, though.

I've also been learning a lot. Now, my main purpose in these visits is for me to learn about the issues facing the different types of libraries involved in the program. I will also admit that I always ask to see something unique at each library. Now, it doesn't always have to be in Gov Docs, though, but it does need to be something that I just couldn't find anywhere.

Now, with the incredible diversity of the libraries in the FDLP, you are a treasure trove of unique and incredible collections. And for me, personally, it's actually a lot of fun. I think it's one of the perks that comes with the job. It may be the only perk that comes with this job.

Now, I've gotten to see some really interesting things, such as:

A replica of Sherlock Holmes' study;

A complete and absolutely gorgeous collection of the

Code of Federal Regulations, including an original Title 1;

A cuneiform from the Bronze Age;

A whole room dedicated to calligraphy, compliments of Kathy;

And some incredible hand-bound artists books, which John showed to me.

Now, I can spend hours talking about the fun side of this job, but I'll go back to the real purpose of these visits. It's very helpful for me to put things into context when Ric and his staff bring library issues to my attention.

I can then ask perhaps more intelligent questions, such as how something might affect a particular library, now that I've seen so many, as opposed to simply asking questions in the hypothetical.

Now, I'm also seeing some trends, particularly in light of the economic situation we're all facing, funding cuts, imagine that. Is there anyone in this room whose library is not facing funding cuts? Larry Myer, Law Library of San Bernardino County, apparently the only library not facing funding cuts.

Coupled with that, there seems to be a greater demand from patrons, who are now unemployed and needing resources, particularly computers and Internet access. And as I've been wandering around and visiting libraries, one of the things that was sort of interesting -- I always ask, you know,

what's one of the biggest problems you're facing? And what has amazed me, one of the things that keeps coming up is outlets to plug in laptop computers. (Laughter.)

You know, here I was expecting space issues or, you know, something. And it's juice, because that's how patrons are using the libraries today.

And for those that don't have laptops, it's the line, particularly the computers and Internet access. Now, what was interesting is, when I went to visit the Brooklyn Public Library, they have a whole section of computers, and you plug in your library card so you can get in the que. And the librarian that took me around -- and I'm going to actually get my name correctly -- Danny Luce was kind enough to take me around. And so we que'd in and, sure enough, 48 minutes was the time, the wait time, and this was in the middle of an afternoon. It was like a Thursday afternoon or Tuesday afternoon; 48 minute wait was the anticipated wait to get on to one of the public access computers. And so we waited, and, sure enough, that 48 minutes, bingo, our computer was ready.

What's also interesting is access to Government Publications, such as the Employment Outlook Book, and that's actually something people like in book form. They like flipping through the pages. And in more than one library we have found copies of it in multiple locations. It's not just with Gov Docs. It's in a career center, and it's in the

business section. And, of course, unfortunately, other
benefit type publications seem to be very, very important.

In fact, when we were in Indianapolis, they have a
computer lab, and on Sundays they dedicate a computer lab just
for people who are applying for unemployment benefits. And,
apparently, Sunday is the day if you do it before 4 p.m., you
can get your check on Monday, or something to that effect.
And so they have opened up new resources just to serve the
patrons right now because of what the need is.

Now, I'm also seeing, firsthand, how the different
types of libraries are serving their patrons, and I can be
honest. I had a much better understanding of what serving a
patron really means. And guess what, it is different at every
one of these libraries. Yet, there's that common thread.
Everyone was talking about how they serve their patrons.

And, you know, that's really what this conference is
set to focus upon. As you may recall at the Fall Conference
in Washington D.C., I asked Tim, to focus this conference in
two areas:

One, how the partnership between depositories and
GPO can thrive;

And, two, how the relationship between the regionals
and the selectives can be strengthened.

And looking at the agenda, I believe Council has
this conference squarely on track, because at the end of the

day it's all about serving your patrons.

Now, during this afternoon's session, I want to stress that GPO wants to hear from Council, library directors, librarians, and others in attendance, so that we can develop actionable items with Council. I want to reiterate that we're focussing attention, as well, on the priorities Council and the library community have given to us already, continuing development of FDsys and getting off of the WAIS, and the items that we received in budgetary funding for this year, in addition to filling our statutory mandates associated with the program. I guess that's the disclaimer. There should have been an asterisk there, and it's in the fine print at the bottom of the page. I want you to know that additional items from this conference will be factored into those existing priorities and other budgetary considerations.

Now, I already know what GPO thinks about these issues. These folks are quite vocal. Okay? This is your opportunity to share with us, and I hope you will take that opportunity very seriously.

Now, to conclude my remarks, I want to go broad, again, and I'd like to switch topics to something that affects GPO and is near and dear to my heart. And that's the topic of sustainable environmental stewardship. Now, since I've been Public Printer, sustainable environmental stewardship has been a great focus of mine and the agency's. And it means more

than going "green." It means being proactive and making
changes so that GPO becomes a more efficient operation that
makes better use of the resources under our control.

Now, we articulated a vision for the entire
lifecycle of what GPO produces, from how we source the raw
materials, from how we produce our products, to what happens
to our products when our customers are done with them.

For GPO this means a variety of initiatives, from
moving from web offset presses to digital equipment to reduce
paper consumption. Accelerating the reengineering of our
business processes to take advantage of efficiencies offered
by digital technology. Conducting energy audits throughout
our facilities to reduce energy demand. Using more
environmentally responsible paper. Reducing total amount of
waste generated by our operations, and to install a "green"
roof on our building in targeted areas to double the life
expectancy and reduce our heating and cooling demands in the
future.

I have a video to share with you that a accompanies
our annual report, and it focuses on sustainable environmental
stewardship, as good business and good government. Let's roll
the video.

(Video played.)

(Video end.)

BOB TAPELLA: So that concludes my remarks. I have

the pleasure of introducing Ric Davis, acting superintendent of documents, and I understand when Ric is done, we will be available for questions and answers. I guess available for you to ask us questions, and we will answer them. Ric. (Applause.)

RIC DAVIS: Good morning, everyone. I am Ric Davis. I'm the acting superintendent of documents and the director of the library services and content management business unit at GPO. And I want to speak on behalf of myself and the 106 great people that I have working with me in the business unit, many of whom are here today and a number of whom are back, keeping things running in the office.

I want to begin by welcoming, again, all of you to beautiful Tampa for the Spring Meeting. I also want to reiterate the many thanks to the University of Tampa, as well as the University of Florida, University of South Florida, LexisNexis and Markive for sponsoring the wonderful event at the University of Tampa last night. And I know many of you were able to attend. And I want to give you a round of applause. (Applause.)

Rather than say this at the end, I usually like to start off by saying, not only am I available throughout this conference, but I'm always accessible by e-mail. During these speeches, I think this is the only time that my Blackberry is physically not connected. It's over here. I know many of you

reach out to me a lot during the conference and after. And I want to encourage you that when you need help from GPO, we have a customer relationship management system, but I'm also always accessible at RDavis@GPO.gov, and, please, never hesitate to get in touch with me.

Before we begin, I want to extend thanks to the esteemed Council members who are ending their tenures this fall. Our chair, Tim Byrne; Denise Davis, Denise Stephens, Katrina Steirholz, and Kendall Wiggin. Your service and dedication is appreciated, and I want to personally thank you.
(Applause.)

A couple of items of note; Bob mentioned the two critical sessions that we're having this afternoon. First, on how the partnership between depositories and GPO can thrive, and how the relationship between regionals and selectives can be strengthened. I encourage all of you to attend those sessions this afternoon.

Two sets of questions related to those are going to be presented for discussion, and these will help drive near-term, mid-term, and long-term actions related through our strategic vision. Additionally, the questions are also in your meeting book. For persons not able to attend this session, we also have a web page where we're going to garner additional feedback. Also from you, after the conference, if you'd like to submit additional comments.

We're also going to be holding additional OPAL online programming for all libraries, OPAL sessions, as soon as we get back to GPO on these two sessions. And I look forward to more involvement from persons, who for economic or other reasons, were not able to make the event.

Bob talked a bit about the budget. I'm happy to stand up here for the first time in four years and not say that we have flat funding for the salaries and expenses appropriation. And I want to thank, again, all of you who supported us in this process.

H.R.1105, the Omnibus Appropriations Act, provided funding for several very important initiatives. Bob mentioned the million dollars for FDsys, which is very critical. Additionally, we had earmarked funds for several S&E initiatives.

First, data storage; it is critical that GPO have adequate server storage to ensure space is available for the continual growth of the electronic collection. The data storage we require for additional content comes from increases in cataloged items and additional fugitive documents that we find with your help that we want to make available for permanent public access.

Additionally, we have funding for FDLP outreach and online educational training. I mentioned OPAL, which we were able to procure for, literally, $800 to get us started. We

now have some real funding to provide additional outreach.

Robin is going to be working very closely on this, and she'll talk about it through the conference. We're going to be working with the Office of Personnel Management, their training and management assistance program, to develop comprehensive web-based educational training modules for use by depositories. I think this also will help in terms of training online that you may need, associated with FDsys, as that continues to roll out.

Bob mentioned funding for modernization of item selection systems and other mainframe-based applications. Of particular importance in that regard, right now, is a critical need in our depository distribution operation, the conveyor system. Some of these pieces that run the distribution system have literally been condemned by our engineering department, so we need some critical funding to upgrade from duct tape, to hold these things together, so that we can continue to distribute tangible items.

As part of that process, Robin is going to speak more during the conference about some of the critical evaluations that she's leading of the distribution operation to improve processing of materials and making sure that you're getting the right product.

In addition, we were very, very happy to see that we received a million dollars for additional cataloging and

indexing. For this and for all of these various initiatives,
we've come up with spend plans that we're going to be sharing
with you in the interest of transparency to make sure that
we're spending these dollars in the right places to provide
the optimal amount of product and service for the library
community.

Laurie has put forward to me nine separate projects
associated with this million dollars, all with the goal of
increasing acquisitions and cataloging of Government resources
and thereby promoting openness and transparency in Government.
In particular, those projects are devoted to continuing work
on the historic's shelf list, serials management, authority
work for the CGP, historic shelf list digitization and
automatic record distribution, among other things.

As Bob mentioned we're very pleased with the work
that's being done on FDsys. The information on GPO Access is
in the process of being migrated to FDsys, and this entire
process is expected to be completed in mid-2009. You'll hear
more about that tomorrow from the FDsys team.

At this point the collections that are available in
FDsys include Congressional Bills, Congressional Documents,
Congressional Hearings and Record, Congressional Reports, the
Federal Register, Public and Private Laws, and the Compilation
of Presidential Documents. The migration is continuing to
occur on a collection-by-collection basis, and GPO Access, as

you see it today, will continue to remain available until this entire migration is complete.

I want to speak for a minute about bulk data downloads, as well. GPO has recently been called upon by Congress and the joint explanatory statement on the Omnibus Appropriations Act to work closely with the Library of Congress, including the Congressional Research Service and the Law Library of Congress, to discuss access to bulk data.

I know over the years, as we've done biennial surveys, there's been an increasing percentage of libraries who have had some interested in getting bulk data from GPO. Right now, of the 70 or 80 applications that we have available through GPO, we have about 7 of those that provide access to bulk data in a very convoluted, locator coded, non-XML format. And I won't really go beyond that.

But to address this request, a task force had been assembled, with representatives from these various entities, to look at how we can provide access to bulk data. We're going to be working very closely with these other organizations to -- with our goal at GPO of making bulk data available in an easy-to-use format, for those who want to retrieve it through GPO's Federal Digital System.

FDsys has been designed to support geographically dispursed content repositories. GPO will be seeking guidance from Council and all of you on the requirements, for how best

we can make use of this information. And for me, personally,
I think this is the best of all worlds, in terms of a future
digital preservation model, where information is housed at
GPO, but we also look to you in partnership with us to house,
for permanent public access, these digital collections for
both access and preservation purposes.

Next, I want to update you on some LSCM library
units specific initiatives. As Bob mentioned, each library in
the FDLP brings something very special and unique to the world
of Government documents. As part of our promotion, marketing,
and outreach program, GPO wants to shed light on these
invaluable institutions that you have and highlight a
different library each month. Beginning in May GPO will be
spotlighting a different library of the month on the FDLP
Desktop and also featuring it on the GPO.gov agency page.
More information to come on that through our listserv and also
through the Desktop.

In addition, we're working on developing a customer
relations program. The goal of this initiative is to identify
ways to improve services and communications with you as
depository libraries. We're working with a contracted company
called Outsell, Incorporated, that is helping us better
categorizes FDLP libraries and determine your unique needs,
based on library type.

We've very fortunate to have Leigh Watson Healy from

Outsell here with us at the meeting.

Leigh, are you in the room by chance? Coming this afternoon. Okay. To learn more about what GPO is doing with Outsell and its customer relations effort, I encourage you to attend our session at 5:30 this afternoon.

Next, I want to speak about the value of the FDLP. Over the years one of the questions that has often been raised to me, during events like this is, "My library director, my dean, and others, want to better understand -- particularly in the digital age -- what is the value of being in the Federal Depository Library Program?" I encourage all of you to take a look at the value of the FDLP web page we've recently launched on the Desktop, and I believe there's information about that in your handout packet as well.

The page is intended to highlight the value of being a depository library, including the services that GPO provides to FDLP members and services that all of you, as FDLP members, provide to each other and the larger library world, in terms of our network. GPO has used feedback, from over the past year, to develop as well this value proposition of what it means to be in the FDLP. This is a living document. I encourage all of you to take a look at it, and I appreciate your feedback that you can provide on that.

Leading into that, GPO working with the Depository Library Council has also been working on developing a

strategic plan leading up, for the next five years, to 2014. Three goals that we identified in developing this plan were.

One, to develop new models for Federal depository collections;

Two, to develop new models for Federal depository services;

And, last, to develop new models of communication for the Federal depository community.

Deliberations on the future of this program, again, will be going on this afternoon, and I encourage you to attend. Part of what I need to hear from all of you on is, where do we go in terms of additional budgetary funding requests going forward? I think it is very much a positive step that we received about a million and a half dollars for new capital expenditures this year, but what are going to be our needs the next five years, going forward on an annual basis? And comments from the strategic plan will help drive that, in terms of things that I ask for from Congress.

Next, I want to give you a brief update on authentication. As many of you know by now, GPO is implementing digital signatures to certain electronic documents on GPO Access and through our Federal Digital System, that established GPO as the trusted information disseminator, but also provide an assurance that an electronic document has not been altered since disseminated by GPO.

In this past year, we implemented an automated signing system for our public key infrastructure, to ease the process of signing all of this content. We digitally signed and certified the FY 2009 budget, and we'll be doing the same with the 2010. We launched authenticated public and private laws, and in January of this year, after successful beta testing and feedback from all of you, we launched authenticated Congressional Bills, as our first Congressional application on GPO Access.

What we're planning to do now is to continue signing, in particular Congressional content, and that will be done through GPO's Federal Digital System. We're also looking at how we can use authentication with you as library partners. Some of you have expressed an interest in having GPO authenticate content that you make available, particularly in partnership with GPO, and we'd like to really proceed forward on that and work with you as a partner in that process. (Applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have a fan.

RIC DAVIS: We need to talk after the meeting. (Laughter.)

Laurie is going to go into more detail on our integrated library system during her presentation, but I wanted to give you a sort of high-level overview on some of the great initiatives that are underway with ILS. The ongoing

capability of our Aleph 500 ILS enhances GPO's ability to perform the statutorily authorized functions of the FDLP, specifically related to the cataloging and indexing program.

Recently, we've launched the administrative module enabling depositories to go in and edit your own directory information, the public interface to the new directory has been launched, we provide access to the CGP via a Z39.50 communications protocol, through which among other things, you can go in and download bibliographic records, so you have access to go in and do that as libraries.

We also created a requirements document and made a vendor selection for authority's cleanup and ongoing authority control. Additionally, we just completed vendor clean-up of controlled headings in 51,000+ bib, and 42,000+ authority records and reloaded those in the CGP.

Coming later this year, we're going to have several additional enhancements, based on feedback that I received from all of you. First, implementation of a login page, specifically for depository libraries to take advantage of our authenticated services in the CGP. This will include configuration of the circulation module and creation of depositories as patrons. We're also going to have serials control, check-in for individual serials issues, all active serials are the ultimate goal of that process.

In addition, as a side note, not so much related to

the ILS, but something that's been on the radar for all of us, in early June, we're going to be launching a new and enhanced Web Tech Notes database that will, I think, greatly improve on what we had in the past, and I thank you for your patience as we developed that.

Next, I'd like to say a few words for digitization. GPO has been working closely with the library community over the years, other Federal agencies, and also the public on a national digitization project, with the goal of digitizing all retrospective Federal publications of the Government. The project includes the digitization of the complete legacy collection of tangible materials, most of which are held in libraries in the FDLP.

GPO, as part of this process, envisions a cooperative, mutually beneficial relationship, with either a private or public sector participant, whereby, the uncompressed, unaltered files, created as a result of this conversion process, are provided back to GPO at no cost to the Government. I want to reiterate. We did not get any funding for digitization, so this would be at no cost.

These files will serve as our digital copies, will be preserved and used for the access -- creation of access derivative files through GPO's Federal Digital System. In exchange, what does a contractor get out of this? What they get is, they are able to maintain a collection of these files

and use them for their own purposes, recognizing that this content must be made available, free of charge, through GPO.

To help meet this challenge, GPO issued in the past year a statement of work. A request for proposal was also posted through Federal Business Opportunities. The review of the proposals is now complete, and GPO, last week, made a decision for an award.

In keeping with the request for my oversight committee, the Joint Committee on Printing -- and because this is a procurement, I am not able to announce at this meeting who we're intending to make an award to. What we've done at this point is, just before I left on this trip, we forwarded information to the Joint Committee on Printing, seeking their approval for us to go forward. So I will be able to share more information, hopefully, in the coming weeks on this procurement.

While we've been waiting on this process, we've also been working with our neighbors at the Library of Congress, National Archives and Records Administration, many other Federal agencies, to work on common digitization standards. There's a website referenced in your packet, www.digitizationguidelines.gov that talk about some of the standards that we've been talking about for digitization, and I'd appreciate any thoughts that you might have on that, because I know there are many, many other digitization

projects going on as well.

Speaking of that, I want to remind everyone that in the past year we relaunched an enhanced version of the Registry of U.S. Government Publication Digitization projects. This is at Registry.FDLP.gov.

What I'd like to see out of this registry is to develop a comprehensive listing of all of the various digitization projects that are going on, within Government, within the library community, and elsewhere, so we can have better dialogue and discussion on what each other are doing, and, also, learn as we establish best practices.

I also want to mention, as we're talking about a lot of these other things, that we're not losing sight of our kid's site; Ben's Guide to U.S. Government. We are in the process of doing a relaunch of Ben's Guide and giving it a new fresh look and feel.

A survey was recently conducted to gather feedback on what users want out of Ben's Guide, and we had over 4,000 responses to our survey. Not surprisingly, most of the suggestions asked for more games, more interactive quizzes, more audio and video. But particularly from parents and teachers and educators, there was a call to action to provide more lesson plans and trying to find a way to take Government information and put them in a format so it can be more readily used in the schools.

We're going to be partnering with our friends at the Department of Education to take advantage of some of their skills and resources, as we go through this redesign. We're looking to have some conceptual models of how this will roll out this summer, and I'd like to hear from any of you who would like to be beta testers, as part of that process.

I also want to take a moment to talk about marketing and outreach. Going back several years to the Council vision document "Knowledge Will Forever Govern," there was a call to action for GPO to work with the library community to better market this program.

Last summer we launched the FDLP marketing plan and the "Easy as FDL" marketing campaign. If you have not already done so, I encourage you to visit the FDLP Desktop, review the plan, take advantage of the free promotional products that we make available and, also, take a look at some of the tips and strategies that we're suggesting for how to market your library.

In addition a set of promotional videos are now available on the Desktop that you're able to download. Most recently we did a "Person on the Street" video, that was both entertaining and also very illuminating about what the general public knows about the work that we're doing. So I encourage all of you to take a look at that as well.

Our next endeavor is also to do public service

announcements free of charge. We're embarking on a campaign
to inform students about depositories, using college radio
stations across the country. To start this process we have
created an audio PSA, and we're reaching out to a sample of
about 20 college radio stations around the country, whose
campuses have depository libraries on them. From there we're
planning to reach out to more campuses with depositories, and
eventually branch out to colleges that don't have depositories
to create better awareness. The first of these will be airing
this summer.

I also want to mention a few minutes about
the -- take a few minutes to mention the FDLP Desktop. We're
going to be having a couple of sessions on that, but as part
of our evolution of the Desktop, we've divided into FDLP.gov
and community.FDLP.gov. Since the launch of the site on
January 5th, we've had about 200,000 page views.

FDLP.gov is intended to provide dissemination of
program-related content, services and news. The community
site is more of a social networking site. There's often been
discussion at these meetings about creating a sense of
community. Where can we go to build expertise and let people
know what we have expertise on. The community part of the
site is being set up to do that, so that we can engage in more
social interaction.

I appreciate all of you who have gone in and created

a profile on that and logged in and taken advantage of it.
For those of you who are unsure about how it works, please,
plan to attend the session that we're going to have where we
talk more about that.

I always want to mention for a second our pre-1976
shelf list conversion project. The goal of this is to convert
the cards in the historic card cataloging system, covering
U.S. Government documents from the 1870s to 1992 to Mark-21
format. The electronic records generated by this contracting
activity, will be available to FDLP libraries and the broader
library community, to assist in your efforts to identify and
catalogue previously uncataloged materials in your
collections.

Records for a batch of these transcribed cards are
undergoing final quality control by Laurie's staff and will be
available in the CGP in the next couple of weeks. I encourage
you to go in and take a look at those and provide your
feedback.

Before wrapping up today, I want to talk about
something near and dear to me, which is community outreach,
public Access Assessments, partnerships, training, upcoming
events. The Public Access Assessments program, being led by
Robin's group, is our individual depository operation
assessment and consultation program.

Assessments will be conducted upon request or as

need is determined by GPO, but as we're going through that
process, if you ever have questions about depository
management, how to run your operation or any question in
general, please, do not hesitate to contact us. We strongly
encourage you to just let us know at any time, when you have
questions or when we can help you.

Partnerships: We have about 18 or 19 official
signed partnerships, with many of you in this room. These
focus on content that is with in-scope of the FDLP that you
house on servers at your institutions, that's with in-scope of
the Federal Depository Library Program. It also focusses on
services that you provide that you wanted to enter into
partnership with us on.

I'd like to double that number in the next year. I
want you to, please, think about things that we can partner
on, reach out to me, and don't just look at past precedent in
terms of things that we've done in the past, but let's look at
new models where we can partner together on various things.

I mentioned as well, early on, the wonderful online
programming to all libraries training module that we were able
to procure for less than a thousand dollars. I want to thank
the libraries that have participated with us in that endeavor.
You're able to use OPAL, to create your own training sessions,
working with GPO, and we can help market and publicize those.
I've been told by the OPAL programmers, that two of the

library sessions that you guys did, were the most viewed OPAL
presentations ever, so, please, keep those coming.

Last but not least, in terms of upcoming events, the
2009 depository interagency seminar will be held July 20th to
the 24th at the Government Printing Office. Registration is
now open for that event. The Fall 2009 Depository Library
Council Meeting and Conference will held October 18th through
the 21st, at our old stomping grounds in Crystal City at the
Doubletree Hotel.

And, finally, I also have a video I want to show.
This is one that I think we might have showed at the last
conference, but I think it's important enough for all of you
to see, again, what the value of the FDLP is. And if we would
roll that now, I'd appreciate it.

(Video played.)

(Video end. Applause.)

RIC DAVIS: I also want to thank all of the budding
stars out there who participated in that. I think you guys
did a great job. Thank all of you for your time and attention
today. And, again, I personally want to thank you for taking
the time to come to this conference. I look forward to
talking to you, hearing from you, working with you during the
conference and after the conference. Thank you. (Applause.)

TIM BYRNE: I think we really are starting to push
up on the lunch hour. I'm not sure we have much time for

questions. Maybe we can take one question from Council.

JOHN SHULER: Either Ric or Bob, I've got to say that what I heard this morning, wasn't what I was expecting, coming into this meeting, because what I heard as a Council member was the depository system is going to end at the end of this month, end of next month, end of this year. But there isn't anything, unless we missed the memo you guys didn't send us, anything that indicates to me that the depository system is ending. Can you categorically stand up and say to these good people here that the depository system has a vital future, and you all are committed to it?

BOB TAPELLA: John, we will both answer that one. Unequivocal, yes, there is a future for the Federal Depository Library Program. (Applause.) And I think if you think about what the focus of today's conference is, it is what does that partnership look like moving forward, and how can we as GPO help those of you in the program do your job better, serve your patrons better?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. From my perspective, I think that's why we retitled the first session this afternoon, not about survival, but about thriving, because that is our goal. Part of what we're doing with this session, where we're categorizing libraries by type is looking at things from an individual customer perspective. Many of you represent different types of libraries.

Part of our challenge, I think, and it's part of the reason we're developing the strategic plan is, with all of the various interests that we all have, our biggest challenge is trying to gain some consensus and consensus on the big issues that we can share with our oversight committee, with our appropriations committee, and that you can share with your Congressional staff.

I think what we need to try to work towards is sending a common message on the things that are really critical and really important. And I think those are the things that will get attention, and I think together with the energy that we have, I think we can do that.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: I just wanted to make one comment to close out the session, and Bob had mentioned in his talk that March 4th is the birthday of GPO. I had heard this before. I just wondered how many of you out there realize that March 4th is the only day of the year that's a command "March Forth." And this is appropriate because depository librarians have long been commanding GPO to March Forth into the Electronic Age. (Applause.)

TIM BYRNE: And just in case you're wondering how I happen to know that fact, I happen to share that birthday.

JUSTIN OTTO: You're 148 years old? (Laughter.)

TIM BYRNE: So it's probably destined that I became

chair of Depository Library Council.

JOHN SHULER: It was meant to be.

TIM BYRNE: So thank you all for coming this morning. We'll see you this afternoon. (Applause.)

(Conclusion of session at 12 p.m.)

NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM -- CREATING AN INFORMED CITIZENRY THROUGH

DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE 21ST CENTURY: FEDERAL DEPOSITORY

LIBRARIES AND GPO THRIVING TOGETHER AS PARTNERS.

Monday, April 20, 2009 2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

TIM BYRNE: Welcome back. I hope everyone had a
good lunch.

One more introduction that I want to do. We had one
Council member who had a delayed flight this morning and
wasn't around this morning when we did introductions, so I'd
like to --

CHRIS GREER: Good afternoon, I'm Chris Greer. I'm
the director of something called the National Coordination
Office. It's an element of the Office of Science and
Technology Policy in the White House. We're responsible for
coordinating Federal spending, networking and information
technology research and development.

TIM BYRNE: Thank you, Chris. Okay. To get sort of
an introduction to this afternoon's session, we'll turn over
to Cindy Etkin.

CINDY ETKIN: Okay. Can you hear me? Yeah. Okay.
I'm going to thank John for that intriguing question that we
ended this morning's session on, and I'm glad we had a very
quick response. I saw both people you mentioned jump up at
the same time. So we're here to continue that discussion on
why we are thriving and how to better thrive and strengthen

our program.

You all have in your book some photocopies of Title 44, the appropriate sections that relate to our programs, Chapter 17, 1710 and 11 that's cataloging and indexing; chapter 19, that relates to the Federal Depository Library Program; and Chapter 41 that relates to GPO Access.

We may be referring to those during this discussion, so I just wanted to let you know they were there. You also have in your packet the questions that we will be discussing this afternoon, for both of the sessions, but we'll just start with this first one to begin with.

I also want to reiterate what Ric said today that we have all these questions up on the Desktop in a web forum for you-all to provide your comments if you're not comfortable standing up at the mic. If you think of something after you've left Tampa and you want to contribute more to the discussions, we welcome that. We do not have a deadline yet for taking down the forum, so there's still plenty of time to get your questions in -- or your answers to our questions.

When I was putting together the FDLP and Directors announcement for that and I was getting the URL for that, I noticed that the final name for that page is New Birth Questions.html. And I thought, Okay, this is going to be needing some explanation here. So let me start with that.

You did hear the Public Printer say that he charged

Council with looking at two issues; one, how GPO and depository libraries can thrive; and, two, how we can strengthen the relationship between regionals and selectives. And he mentioned back in the fall, that he thought this was an appropriate time to do this, because we were looking at a new administration coming in, and we had just finished up our report on the regional conditions. And so this was just a good time to start looking at some of these other issues.

So we came up with this theme, New Birth of Freedom, Creating an Informed Citizenry through Depository Libraries in the 21st Century. New Birth of Freedom comes from the Presidential Inauguration theme that was decided upon by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies. And we thought that there were some common threads that run through this theme that was referring back to Abraham Lincoln, some themes that were similar to what our President is talking about and very similar to the Federal Depository Library Program, and that is we are originating from humble roots. We want to serve the grass roots supporters. We're here for the general public and the transparency in Government.

On January 21st President Obama issued two memoranda to heads of the executive departments and agencies, and I think they are of particular interest to this depository community. In one he stated, "All agencies should use modern technology to inform citizens about what is known and done by

their Government, and disclosure should be timely." And he directed the Office of Management and Budget to provide guidance to agencies "to increase and improve information dissemination to the public," direct relation to what we do, of course.

In the other, he called for an unprecedented level of Government openness "to strengthen our democracy and promote efficiency and effectiveness in Government." And he directed agencies to take specific actions to implement the principles of transparent participatory and collaborative Government.

And then you heard the Public Printer say today about the letter he wrote to the President. So GPO fully supports the open and transparent Government initiatives, and we hope to work more closely with the President and his staff. So in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, the new Obama administration, and the long tradition of the Federal Depository Library Program, what we want to do today is to mobilize you to help us improve the FDLP from the grass roots up.

We want you-all to reach out to Depository Library Council and to GPO, tell us the challenges you face as a Federal Depository Library today, convey your ideas for change or modification, and let us know what GPO can do to help you manage your depository operation in a manner that will create

an informed and engaged citizenry.

So we have the questions, and I'm going to turn this over to Tim, now, to explain how we're going to facilitate this section.

TIM BYRNE: So we think we have about time enough to spend like 15 minutes on each question, and we're going to do this a little bit differently than our normal Council sessions. This is really something we want to hear what you have to say. We don't want you to listen to what Council has to say. So we're going to open up each question, and because we have specially invited library directors to come to this meeting, I'm going to ask that the library directors speak first. And when I say "library directors," I mean library directors, deans, associate deans, if you're representing your library director, and then we will hear from the rest of the audience.

And, of course, when you come to the mic, introduce yourself, give your name and your institution. So the first question: What is the major challenges your library is currently facing, which most directly affect the library's continued participation in the FDLP? So do we have anyone that wants speak to that?

JOAN GIESECKE: Thank you, Tim. I'm Joan Giesecke. I'm the dean of libraries at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, and I also chair the ARL Task Force on Government

documents. The challenges facing our library are the same challenges we're all facing. We are looking at, as a State institution, we are looking at State budget cuts. We're looking at laying people off in the next year. We are looking at losing faculty positions on our campus. We are looking at changing -- losing programs on our campuses. We are looking at a State library that is not going to be any better funded than the university system. And so the challenges we face are the ones everyone is facing.

When it comes to the Federal Depository Library Program, we face the problem of an inflexible program that is not allowing us to provide the best services that we can to our state, because we are restricted from making changes that will make it possible for us to be more effective to provide better services for our campus. And so the budget crises that we're all facing, plus the inflexibility of the program, are the two things that are making it very difficult for us, in our region, to provide really fine services that we need to be providing to the citizens of Nebraska and to the citizens in our surrounding areas, where it takes less time to drive from parts of Iowa to Nebraska, than it does to drive across the state to Iowa City. It takes less time to drive from Nebraska to Colorado, western Nebraska, than it does to drive across the state into Kansas. We need a system that allows us to address the realities we're working with. Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: I've often felt it takes forever to drive across Kansas. (Laughter.)

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Can I ask you a specific question? What changes would you like to make?

PAT STEELE: I won't even stay here. I'm Pat Steele from Indiana University, but we've talked before. We might have just gotten a chorus together and sung, because I think all of us as directors have the same kinds of issues about the inflexibility of the system, our ability to respond using new technology, our ability to respond to the new user needs and expectations. And Joan can speak more directly to needs, specific changes.

JOAN GIESECKE: Thank you, Pat.

Joan Giesecke, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. The changes that we have asked for that we've been asking for, for over six years now, between Kansas and Nebraska, is that we be allowed to have a more realistic view of how you can best preserve a print collection in two regionals that are less than four hours apart driving time. And to 1854, we're all part of the same territory. The line between our states almost got drawn at the Platt River, which is north of Lincoln, and it would have put us both in the same state. We wouldn't be having this argument. So we're going back to 1854.

We would like to move out of the 19th Century. We'd

like to move into the 21st Century. So we want, simply, to use what's already in law, depending on how you interpret it, to have a more flexible approach to being able to preserve print collections in a more positive way, so that we can invest more of our resources into our electronic collections, providing materials in digital form, that type of thing.

Our patrons are not coming into the building to use our print collection. They're coming in to get access to the computer systems, they are using us for places to study, group study, etc. We work closely with our public libraries. We work closely with our colleagues around us. We can get journal articles and digitized materials to each other through interlibrary loan on an average of 18.1 hours, including weekends.

It is ridiculous to think that we can't manage a print collection more effectively that we can. I would like to see that part changed. I think you can do it within the law, or certainly through a better interpretation of the law, if we would simply be dealing in the 21st Century.

CAROL DIEDRICHS: I'm Carol Diedrichs. I'm the dean of libraries at the University of Kentucky. We are a regional depository, and there are several things on a very pragmatic basis for me. I'd like for us to have a much simplified disposal process. I think there are some institutions who would very much like to experiment with new ways of thinking

about how you dispense -- with selectives dispensing, as opposed to building lists, checking everything multiple times. That's one example.

The other is we are a part of the ASERL (Association of Southeastern Research Libraries) Project, which has been widely misinterpreted, I believe, but we're very excited about the possibilities of the idea of having centers of excellence to better serve those particular areas. One of the examples for us at the University of Kentucky is, the works -- the WPA, and the WPA is so important in Kentucky history. And we have very rich and deep special collections on the history of Kentucky and its contribution to our nation. And so we want to focus in part on the WPA, because it ties together our special collections, as well as our mission with Government documents. So we just want more flexibility to provide a better service experience, using that as an example.

PATTY IANNUZZI: Hi there. I'm Patty Iannuzzi. I am dean of libraries at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. We've gone from being a 79 percent to a 39 percent depository. We are not a regional. We're going to continue to go down. We'd like to see a national system, as Joan referenced, a national system of print repositories that are robust that we can all support, that are designated and coordinated, so that those of us who are interested in electronic only, as all of us are, can focus on the electronic only, and we'd like to see

more resources dedicated to the digital preservation for the back files, for the older documents.   Thank you.

JIM WILLIAMS: I'm Jim Williams from the University of Colorado, and I guess I'm confused.   Is this a time we're going to stand up here and make statements, or are we going to get answers?   We've been surveyed and surveyed and surveyed. You've got answers to all these questions, all of them.   So is it going to be a dialogue, or is it going to be a series of statements from us to you with no answers?   I mean, this could be a waste of time.   Let's -- let's -- let's have some back and forth.   I'm confused, or is the venue to be one where we just make statements and sit down.   What do we want to do here?   This is not what I want to do.   I'd like to have some answers.   Are we going to revise T44?   Are we going to work on it?   What are we going to do?   Is it going to be a series of "yes, buts" for another six months?   Where are we?   I'm confused.

TIM BYRNE: Well, I think our plan for this session was to get statements from you, really, and this is all information that is feeding into the strategic plan that we are in the process of, you know, drafting and working on at this point.   A lot of these questions are things that there are not easy answers to, and whether it means amending Title 44 or reinterpreting it, we have to really fine tune that before a definite yes or no is made on that.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. As Tim mentioned
that today's discussions will be feeding right into the
strategic plan for which the three goals are developing
different models. So, yeah, we've surveyed, we've talked
with, and had other activities to feed into what we're doing.
We also know that since we last talked or last surveyed, there
have been a lot of things that have been going on outside of
our libraries, putting more pressures onto our libraries that
may have changed some things.

So in looking at the three goals that we have, what
we really want to do is to try to determine different models
that we can have to look at, to study, to implement or not.
Some of them may need Title 44 revisions, some of them may
not. So that's where we're headed with this.

CLIFF HAKA: Cliff Haka, Michigan State University.
You know, I think a lot of times we express our frustration,
and I guess, I hope I speak for the majority of library
directors when I say we find these collections to be really
valuable and they are of immense and enormous use to our
constituencies on each campus, but the reality on campus, on
all our campuses, people just don't use print anymore. I
mean, now that's not an absolute, but they don't.

And the next generation absolutely, positively is
not going to be. We have an opportunity to move from a print
orientated orientation to something the people -- but if we

remain there, it's just -- we're going to become a museum of things, that a rare person will come and look at every once in a while. The current generation of scholars, the newer ones that are -- certainly our students -- are just completely focussed on online access.

There is just -- and as we are facing -- I talk to many of my colleagues over lunch and stuff, 5-, 10-, 15-percent cuts. To continue to ask us to spend a lot of time maintaining print collections, that we know darn well nobody is using now -- well, not nobody, but almost nobody is using now and fewer are going to use it, it's just flying in to the face. You know, we have to serve our public, and we're going to be putting our efforts into the things they want and that they need, and access to print -- yes, we need to preserve, you know, print copies and all that, but, you know, this just seems unduly negative.

We want to get this information to people, and what we're saying is if we continue with the program as it exists now, it's not getting information to people. It's just not. It's only -- I would say the majority of the use of these collections now come when a reference question comes in that we know we can answer that, and we go to the collection, meaning the librarians, but by and large our users don't.

And if we remain there, it's going to be pointless in the very near future. Given our budget cuts, it's just

very difficult to deal with, what seems to be this, you know, attraction to our last century. Thank you.

NANCY BAKER: I'm Nancy Baker from the University of Iowa, and we're also a regional. And one of my -- I have the same concerns that have all been expressed, so I won't go through that, again. But I think one of my concerns is that -- and the budget cuts are probably just simply accelerating this, things are changing, and we're trying to kind of figure out how to adapt this program that's been here for a long, long time, to kind of work within it. And that's a very normal kind of reaction.

In the meantime, there are a lot of selectives, at least in our region, that are really beginning to question, you know, why do I need to be a selective and things are -- you know, and my fear is that the model is going to get changed, you know, almost whether we want to or not. And it would sure be nice to be doing it in a way that in the end there's been some planning, and there's been an effort to say, here are the goals that we're really trying to accomplish here. And we're going to try some things to get there.

It's going to happen almost by default, and it may not be the result we want in the end. So I guess that's one of my concerns is that if we kind of keep waiting and adjusting, and as Jim said, you know, we appreciate being asked, but it's kind of time to do something. And I guess

that's -- and there are some groups that are stepping up to say, We're going to do something here. Just please give us the means. You know, please, give us the ability to do that. So that maybe we can be doing this in a little more systematic and intelligent way that's forward looking. I guess that's really what would be my point.

TIM BYRNE: Do we have any other directors who wanted to make comment? Just one quick one. We're running out of time, so let's make it as quick as we can.

GLADYSANN WELLS: GladysAnn Wells, Arizona State Library. I've been in regional libraries my entire career, and I think the reality that I'd like to bring to your attention is twofold. I agree with everything everybody said, especially with Jim -- because I feel surveyed to death as well -- but we have to face situations in our state that GPO cannot gainsay. When a budget officer walks through our stacks and goes like this (hand gesture) and looks at the dust or asks me how often that collection is used, I have no answer. And, second, we have got to do more training. Every library in the country is now a Government depository library, in one form or another. People need that information. (Applause.)

JONATHAN MILLER: Well, I'm Jonathan Miller. I'm the director of the library at Rollins College in Florida, and I'm also Chair of the ACRL Government Relations Committee.

And I wanted to make sure you realized the number one priority on the ACRL legislative agenda this year is Government information. And we feel that way, because we've had -- we've heard from a number of ARL large libraries here today, but this is an issue that is affecting a huge number of smaller libraries, a lot of those are ACRL libraries, many of the regionals, but also perhaps most of the selectives. And I think I'd like to reiterate what Nancy said, that this system is going to change, whether you want it to or not. A lot of selectives are deselecting at a very rapid rate and more will do so. If things don't change at the sort of GPO level, then they will change at the library level.

And then I'd also like to reiterate the last point made that in a digital environment, I mean, you really need to look forward, deal with the print, get that out of the way, and then look forward to an electronic future, both in terms of preservation, in terms of access, and in terms of training for librarians in every library, so that we can be effective assistants to the citizenry in terms of using these resources.

TIM BYRNE: Mary, did you want to make a comment?

MARY MARTIN: I'm Mary Martin depository -- well, temporary depository librarian at the Libraries of Claremont Colleges. My director is here because my library is so fragmented, I don't even know if he got the letter to come to this meeting. Our concerns in my library are space. We are

not a regional, but we're a very old depository. We have a
huge collection, about half of which is not cataloged. We are
being encouraged to move it off-site, move really almost all
of our paper collections off-site, because the directors and
the administrators are saying what some of the previous
directors were saying. Nobody wants paper anymore. People
just want electronic.

I think one of the problems with the model we're
using here is we're looking at paper and transitioning
directly from paper to electronic. So GPO still focusses on a
paper item, and if they find that paper item represented
electronically, then we get a record for that. But what's
really happening is people are going out to find information,
and they're using Google. I teach in library school. I teach
new librarians about Government information, and they can find
it as fast on Google as any of the tools that I give them to
use.

So it seems like we're kind of lumbering along with
this antiquated system, and we're not moving fast enough. I
mean, GPO Access notwithstanding; it's still a WAIS search
engine, and it's really hard to search. So it seems like we
-- I know FDsys has just come up, but we've been waiting for
years and years and years for it. And in the meantime, the
directors and the administrators are saying, You know,
nobody's using these collections, and what have you done?

What do you have to offer us? We're moving them off-site. We
don't have the cataloging, we can't tell people what's there,
and we don't really have a viable electronic representation of
information available in the Government. It's not an
organized system. So these are all the things we're facing,
and it seems like we're still, like I said, lumbering along,
bogged down in the details of paper. Thank you.

ANN SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders. I'm from the Library
of Michigan. We are a regional, and I really feel compelled
to stand up at this point because -- with all due respect to
everyone who has spoken, and I understand and appreciate their
concerns -- we've only heard from academic libraries. There
is -- we've heard from, other than GladysAnn, everybody who
has spoken has been from an academic institution.

I see a couple of things here. Major challenges I
see from the selectives in my state are the same ones that
everyone is talking about, but I see the public libraries
responding to them very differently. Public libraries have
already winnowed their item selections down. They're now
starting to bring those back up in terms of raw numbers, but
they're all electronic.

They're selection percentages are growing naturally,
but they're growing electronically. They're already there.
They did -- they don't have these large, if you'll pardon the
word "legacy collections" of print stuff. They've already

dealt with it, and they're all ready to move on. And those libraries that are taking print, their taking print that their patrons need in print. They've already asked that question. They're not taking print just in case somebody might want it in print. They're taking print because they know that's what their patron base uses.

It's academic institutions that I'm not seeing make this transition or are only now realizing, Oh, my God, we have to make this transition. And the publics are way ahead of them. So I think those libraries have already made the transition to the newer version of the FDLP. And I also think that we have to really be very cognizant of those of us that were privileged to come here, are in no way a real true cross-section of the community that's doing this work and is trying to provide this kind of service.

JOHN SHULER: One question: As a regional librarian, did you feel in talking to these public libraries, nonacademic institutions, that they felt they had the tools and the flexibility to do the job at the time?

ANN SANDERS: Yes. Once they got past their historic collections -- and we tried to work them. We try not to make it punitive as much as we can. We try to focus on the institutions that are disposing of large amounts of paper that are more likely to hold stuff, that we, as a regional, might need. The small public institutions and the academic

institutions that are only having a current five-year
collection, anyway, well, their disposal problem is going to
go away in five years. They don't need that kind of help.

It's the libraries that haven't seen this coming for
a long time, or in some cases, it's libraries who are trying
very hard to get volume counts out for other reasons that are
now behind the eight ball, in trying to make this transition.

And as far as use, I can say that as a regional,
we're answering more reference questions -- we're answering
three times more reference questions in the Government
documents unit in a year, than our reference desk is. I'm not
seeing it go down.

And, yes, every library can be a depository, every
library can provide access to this information, but putting
something on the Internet doesn't make it that easy to find,
especially for the average patron in the public library. And
those libraries are making the decision that they value being
in the FDLP, they value their connection to the community of
experts, and they're just changing how they do it. And
they're already there.

TIM BYRNE: This will be the last question for this.

CARLA STOFFLE: Well, it's more like a statement,
not a question. I'm Carla Stoffle from the University of
Arizona, and we're a selective. We were the first library to
become all electronic. We don't -- we're a depository, but we

do not receive print. And we work through our State library. We have, again, working through our State library, we have weeded our collections extensively. We're involved with the Greater Western Library Alliance in trying to digitize Federal pre-'75 Federal technical reports.

We work -- at least we did, unless we've stopped, having graduate students find citations for electronic materials that GPO doesn't have a record of, and we supply those. So we've been trying in our little way to, at least, help provide this information, but we've moved on.

My problem is that I don't think it's fair for some of my colleagues to have to -- and as many of them -- to maintain the print legacy collections, in a way that they either stay regionals and they do this, or they become selective. And they begin dumping stuff, and we have no orderly way when you dump the amount of stuff that we have.

And that's what we're going to end up with. We're going to end up with no or very few print collections, the legacy collections, because these libraries cannot afford to do what I did. If they all do, then we're in a heap of trouble about providing access to Government information.

And I do think that we do need different systems. We do need to help the large libraries out, in an orderly way, and I don't think anybody is saying they're not willing to make contributions. They're trying to do something in an

orderly way and not destroy these collections.

JOHN SHULER: Same question: Do you feel you had the flexibility, the tools at hand, to make your electronic conversion and deal with your deselection process?

CARLA STOFFLE: I had a State library that didn't give me any trouble about removing my materials and made it easy.

JOHN SHULER: So --

CARLA STOFFLE: Instead of drawing up all kinds of lists and having to ship stuff around -- and I was also given dispensation because we were the first to try to do this.

I believe that my other colleagues can do this. They just stop being regionals, but then what's going to happen to the system? They can get out of this, and then they can dump what they've got, their legacy collections. They can weed like I did, but I don't think it's going to be good overall for Government publications and Government information.

They can do it, if that's the kind of thing you want prompted by the economic situation.

TIM BYRNE: I did get a note from a Council member asking whether there are any libraries who are willing to hold the print? And I think what I'd like to do is just throw that out and let it mull for a while and move on to the next question. If we have time at the end, we can ask if there's

any comments about that.

Let's go to the second question: What is needed to better support the needs of the Federal Depository Library community within current law? Any needs that will require change in law? If you could suggest only one or two changes to Title 44, what would they be?

CAROL DIEDRICHS: I'll sort of give you my answer to the other question. Carol Diedrichs, University of Kentucky. I think, in part, what Carla is trying to say and what we think needs to be changed is we no longer need 50 legacy collections. Okay? And right now there is no mechanism to change that. So one of the things we, who are regional libraries, are interested in, is a process for determining how many regionals we do need. How many legacy collections we need, and then an orderly process to proceed down that path. (Applause.)

PETER KRAUS: Peter Kraus from the University of Utah, and I'm representing my director Joyce Ogburn. I think one thing that we've talked about in our institution, changes that we would like to see to Title 44, is the elimination of the five-year waiting requirement to dispose of documents. We did a very large weeding project, as part of our renovation, and that would have made things a lot easier for us.

You talked about holding of large legacy collections, and I've talked about this in the future, I think

one thing that ARLs could do -- and, you know, GPO's participation would be welcomed -- is to work with, for example, the Center for Research Libraries; establishing a home for a permanent legacy collection that could be shared among academic libraries, especially those that are shrinking their collections or leaving the system. Thank you.

LARRY MEYER: Good afternoon. Larry Myer, law library for San Bernardino County, and I think Cindy already knows what I'm probably going to suggest. I'm going to change the topic for a minute. The change I would like to see in Title 44 is putting some teeth into making sure that all the agencies and departments in all three branches of the Federal Government submit their material to GPO, particularly, the PACER and -- PACER and other court records.

TIM BYRNE: No other comments on this one? You don't want to change Title 44? I knew I'd get somebody on that.

PEGGY JOBE: Hi. I'm Peggy Jobe, U.C., Boulder, and I'm not going to -- a colleague pointed this out. I mean, I want to know -- we're a regional -- how literal we have to be in interpreting Title 44, because I notice when I look at Title 44 that GPO is required to print a print catalog of the Catalog of Government Publications. And as far as I understand, that hasn't happened in several years, correct? There's no CGP in print?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's correct. We went through a process where we got the approval from JCP in what we'd call like an administrative change in the law, so that we replaced the tangible monthly catalogue with the Online Catalogue of Government Publications, when we got the OPAC from our integrated library system up and running.

PEGGY JOBE: Okay. So you went through an administrative process. So I guess I just have a question about how literal do we have to be, in interpreting Title 44, because it's burdensome for a regional. It's burdensome for the selectives. That's just kind of an open-ended question.

NANCY BAKER: Nancy Baker, University of Iowa. I was hesitating about getting up, because I'm always nervous about talking about editing Federal law. I mean, I'm not naive; just what can happen and what's involved. But I guess what I would I say, if that's the approach that needs to be taken, and is that, whatever we come up with, we come up with something that will ride with us to the future, recognizing that some things we can envision now may well be different down the road and not too far.

Things are changing very quickly in libraries and in publishing and in information, and all of that. And I guess I would prefer to see something that, you know, authorizes information coming out to the public and something without it being so prescriptive, or in such a way that very soon, no

matter what changes we make, it will also start to tie hands
on doing something that is, perhaps, more creative and in the
interest of the overall goal of the program. And, you know,
I'm not sure that the law is always designed to do that, that
well. So I'm hesitating but, you know, to ask you what's
really wrong. We can pick little things from it, but we all
know we'd never design this program, now, the way it is. And
what we would imagine now, may well not be the way it ought to
be in five to ten years.

JOAN GIESECKE: Joan Giesecke, University of
Nebraska, Lincoln. If we going to change T44, at least change
the interpretation of it, in Section -- you know my favorite
Section -- 1912, dealing with regional libraries, where it
indicates that we have to retain everything unless we're
authorized to discard by the Superintendent of Documents. No
where in here does it say it can't cross state lines, but
that's the current interpretation. And someone has yet to
explain to me why we cannot have a regional that crosses state
lines, when it's already been approved by the selectives in
both states, both State librarians and both Senator offices,
both Congressional delegations. We have followed all of the
rules, as we understand then, and we are still being told that
that can't happen. And I don't see anything in this Section
that says it has to be within a state or why a state line is
so important. So that's the change I'd like to see. I'd like

us to get a little realistic about what state lines are.

TIM BYRNE: Going on to the next question:
In what way or ways can GPO help depositories and depositories
help GPO in sorting through priorities, during economically
challenging times. How can the partners effectively reconcile
the needs of the local institution, the needs of the
depository program.

DONALD DYAL: Donald Dyal, Texas Tech University.
I'm the dean of libraries. I also do research. I agree with
most of what's been said here. I have an air-conditioned and
heated and well-preserved landfill. The problem is in that
landfill there's great value. Presently, it is
undiscoverable. I use it regularly. Personally, I find it
annoying that I have to go use it in the form that I do. I'm
not the only one who finds it annoying.

As I listened to the Public Printer this morning and
also to Ric, I heard that GOP -- or GPO rather (laughter)
-- is spending money on lots of public relations initiatives.
They're spending money on lots of things that seem to enhance,
at least in their own minds, the value of the GPO. I'm not
going to gainsay that, but I'm a little concerned about what I
did not hear. I did not hear that there's any money to --
together, jointly -- digitize some of these collections, which
is actually what's needed. I didn't hear that. That's
something that could be done. That's one issue.

The other issue is -- and maybe this is harking back to Question 2 -- there needs to be a redefinition of what constitutes an acceptable depository collection. A digital collection ought to be acceptable. It is what our users want. I have users -- we've all heard this. It's plain. In fact, it's a principle that's been established. If it's not digital, it doesn't exist. You and I know that's not true, but it feels like it's true. And that's what needs to change.

CHARLES BERNHOLZ: My name is Charles Bernholz. I'm also from Nebraska. Joan is my dean. I'm going to try to make a couple of comments from the street, as opposed from the dean's office.

We heard a lot of stories over the years, and I'm a relative newbie to this. A lot of my friends here have been in documents for a very long time, but, you know, everything was going to be delivered, you know, through the Federalists Papers by December, 2007, and we wouldn't be arguing about this, because we'd have all that stuff at home, and we wouldn't even have to come to Tampa to talk about this.

But the reality is that we have to deliver these things to our patrons, and some of us are running into financial difficulties that are not going to permit us to do so in the future. One of the reasons why so many academic institutions are standing up here and the deans have all come, one of the reasons why there's so many people from the

academic level making comments is because there's an awful lot of academic depositories.

I started out in a public library. I opened a depository in a public library, and I'm a -- to be very blunt, I'm a militant public librarian. But I think the important thing is that we have to deliver these materials to our patrons. The model that Nebraska and Kansas have put forward, again, with all the political support that we have been able to accomplish between our states, is designed to deliver those materials to our patrons.

If I don't get something -- if I don't have something at my house, I go to Kansas. It's close, they have stuff, and it's a little bit easier, and we have a very good interlibrary loan program that allows us to do that. All we're trying to do is do that. We're going to be shipping things back and forth to Kansas. They're going to be shipping stuff back and forth to us. They know who we are; we know who they are. There are very few states that have such similar demographics.

I'm not trying to go off with my friend David and hook up with California. Okay? I'm not trying to go off with my friends on the East Coast and hook up with them. I'm trying to do something with a neighbor that we've interacted with, successfully, over the last 100 years or so. So I think it's very important for people to understand that there are

issues, and we're all suffering.

And public libraries and special libraries and academic libraries have all these economic issues that they have to worry about, but we also have this responsibility, otherwise, we wouldn't be here today. We all have this responsibility to deliver these products and deliver these things to our patrons.

It would have been a lot easier if we hadn't heard all of those negative things about being a librarian from the previous Public Printer when we went to Albuquerque, where he bad-mouthed librarians, who were going to be scared to death, because they were going to digitize a couple of things.

Well, they did digitize a couple of things. And they haven't done what they said they were going to do. And we're stuck with paper, I guess, but that's what we have. And what we'd like to do, at least in the model we're presenting, is we would like to be able to share that very effectively, so at least the patrons in our two states and we're not afraid of the neighbors, either, to use that to their benefit. Thank you.

MARTHA BEDARD: Martha Bedard, dean, University of New Mexico libraries. I'd like to speak a little bit about the priorities and to reinforce what my colleague Don Dyal has said in terms of discoverability. I think that if I were to set priorities for my own libraries and for GPO, it would be

about the discovery and discoverability of this vast resource that we have.

One of the ways that we struggle with that right now, with the lack of appropriate metadata and cataloging practices, we have to keep training people to -- who just have to know. They just have to know where these things are, and the reality is that I won't be getting any new positions. I have frozen budget for salaries. So who am I going to hand down this historical knowledge of where these things are, if we don't enhance the discoverability to these materials.

The other problem that I'm struggling with is trying to move some of my materials to less expensive real estate off of the center of campus. What we run into is, but if we move it to a storage facility miles away, we won't know what we have, because we don't know how to get to it. So the things that are most likely candidates to move, should we keep them? We are a regional, and I am committed to serving the citizens of the state, as the only regional in the state, but I can't move the very things I think that would most benefit the rest of the campus, because we just don't know how to find them if they're gone.

GLADYSANN WELLS: GladysAnn Wells, not an academic librarian any longer, State Library of Arizona. I think there are a couple of things, there are a couple other models that GPO could look at. Number one, I think it's very hard for one

size fits all, and that's part of the issue. You've heard a
lot about flexibility.

I think, number two, it's impossible for folks
sitting in Washington to know what the needs of any
institution is, whether it's a regional or a selective or a
small public library. Those of us who are where the rubber
meets the road have to make those decisions, and I would
respectfully suggest that you might consider something like
the plan that we have to file every five years with IMLS. Let
us tell you what the priorities are for our state or our
region or our cross-state region or our citizens. Let us tell
you what we're going to do, instead of you telling us it's
this way or the highway. "You" being collective GPO, not you,
Tim. Let us give you some suggestions, and let's follow
whatever procedure we have to follow. But let's get out of
this box. There are several of us in this room. I've seen
Mary Alice, I've seen Dan, who worked for a very long time on
the interagency working group, revision of Title 44. It is
not an experience I'd like to repeat, but there is a lot of
information out there about what was deemed important,
whatever it was, 12 years ago, Dan?

And so we've got a lot of stuff. As Jim said, we've
got a lot of information. What we don't have is a willingness
to, perhaps, look at other models that could be legitimized
under the current frame work, or as they do things in Arizona,

do it through the damn budget.

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Hi. I'm Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas, of the regional. One of the things I haven't heard spoken about yet, and I think it fits in to this particular question, is that we are, as an academic library, spending a great deal of money to provide digital access, not -- because we don't have another means to provide digital access to those legacy collections.

And I'm also concerned that by using vendors to do this, things that really should be in our public domain are locked up behind proprietary licenses, and I would like to see that changed. I can help people when they come into our building, but I cannot necessarily always directly supply this electronic document to them, without going to the book, itself, and scanning it. I think that's a silly way to do it, so. Thank you.

MARY FETZER: Mary Fetzer from Rutgers University. I think the discovery process is really tantamount to our being able to provide services to everyone. And in the recent White Paper that was released by the Association of Research Libraries on future directions, for the Depository Library Program, it mentioned that I think there are some 30 Federal depositories out there, who are working on cataloging the pre-1976 materials. And I guess my question to you and suggestion that it would be a help to us to know is, one,

defining, first of all, who is going to maintain the legacy collections and then getting their cataloging and being able to know when that national bibliography of Government publications is going to be complete. There is a commercial product out there that some of us are maybe thinking should we or should we not buy. I'd sort of like to have some idea of a projected time frame for this national bibliography. Thank you.

BARBARA COSTELLO: I am Barbara Costello from Stetson University. I'd like to talk a little bit about the priorities of GPO and some of the capturing and cataloging of electronic documents that they're doing. I've noticed, especially with the last few new electronic titles list, and in particular the last one that we received that was sort of cumulative, because it had not been issued for a while, there were a lot of titles on there that are quite old, from the 1970s. There were several that were one- or two-page pamphlets or ephemeral.

And in addition to space concerns, I'm also getting some feedback from my director now about the number of records for electronic titles that we are putting in our online catalogue. And I, personally, don't like to see GPO putting a lot of time and effort into cataloging the type of materials that I just mentioned. I know that if you want to digitize the entire legacy collection, it's going to have to be done,

but there are some documents that are more important to digitize than others. And I would like to see a little more planning go into that. Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: All right. Number four: What challenges are you encountering in providing service to remote users or to patrons who come into the library to use online resources? What can GPO do to help you?

PEGGY JOBE: Hi. This is Peggy Jobe, again. University of Colorado, Boulder, and no director leapt up, so here I am. I think it would be really great if GPO had a robust print-on-demand capability, because a lot of people who come from remote locations, do not have computers, they don't bring thumb drives. So while they can look at the electronic information in our collections, they really would like a tangible copy.

So a print-on-demand feature that really doesn't cost the user anything or at most a nominal cost would be useful, if it were robust and quick. And that could also be used to fulfill claims, because I don't know what the experience of other libraries is, but when we file claims for things that didn't come through on our shipping list, we have an increasing problem getting copies of them.

And so, recently, we asked for the Stat Abs as a claim, it didn't come to us. They said the print supply was exhausted. So then we had to go buy copies from the GPO

bookstore, because the print supply for depository was exhausted. So have a print-on-demand service that costs next to anything.

People can just check a box, and they get a print copy delivered to fulfil claims, because sometimes we actually do need the print. I mean, no one would want to go without a print of Stat Abs. And our users, sometimes they come from remote areas, do not bring thumb drives, don't have computers, don't have a way to deal with the digital files easily.

PAT VAN ZANDT: I'm Pat Van Zandt, from the College of William and Mary in Virginia. And I'm here on behalf of my dean, but now I'm speaking for our Government Information librarian, who also addressed these questions for us. And he said that one of his problems is how to find information when a URL has changed. Many of these agencies remodel their systems annually, at least, he says, it seems that often. I don't know. It would help if GPO could devote more resources to maintaining the PURLS, or come up with a better replacement approach to maintaining the address.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I think one of the things we're finding more and more of a problem are password access only databases. I went through a painful process with Stat-USA recently, and to the extent that I know that you're hands are tied on occasion, but I really think these are barriers that, perhaps, transparency

in Government would not support, if it were known for their
(unintelligible).

TIM BYRNE: What value does your entire institution
receive from participation in the FDLP? Entire institution
can be defined as either entire library operation or the
entire community the library serves, the entire university,
its curriculum, faculty and students.

LORI PHILLIPS: I'm Lori Phillips, associate dean at
the University of Wyoming in Laramie. This is an issue that
the entire state of Wyoming has really struggled with. And
our status as of now, for the University of Wyoming and also
the Wyoming State Library is, that we are without a regional
library, and we're being served currently by GPO.

It was, basically, a two-fold decision. Part of it
was a management decision in terms of return on investment,
and the other part of it was, in Wyoming, we didn't feel as if
we were really serving the needs of the citizens of the state
in terms of the current program. Our goals are to provide
information to people in a usable format, in a timely manner,
and I won't repeat the obvious. People want electronic
information. That's what they want to use.

We don't have people coming to Laramie. If you've
ever been to Wyoming, it's a very rural state, huge distances.
So the model of having print collections on-site simply was
not workable for us. So in our state we're really struggling

right now with what is the value of FDLP for our state? We
proposed a pilot program to GPO, in terms of having a shared
regional within our state, between the University of Wyoming
and the Wyoming State Library, and we haven't gotten any
traction with that idea.

It's a flexible idea; it's a novel idea. And I'd
certainly be happy to share the specifics of that with anyone
that's interested, but we crafted a proposal, came forward
with it, and we'd like to try something different and make the
FDLP really meaningful to our state. Thank you.

KENDALL WIGGIN: Tim, I have a question.

Why can't you just go ahead with the agreement
between -- for Wyoming, why can't you just go ahead with what
you're planning? Why are you waiting for GPO?

LORI PHILLIPS: Well, we want to be good citizens.
We're committed to the program. I won't say that we haven't
considered that very same question. We're not
actively -- we're not actively doing anything right now,
because we're still awaiting official communication from GPO
about our plan.

We've heard that there are as aspects of it that are
questionable, in terms of the legal interpretation of what
we're trying to do, but I may be speaking out of school
because I haven't -- I haven't seen the official
communication. So we're waiting.

          CHRIS GREER: I'd like to hear something from GPO.

          ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: I've been elected according to Ric.

          Cindy, if you're rather, I don't mind.

          The proposal was not -- I'm sorry. Robin Haun-Mohamed with Government Printing Office. The proposal was not really a shared regional. It was a pilot. It was a new model. And it comes down to disposition of materials, that is weeding, when there is not a regional in the state, or it's not served by another regional. And we did talk to General Council, and right now it is against Title 44.

          Cindy, would you like to add to that?

          CINDY ETKIN: Yeah, I would like to add a little bit. Are you done, Robin?

          ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Promise. (Laughter.)

          CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the other things that the pilot proposed was this shared relationship, and that they only receive electronic, and of those things only materials that are Wyoming related. And if you're going to be a regional, you can't pick and choose what you want to receive at this point. That was something that came down from our General Council.

          LORI PHILLIPS: And one clarification on that, what we were attempting to communicate was that, in addition to materials that we would select, we would also develop a

program within our state, to identify documents that were Wyoming related that our citizens want to access and digitize those and add those to our local collection. So we were really trying to craft a collection that meant something to the citizens of the state of Wyoming.

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond in Virginia. I wanted to just comment on this question. In terms of what value does my entire institution receive from the participation, it has been the training that I have received over the years of how to use Government information, how to find it. To be honest, our collection is going down. I'm going through, and I'm doing a very comprehensive weed, because I've got my administration to agree to get our material finally cataloged for what we hold onto. But it is the training. It's my ability to train my co-workers, it's my ability to explain things to our patrons, that has been really critical. The collections only do so much. I think it's the understanding that we share with each other that really has probably given the most value to my institution.

TIM BYRNE: Question six: Could you identify the cost, tangible and intangible, direct and indirect, of being a regional depository or a selective depository? How can the costs of participation in the current program be made more transparent/apparent, to both the depository and GPO, in order to make rational economic decisions during periods of fiscal

challenges?

JOAN GIESECKE: I just apologize for the umpteenth time to my colleagues here. I'm sorry. I keep crawling over you. Joan Giesecke, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. I don't want you to think we haven't figured this out. We answered it in the regional -- I believe it was the regional survey. Is that the one where you asked us for cost data? As GladysAnn said, we have been surveyed quite a bit lately, and we've been filling them out very faithfully. We have figured out about what it costs us. We are at around $680,000 a year, out-of-pocket expenses to be a regional for Nebraska. We think we can cut that down if we could work with a regional -- work in our region, which we call Kansas.

Kansas has also figured out how much money they're spending on it.

Lorraine, do you remember your number?

It was close to a million dollars. We have figured it out. We have sat down and done the cost for the computers that we've got, the cost of storage, the cost of staffing, the cost of electricity. We have to figure that out on our campus, now, because we've got a huge utility bill issue that we're trying to take care of.

So, yes, we do have that information. We've provided it to you. We are happy to provide it to you again. If GPO didn't share that with the Council, we are happy to

send you those forms, but we have provided that information.

PETER KRAUS: Peter Kraus, University of Utah. One area that we have found to be a very high cost is original and copy cataloging, not only of Government documents, but of all monographs. Effective July 1st, we are eliminating original cataloging in our library, except for rare book and special collections and doing a one-year experiment. We are outsourcing it to OCLC, and we hope that -- we are looking at doing this, too, with Government documents, and we hope this significantly brings down the cost.

PAT STEELE: Pat Steele, Indiana University. I think sitting here listening to these comments, what the final answer here really is, for you to provide the flexibility and coordination that we need. Nancy made a very good statement that these things are going to change, whether they're put in a context that you can provide or work with us to help provide, but the comments since she made that remark show me that it's happening already in pretty dramatic ways.

We had a consultant come in and look at our technical services operations. We were putting 30 to 40 percent of our tech services -- resources into Government docs, and he told us right, like number one thing "Quit it. You cannot solve the Gov docs cataloging issues at Indiana University." Believe me, the lightbulbs went off in my head. So we really are -- everyone is out there doing some of this,

and there's no one trying to knit it all together into
something.

And we are smart enough to see what this is costing
and what a real -- I don't want to say "mess." I'm sure
there's a much more sophisticated word, but right now it's
feeling pretty messy as I listen to this. Thank you.

GLADYSANN WELLS: I just told Carla never to sit
next to me again, because I always find the wrong place.
We're right in a path here. Have you noticed, there's a group
of us here. We didn't do this by design.

GladysAnn Wells, Arizona State Library. I don't
think you want that question answered in a public manner for
public policy makers. If the Arizona State Legislature knew
how much this was costing us, I would be in real trouble.
There are not rational decisions to be made about legacy
Government document collections that would benefit the program
in tough economic times. We can't justify it.

So that's why we're asking for the flexibility,
that's why we filled out all those surveys, and that's why
we're here today. I mean, you've got an enormous number of
people who obviously care very, very, very much about this
partnership, but we've got to give it a kick and get it off
center.

DENISE DAVIS: GladysAnn, not to put you on the
spot, but since you were at the mic.

GLADYSANN WELLS: Yep.

DENISE DAVIS: A question: As you think about the cost of operating your library, and you think about the cost of maintaining a depository collection, and you think about the cost of interlibrary lending, are they about the same cost to you, ILL and GPO stuff, depository? Is one half of the other --

GLADYSANN WELLS: No.

DENISE DAVIS: -- as a percentage of your operating budget?

GLADYSANN WELLS: No. There's really not a correlation at all, Denise. I think the reason that we have been able to maintain our regional status is a couple -- there are a couple of critical reasons. Number one, we're in a building that was built for the Arizona State Library, and it can't be used for anything else without tearing it down. So we're not pressured to get rid of the millions and millions of Fed docs that we have there.

And, second, we really work so well with our selectives that we don't have a huge burden of interlibrary loan. And, third, our Government documents collection is not used that much by other than primary researchers and the archival community. It's not normally -- Janet can throw something at me. It's not normally the library community at large that uses it. We get a lot of interlibrary loan

requests for it. We do a lot of work with it. I've forgotten
who said, we do a lot of work for it. We do the data mining
on our staff for questions, but it's really the archivists who
are -- who want the paper, who want to go through it, that
come to it.

TIM BYRNE: Question seven: Given your library's
situation and the discussion thus far this afternoon, what are
one or two things that GPO can do that would most benefit your
library?

BETH HARPER: Beth Harper, University of Wisconsin,
Madison. I'm the documents librarian or one of the ones on
campus. I'm going to broaden this out a little bit, and then
I'm going to mention it here, because it hasn't come up.

If we're talking that we need the electronic, if
that's what people want, we have to have that archived. We
have to have that discovered and archived in a trusted
resource, because there are so many documents that are coming
up and disappearing, and it's just not the agency's mission to
keep it up. We need someone to be doing that. So I guess I
go back to the San Bernardino County librarian person talking
about that.

And, also, I don't know. I can't say my library
would do it, but I know there are libraries that like to do
the digital deposit, to have those extra repositories, some
redundancy in storing the electric documents. I mean, we can

say we want -- that's what our patrons want, and I know our patrons want stuff that was put out a couple years ago and is gone now.

LORRAINE HARICOMBE: Hello. Lorraine Haricombe, University of Kansas. In response to this question, I just want to let you know I've been at Kansas three years now. This has been going on before my arrival. I am now entering my fourth, and it's still going on. Please, give me an answer.

DONALD DYAL: Donald Dyal, Texas Tech University Library. This is only slightly tongue in cheek. I've been dean for, going on eight years. I've never seen a GPO Sheriff come to my facility. I've never gotten a ticket for failure to follow, whatever. I've never had an inspection. And I don't even get any directives, frankly, from GPO about what I need to be doing.

One of the things that was mentioned earlier by someone, I've forgotten who. One of the things that, perhaps, Lorraine and Joan might do, is do what they need to do, because I don't think GPO is going to do anything about it. I don't think they have the power to do anything about it. I understand that GPO has to follow the law, but, you know, if GPO wants my legacy collection back, they can send their 18 wheelers and haul them away, because I can access the stuff elsewhere. Do you understand what I'm saying?

CAROL DIEDRICHS: Carol Diedrichs, University of Kentucky. I'd like to see leadership from the Council and from GPO to define an entirely new model and do what it takes to get it approved.

BETH ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. I have my director in the audience with me in the audience today, and I thank her and all the directors coming and showing their support and having this discussion.

I have two things that I want from GPO. Before I state those, I want to state unequivocally -- Ric, are you listening -- unequivocally, the one thing I do not want changed is the exemplarily customer service I have gotten from some of their staff, Robin Haun-Mohamed, (applause) Kathy Brazee (applause) and others. Everything else is on the table but that. (Laughter.)

Short-term, yesterday short-term: Quality control from GPO. Now, I know the staff have butted their heads against the wall many a time, but if they can improve the cataloging, correct the PURLS, shorten the claim period, do all those icky things, processing things that we've kind of alluded to today and clean it up before it hits us, that's going to cut our processing and workflow in half, at least.

Long-term: Digitization. And I know this has been something that GPO staff, a dream they've shared with all the rest of us, but they're not getting the money for it. They

didn't even get the money this year with the sweetheart money they did get to do some other initiatives.

But maybe it's time for GPO to stop thinking they can do the digitization, but work with us in the community, collaborate with those of us. Somebody's already mentioned CRL. I think it's, what, the CCIC is another possibility, the Western Coalition. Heck, even UNC Chapel Hill is very interested in possibly partnering on some digitization efforts. We have a wonderful Carolina Digital Library that our director is supporting, and there may be a way that we can leverage that. Let's have those partnership conversations for the future, short-term and long-term. That's what we need.

GLADYSANN WELLS: A plea for continued organization, I think more than anything. Carla just leaned over to me and said, Oh, please, God, let us not all digitize the same three things. (Laughter.)

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond. I would like to second that. We are a small university. We are working on digital initiatives. We want to digitize worthwhile material. We tend to do small projects, because that's what we can do. I would love to see GPO do a little more coordination besides the registry of digitized collections. So that if we could, you know, divide and conquer, I think we could actually start digitizing material that, maybe, yes, we can't do all of it, but we could do a

portion of it. We can be responsible for a portion of it and maintaining that preservation for what we create. I know that we're a patchwork quilt. I just think that if we could have more coordination, we could really start attacking those really major titles, that we all really wish we could do, but no one has the capacity to do by themselves.

PETER KRAUS: Peter Kraus, University of Utah. To follow up on that, GPO having greater coordination with the Google Books project. We're currently doing a digitization project on Native American materials, project between the Marriott Law Library and the Department of Indian Affairs through the State of Utah. I did an inventory of the Government documents for one of our associate directors on what needed to be digitized. I found out that 25 percent of those documents had already been digitized through Google Books, through the University of Michigan, eliminating a tremendous amount of work that would have been done, so a greater cooperation with Google. Thank you.

KENDALL WIGGIN: I guess this is a rhetorical question, but those of you who are talking about digitization, would grants from GPO entice you to do more of that? (Applause.)

JIM WILLIAMS: Jim Williams, the University of Colorado. I'm the dean of libraries there. We're a regional. I guess this is a question based on all the information that

you have received today and in those previous surveys, is GPO authorized, within it own protocols, to fund a study on a new model, a new model for the FDLP, or to fund the study and collaboration with some of us in a partner community? In order to answer the question, if we were starting all over today, assuming that the program -- and I am assuming that the program continues to have value -- what would we create if we were starting over today?

I think there's sufficient interest in the community to work with GPO to fund that stuff. I think it's -- I think we've got enough information now, and based on that information, what should that new model be? Thank you.

DOTTIE ORMES: Dottie Ormes, New Mexico State University. And I'm a selective and very new Government documents librarian, but because this digitization information is coming up, I'd like to say that for digitization I think we need to leap way ahead in our thinking. Somewhat like, if they had only developed universal chargers for all the cell phones in the world, we wouldn't be dealing with the problem of not being able to charge our cellphones, you know, all over the place.

It's kind of the same thing. I worked on a digitization project up in Southern Oregon University. We were using one format. We used PTFS. Somebody else was using Content DM. Somebody else was using something else. And we

ran into problems of wanting to share our digitization
projects and share some of that information. So if we're
going to talk digitization, I strongly suggest that GPO, FDLP,
be leaders in thinking that far ahead and really planning
digitization in a reasonable way.

TIM BYRNE: We're getting close to reaching the end
of this period, so I'll just do two more questions and we'll
go.

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of
Kansas. This is certainly not necessarily a top priority, but
something that, maybe, could be considered. While there's
digitization happening and there's libraries purging their
collections, there also -- some of us may or some places -- I
shouldn't say "us" -- may be purging collections that have
valuable books in them, but we have very little way to benefit
from these books. So I'm thinking some of these might be
landing in landfills. I mean, there's collectors out there
that wouldn't mind purchasing them. Maybe we could, somehow,
get rid of this requirement or having to send the money back
or the whole complication of that and letting some of our
paper go that way.

PAT REGAINS: I am Pat Regains from the University
of Nevada, Reno, and we're a regional library. To answer this
question, I thought of a couple of things that certainly don't
cover all aspects of what's needed, but I think that they're

pretty important, nevertheless.

One is to proceed as fast as possible, with cataloging the legacy collection pre-1976. I believe that once those records are available and holdings are attached in the network services, like OCLC, then it will be easy to put URLs in those records, make the digital part of the transition more easy to -- it will just happen more easily, I believe.

And then once that's done and that the digital content is authenticated, that -- that regional libraries and other libraries could allow those to become their depository copies. Not that they will be hosting those, but they will be providing access to those, because we're more concerned with providing the public with access than we are in holding tangible copies in perpetuity.

I think that our tangible collections are only useful insofar as we don't have another means to access the content and to rely on that to be relatively permanent. I think once these things happen, a lot of other things will be easier to approach, such as creating shared regionals, to allow certain regionals, if they want to, to relinquish that status, perhaps, and still remain part of the program.

Also, you could provide a more rational basis for current smaller selective depository libraries to stay in the program, rather than be faced with either/or decisions, which has been happening in my state, as well as around the country.

And we could more clearly make the case that staying in the FDLE, for these current small selective depository libraries, would allow them to better serve their user communities and not force them to be -- not force the libraries to be burdened with processing tangible collections.

CHRIS BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver. We're a selective library. One -- in direct answer to question seven, one thing the GPO could do, I like the new CGP, the Z39.50 extraction of records, but they have a restriction that makes no sense to me. Right now you can only take out a thousand records, and for those of us who are serious about doing cataloging, we don't want to have to pay for OCLC records. And I want to be able to have that restriction of a thousand records per pull lifted, so we can extract any number of records from the CGP.

TIM BYRNE: Let's go ahead and take our break now, and we reconvene at four o'clock. (Applause.)

(Conclusion of session at 3:30 p.m.)

PLENARY SESSION: A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM - CREATING AN INFORMED

CITIZENRY THROUGH DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES IN THE 21ST CENTURY:

STRENGTHENING REGIONAL AND SELECTIVE RELATIONS

Monday, April 20, 2009, 4 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: (Gavel.) Let's go ahead and get

settled. In the earlier session this afternoon there were a

number of comments that seemed to almost demand a response

that we really didn't give. So I've asked Ric to come up and

just give us just a brief comment about some of the comments

we heard earlier.

RIC DAVIS: This is Ric Davis, GPO. As the Public

Printer mentioned, we were kind of asked to sit, patiently,

and listen through the session, which we did, and I appreciate

all of your -- all of your good comments and responses.

I think, as many people in this room know, when we

talk about things like Title 44 change, the challenge that

we've had over the years is one thing -- and I mentioned it

this morning, and it's consensus building. I thought when the

person stood up and asked about the comment about the Printed

MOCAT, I thought that was so on target, because there's an

example of something that is written in Title 44, where,

literally, with a memo that came from the Government Printing

Office to the JCP, we were able to get an administrative legal

change that benefitted the library community by not having to

print the month MOCAT, anymore.

We had an agreement from the Library Associations, the support of the Library Council. We were asked if anyone would be up in arms if we were to do this waiver. And I put my foot out there, and I said, "I don't think so," and luckily no one was up in arms about it. And we are able to do these types of administrative changes.

What we often hear inside the Beltway is that we can't reach agreement on what changes are needed and what changes we need to make. So part of this modeling activity that we are going through is to try to work with Council to really try to nail down those things that are critical. And I had trouble, as I was sitting here thinking of things that you were bringing up, that I'm not supportive of.

I think the comment was made that, you know, we were asked why we were focussing money on things like promotion and outreach, when there are higher priorities like digitization. I want to reiterate we received no dollars for digitization, so we're trying this creative proposal of awarding a contract, at no cost to the Government, to provide free access. The promotional work we're doing is less than $5,000 a year, but I think that's still a good spend of money.

So what I'm hoping to come out of this session is, this focus on what priorities we need to take back, to say these are things that we need your support on JCP to move forward. Things that we supported as an agency, like the

Kansas/Nebraska proposal, but in doing that I also encourage
you to work with your Congressional liaisons and your
Congressional delegations to make sure they know these things
are important.

One of the questions I often get is, are things like
the Kansas/Nebraska model still important? And Congressional
staff need to hear about that from you, and they need to hear
about it from us. So, again, thank you for these comments.
And this is helping us in terms of, I think, where we need to
be in developing these new models for flexibility.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, National Coordination
Office. I thank you, Ric. I think those words really help a
lot. I want to remind the audience that Council is not GPO.
We provide advice to GPO. I was impressed by a lot of the
really creative and imaginative ideas that I heard in that
previous session, a lot of dedication and commitment to your
mission, to your patrons and their needs. So what you've said
was heard by Council, loud and clear. I talked to other
members of the Council, and I think I can speak for them on
that.

So the kinds of guidance and advice and ideas that
we'll provide to GPO, we'll take into account the ideas that
you've put forth today. So I wanted to thank all of you who
have attended, who have taken the time to put your ideas on
the table and reassure you that we are listening to what you

say.

JOHN SHULER: Can I just say on the outset that these are the best damn afternoon treats ever! (Applause.)

Tim, being the good friend that he was, thought I needed a moment of practice to talk to a bunch of people about lost change and opportunity, so I thank him. So I've -- he's tired, so I've agreed to step in.

Nobody told me this was going to be the first question though. Okay. Are you communicating well with your regional selective? Oh, please. What works for you? What innovative ways are in you -- no. Excuse me -- innovative ways are you using to communicate and strengthen selective regional relations? Are you using social networking space to communicate with each other? How can GPO and depository libraries effectively use social networking open source software to share information about the program? And how can depository's more effectively communicate directly with each other, across institutional and geographic boundaries? Hallelujah!

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hey, Hallelujah, Brother!

JOHN SHULER: Can you tell we've moved into a different part of the program? (Laughter.) Anybody want to stand and testify? (Laughter.) I guess not.

So I guess all those regionals and selectives are just getting along, swingingly? Ah, okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we waiting for directors to speak first?

JOHN SHULER: Sure. Yeah. Any directors? Any directors? Going once? Going twice?

CLIFTON BROADWORTH: Cliff Broadworth, Oklahoma Department of Libraries. On this first question that comes up here, we, in the Oklahoma Department of Libraries have had a long program for the last several years, where we worked out directly with all of our selectives to where we visit them every year. When we go out and do that annual visit, we also provide training opportunities, that we select about five or six different websites and offer them to provide training to them if they select them. If they don't select them, we don't provide the training.

We also go out and about once or twice a month, we try to provide either a three-hour, one-and-a-half hour training opportunity on different subjects. Oklahoma, one of our major things, of course, is weather. We have different USGS training opportunities. We just had Tim come to Tulsa City County, that he gave a small training opportunity there. So we try and schedule these training things at different parts of the state. And as a State library, we feel that that is our responsibility, and as a regional, to go out there and provide them. And we feel that we have one of the strongest depository library programs, possibly in the United States,

because we do get out behind our desk and visit those other
libraries. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Anybody want to talk about
any other aspect? How can GPO and depository libraries
effectively use social networking open source software to
share information about the program?

JANET FISHER: I don't want to answer that, John.

This is Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library and
Archives. And I want to get back on the communicating with
selectives, and what we've decided to do -- because Arizona is
a big state. Some of the depositories, who attend our
twice-a-year meeting, would have to come three-and-a-half
hours one way. So it's a big trip.

So what we started doing a couple years back, is
start using Live Classroom, so that they can all connect
through computers, or if they're computer is on the fritz,
they get on the phone. And they're there with us during the
whole meeting, and we've gotten a lot of people -- well, not a
lot of people. We've gotten a few who couldn't otherwise
attend. They can sit at their desk and do this. We've gotten
some people who can't even come across town, because they're
blocked in on their schedule between meetings. And this has
worked out really well.

I have not forgotten the old social networking of
telephones, because a couple of months ago, when the budgets

looked bad, I got on the phone and I called every single

 depository librarian to say, "What's it looking like in your

 place?" And "Here's what it's looking like in ours." And

then we ended up having a special meeting last week with Live

 Classrooms so as many could attend as possible, and two

 directors came -- three directors. Sorry. My State librarian

 came. And we got a chance as a group to talk about what was

happening, and what we wanted to see in the future. So it's

 those kinds of things that have helped continue the network

and continue the communication. So there you go.

        JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Anything else?

        ANN SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of

Michigan. We have just started to experiment with social

networking a little bit, but the universal response we've

gotten in Michigan is that we don't want to give up meeting

face to face. We don't want it to replace, but maybe enhance.

        One thing we are running into is this bit about

depositories communicating with each other. Some areas of

Michigan are more remote and more rural, and those are the

librarians that talk to each other all the time. They don't

have any trouble getting together. They get together on their

own. Some times they invite me; sometimes they don't, you

know, whatever.

        Amazingly, it's the libraries in the very densely

populated areas that never talk to each other. They're like

all inside little bubbles or motes, or something -- I'm not sure what it is -- between them, but they don't talk to each other. And I keep trying to impress on everybody as a group, that it's really dangerous when all of your communication runs through me. I forget six things on an average day, and -- and -- and that's just not a really healthy way to do things.

And so we're trying the social networking to see if that will help some of the more reluctant ones, but it's too early. I can't really tell you if it's going to work, or how GPO can do something more effectively to help us. It's just too soon.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Anybody else?

VIRGINIA RIGBY: Esther Crawford and I were just looking at each other, kind of pointing "No, you go. You go." And I'm afraid that I was closer to this. We have in the Houston area tried to work on a WIKI, that we can all respond to and have questions sent there. The problem that we have is that now we've set up the WIKI, we don't know how to use it right, so we're still working on that. (Laughter.)

But the point being, it's 2.0 technology -- Web 2.0 technology that we can use and have everybody respond to and allow this then to go out to all of those that are involved in the Houston area. And we think it's going to work once we figure out how. Right?

JOHN SHULER: Don't forgot your name and

institution.

VIRGINIA RIGBY: Virginia Rigby at Lone Star
College, North Harris.

VALERIE GLENN: Valerie Glenn, University of
Alabama. And I'm so glad that Virginia got up before I did,
because the first thing I was going to say is, Why aren't
there more selectives up here?

I've been a regional for two years, and a depository
librarian for, I guess, almost seven. And so I've had
experiences in two different states with very poor
communication from my regional, and that has guided me in
my -- it's my philosophy as a regional to try to reach out to
people, call them, e-mail, visit, whatever, because sometimes
people just want you to show an interest in them. It's not
that hard, and it really doesn't take new social networking, I
guess, program, software, or whatever.

The other thing I wanted to comment on is, okay, I'm
a Facebook user, I tweet, I blog, I do all this stuff. I have
set up a blog for my selectives. You know, they read it.
They don't necessarily comment, but reading is good enough.

I signed up for the FDLP Community. I couldn't
figure out how to use it. I've never been back. When I
couldn't find out how to friend somebody, I was like, Okay.
I'll go back to Facebook where I have, what, at least 25, 30
other depository librarians already as my friends and go

there.

So maybe GPO just needs to integrate themselves into existing software, rather than setting up yet another community for us.

BILL SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina. I'm not up here to answer the question and say what we're doing in South Carolina, because I rely on my selectives to tell me whether I'm communicating well with them or not.

What I try to do is, I try to provide them as many opportunities. I try to give them as much information as they need. I let them know that I'm available, but I govern just like Valerie said before me. I govern -- my role as a regional is to do the best that I can with what I have, and I have to base it on past experience.

I had good experiences in a previous state, and a bad experience in another state. I'm not going to say what they are, because everybody -- it changes, and everything goes through a cycle. It's a two-way street, and I guess the thing is, I'm lucky -- or I'm not lucky -- in that I don't have any of my selectives that are able to attend. I was lucky to attend, but, again, they don't need to come to Tampa, Florida, to tell me whether I'm doing a good job or not. I try to keep in touch with them, but it would be interesting to hear what selectives think regionals could do better for them, and that would help all of the regionals.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Anybody else?

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia. I'm at a selective, and I want to give props to Barbie Shelby, who is not here. She is an excellent regional. I actually asked her to come visit me last year.

I'm in the middle of doing a pretty extensive weeding project, and I was able to talk with her. She was able to help me shape that and pretty much give me the blessing I needed in order to go forward. So it's been great to have that kind of a relationship. Definitely, when we're looking at weeding, needs and offers, those sorts of things, that's been incredibly helpful. I've also worked at a regional library as well. I think it definitely is a two-way street.

To me, training -- I know I've said this before, but training I think is really critical, and I just want to say also that the Government in the 21st Century, I think, is the beginning of something we really need to be doing more of. I don't think it's necessarily just a regional and a selective relationship. I think it's a Government information community, and we need to be able to talk with each other, train each other.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. One more comment?

JO ANN BEEZLEY: Jo Ann Beezley, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas. I've got two comments to make.

One of them is kind of the bottom of this geographic boundaries. I have had wonderful response with any contact I've have had with the State library in the State of Oklahoma. Steve Ballau has communed on a couple of wonderful workshops for us, that the State library has said, "Well, you're only 40 miles over that border, and so we're going to let him bring a car." And this has been wonderful training for the people in my area to get his expertise on several databases.

We were also invited to participate and we were one of the ones, Tim, that did your workshop with the -- whatever software we were using. I think they were on OPAL, right?

TIM BYRNE: Yes.

JO ANN BEEZLEY: And it was wonderful. Allowed us -- I didn't have to make a two-and-a-half hour drive to Tulsa, and so I can't say too much about Steve Ballau and the State Library of Oklahoma, with their outreach to particularly my area in the State of Kansas.

My other comment -- and I wasn't going to talk about this, and I was talking to a couple of people on break. I heard a comment this morning from the lady at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, about our cooperative agreement, and I will admit that, you know, it probably would have worked or it might work, but I thought it was interesting that we agreed. We were told at a meeting from the Associate Provost, or somebody, from KU; came to one of our meetings in Kansas and

said, "We are going to work on a cooperative regional, between
Nebraska and Kansas," and if my dean knew about it, he had not
shared that message with me. And I can't believe, knowing my
dean, that he would not have told me, that we were going to do
this.

And I was just shocked, because we're not Big 12 at
Penn State. And we don't get interlibrary loan requests
filled at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, because they
take care of Big 12 first, so we're going to get pushed on.
There were just some things that weren't quite taken care of.

It might work. I'm not saying it won't. But I
don't believe at the very beginning there were two people that
were involved in that whole thing. I believe they are both
gone. And I'm not going to say it's not going to work, but I
don't think all of the problems were aired out of that thing
before it was taken to GPO as a shared regional. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Okay, oh.

JOAN GIESECKE: Joan Giesecke, University of
Nebraska, Lincoln. I need to respond to that statement, even
though it's out of order. To say I said the selectives -- I'm
sorry if I misspoke -- but the selectives in Nebraska did not
object and are supportive of the plan. And, also, if you read
the agreement you will see that it says that "An interlibrary
loan among -- for depository library will be at the top level
for us." So the statement that was just made about

interlibrary loan is inaccurate, and I just want to clarify
that because I don't want people leaving with the idea that
the agreement, in the end, did not address the issues that
were raised in a public meeting in Kansas. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Time to move on to the
next question? Okay. Good, John, there you go.

To foster collaboration and in the interest of
resource sharing, are there service or collection activities
at the institution or State level that can be extended across
the region or country; for example, GIO, Ask a Librarian,
increase the use of OPAL social networks, to produce a more
robust service model? (Pause.)

Did I say the best cookies ever? Ah, here we go.

PAT RAGAINS: Hi. I'm Pat Ragains from the
University of Nevada, Reno. And as you know, John, I joined
the GIO service last year.

JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

PAT RAGAINS: And I think that GIO already is, in
some sense, strengthening our national service model. I would
like to see it further strengthened greatly by increased
membership. One of the things that I've noticed, since I
began participating, and this has sort of become something I
think about on -- on occasional basis is, you know, how do I
talk to other library professionals in my immediate area at my
university and in my state, about the GIO service to promote

it effectively. And I don't know. That -- that doesn't seem
to working as well as it needs to at this point. It's still
pretty early, because I've only belonged to the chat service
for about a year. I think it's something that has a lot of
potential.

Things like GIO, we need to take it from the, sort
of, just beyond the pilot stage. I know it's not in the pilot
stage now. It's beyond that. But we need to think about
doing some things, perhaps, more strategically to promote it
and get more libraries on board with it.

This is going to -- I think it has the potential. I
don't know if it's going to, but it has the potential to help
vastly in terms of maintaining and extending the knowledge
base in the profession, for providing the kind of public
service that documents librarians have always done.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. And just as a footnote to
that, we're approaching question 10,000, since last February,
as part of the project. So I think that indicates the
knowledge base that Patrick was referring to.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What does GIO stand for?

JOHN SHULER: Government Information Online, real
original.

JAMES JACOBS: Hi, John. James Jacobs, Stanford
University. To build on that knowledge base concept, I've
created a custom search engine that indexes blogs that have

library Q&As published, so I would like to recommend that
everybody in the room create a blog and post your questions
and answers on that blog, because once they're online, they're
more likely to be found, and that includes highlighting

collections and services. If it's online, people can find it, and you'll find that more people will come into your libraries.

So I would like GIO to create a blog --

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

JAMES JACOBS: -- and I can help with that if you want.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

JAMES JACOBS: Thanks.

JOHN SHULER: All right, a race.

CHRIS BROWN: My regional is here.

PEGGY JOBE: We have an act here.

CHRIS BROWN: Chris Brown, University of Denver.

PEGGY JOBE: Peggy Jobe, C.U., Boulder.

CHRIS BROWN: One thing that we're doing in Colorado -- you probably heard about this last fall, but we have a WIKI project where we collaborate the regional and the selectives in the state, where we have actually two or three WIKIs. One WIKI is where we host the extent of our collections by SuDoc's number. A second one is a needs and offers list.

PEGGY JOBE: And the third one --

CHRIS BROWN: Is --

PEGGY JOBE: -- is we're working on revising State plan, so we're using the WIKI. And I think the first one, which has been presented on pretty extensively -- can you guys hear me? -- I think is really interesting because -- and this started when Tim was in CU, so I can't give him credit for it, but --

But the libraries in the alliance are creating that Inspector Site Survey of their collection, in which they indicate the strength of their collections and also their commitment, as to whether or not they want to keep it. And we're hoping to use that information to really streamline that withdrawal process, because if you've got, you know, one library that agrees to really retain a stem and build their collections, then we can feel more confident as the regional, in allowing another library to withdraw that stem, without the listing and all those kind of things.

So we're already bending the law, somewhat, but -- no. So I'm happy to see GPO saying, No, we don't think so. I think it's really been really interesting, because we've learned what people -- what collections are valuable to the libraries that, you know, they want to commit to keeping it they're selectives. And I think it's a really good process, in terms of communication.

And the one thing I want to say, that this is somewhat extraneous, but I was sitting there, because here I am a regional, and I've got my dean here. And all I heard was these really negative things all day long, and we committed to remain a regional. So I'm thinking, okay, there's got to be some benefits to being a depository.

And I have to say that I think that working with the selectives, the knowledge base that we've been able to build in Colorado, in terms of what people, you know, know and are willing to share, I think has been really invaluable.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

JIM WILLIAMS: Jim Williams, University of Colorado. We're a regional, and I'm not here to contradict anything there. I think this question gets -- it allows me to say one more time, when you talk -- those last words, "robust service model," I go back to my suggestion that maybe it's time for us to think about funding a study on what should that robust service model be, if we can get there, with GPO.

The other thing is we could be talking about collaborative collection development among the regionals. Here we could be talking about, therefore, a collaborative national storage plan among the regionals. Here we could be talking about a national training plan, among -- among and with GPO. So I think there's a lot of opportunity, if we can get back to that funded study that I'm really geared to push.

Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

CHRIS GREER: John? Chris Greer from NCO. Maybe we could just hear from GPO on this concept. Is it -- are there other examples where GPO has funded studies of this type or any other type? Is this a mechanism that GPO has used? Can we get some background from GPO to better understand this?

JOHN SHULER: Does anybody from GPO want to talk about their tradition and history of funding these kinds of studies?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Cindy, you're thinking about what you want to say on that?

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah, but go ahead.

RIC DAVIS: I'll start -- then I'll start.

CINDY ETKIN: Go ahead.

RIC DAVIS: I think kicking off the model that the gentleman from Colorado asked for, starts at 5:30 today. That's part of what our thinking was in awarding this contract to Outsell, in terms of looking at the segmentation of libraries by types and terms of helping build the new model.

So we have devoted funding to begin that process, and it's first of the multifaceted project. And as we build out additional phases, we'd like your help on what the requirement should be to continue building that model.

JOHN SHULER: And if I could be so bold to make my

own observation, though, I -- just an unfounded observation.
I would say, John, we've been in this process for about ten
years now, and we have 18 or so partnerships that demonstrate
innovation and sustainability. And I think strategically,
now, we need to stitch that together and reflect on how that
affects our daily best practices and footnote.

Yes?

MARY CLARK: Hi. I'm Mary Clark. I'm at the
Library of Virginia, and I want to thank John Shuler, in
particular, for the Government Information Online Project. We
were one of the members in the pilot program, and it has
really been fun, first of all.

John had asked several years ago, What does it mean
to be a depository library? And it was alluded to many times
this morning, and what it really is, it's a community of
service, as Laura mentioned earlier. And GIO is precisely
that. And we are able to use all of our resources and all of
our skills to make Government information available, and GIO
is a great service. And people are really taking advantage of
it, and it's fun to do. So thanks. (Applause.)

CAROL DIEDRICHS: Carol Diedrichs, University of
Kentucky. I just wanted to respond a little bit to Ric in
that I hope this conversation might continue at 7:00, because
there's no time to eat dinner in this schedule. I mean, I'm
not being -- I mean, literally there's a 5:30 meeting, and now

you're saying that's when this conversation is going to be held. And then there's a 7:00 to 9:00 meeting for regionals, and so.

JOHN SHULER: If Ric would forgive me, I think he may have been speaking metaphorically. No? Damn you, Ric.

CAROL DIEDRICHS: There is a meeting. (Laughter.)

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to clarify what the 5:30 meeting is. It is the beginning of our working with Outsell. And as Ric said, the first part of what we need to do to find out how to better serve all our libraries, is to look at how we're segmenting them and how that might need to be changed, and looking at primary and secondary segmentations of our libraries. So we're going to be talking about that.

And how all of this can then feed into a communications plan -- not a communications plan -- a customer relations plan, library relations plan, so we can better serve you all. And as we get into the later phases, we're going to be looking at -- Jim, is just really not going to like this -- survey results.

But we're going to be looking at survey results and how we can put all of this together and feed everything into what will then, hopefully, be what we're talking about here with new models. But tonight at 5:30, it's just the very beginning phases of that.

JOHN SHULER: Any other points? All right. Next question. Thank God. What specific flexibilities would selectives like to see from regionals, and what flexibilities are regionals looking for, from the selective they serve?

It's just like marriage counseling (laughter), just keep asking the same question different ways. (Applause.) I'm sorry. I'm backing away from the microphone. Anybody want to try that? They can hear me from here.

BETH ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. My predecessor was a Government documents librarian for 25, 30 years. I don't yet have the experience to either go to my selectives and eyeball the collection and say, I don't need that, you can get rid of that, so and so in my state needs that. So my selectives still are doing lists, and, yes, I'm drowning in the lists.

However, there is a silver lining, in that, we're starting to get enough repeat business on the lists that it's cutting the time down for those who are weeding, after others have, and I hope within the year to have a pretty good inventory of our collection, because I'm merging, attempting to, merge all the lists that I've gotten over the last two years. And I hope that there might be some advantage to the community in having that.

We're a pretty large depository. Outside of being a regional, we've been a selective since the late 1800s -- been

a depository since the late 1800s. So I don't know if it will
be a benefit to anybody else or not, but I'm hopeful that,
perhaps, it will either help with some of the pre-'76
cataloging or help other states build their own inventory and
do a lot less work building from ours.

So that's one thing our selectives want, and
there -- it's making the burden a little less on them to
prepare the list knowing that they're helping drive towards
this ultimate goal.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

ANN SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of
Michigan, and I'm going to take a fly around saying this
because there's only two people from Michigan in the room.
And I said facetiously to somebody that I'm sitting next to,
that the flexibility I would like to see is the poor planning
on your part doesn't constitute an emergency on mine.

And I need to qualify that by saying that a lot of
the time I'm spending with libraries right now are people who
have been blissfully plotting along, as if it was 1985. And
they call me up and say, "Oh, my gosh, my dean, my director
needs the space, and what am I going to do?" And they have
not be paying attention to the whole electronic thing, and
they're just like a deer in the headlights.

And once you can reinforce to them that the minimum
selective -- minimum selection rates -- isn't that what they

used to be called, Robin? -- have gone away, and that it's

okay to take electronic stuff. And that just because you're

sitting on the boarder with Canada doesn't really mean that

you need a full run of treaties and other international acts,

and things like that. It's fine, but it's -- a lot of the

trouble is coming from people who are just -- been very slow

to realize that time has moved on.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Anybody else?

MARY MARTIN: Mary Martin, Libraries of the

Claremont Colleges, and this may have been said. Numerous

times, and I don't blame either the regionals or GPO for this,

but the needs -- the whole needs and offers process is just

really a pain in the neck.

JOHN SHULER: Anybody else?

PEGGY JOBE: Peggy Jobe, C.U., Boulder. I was

trying to get Chris to come up and do our team show, again,

but he won't do it for some unknown reason. Anyway, one of

the things that was really useful to me, because I'm new as a

regional coordinator, is that I really relied on the expertise

of the selectives a lot in making decisions. I've learned a

lot from them. I took a group of selectives with me to really

help drastically downsize a library a year ago, and so the

selectives really helped me make decisions. That was great.

And we used a really goofy technology. We were cell

phone to cell phone. Somebody walking through the CU

collections; somebody walking through the unknown library
collection. We were both on Verizon so we weren't getting
killed alive by the charges, but we were saying, you know,
they've got this. Their copies are in good shape. We'd say,
Oh, ours are in terrible shape. So we were swapping out. We
were making decisions, kind of on the fly.

And it was really -- it would have been really
difficult to me, because at the point that had happened, I had
only been on the job for four or five months. So it was
really useful to have the expertise that the selectives
provided to me, and then the --

I wanted to say one more thing, Chris. Help me with
what it is. You and I were talking about it. Oh, we've put
up -- we are working on for Colorado, based on the fact that
you get repeat business. You start to get to know your
collections. We're working on a list that will be placed on
our depository page of serials, that you don't need to ask us
for permission. You can just pitch them after checking our
holdings and our catalog to see if we have any gaps that you
could fill.

So we're really looking, pretty actively, for ways
to streamline the process, and the selectives have been great
contributors to that process.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. The big clock on the wall
indicates time is marching on, so must we. March forth, as we

so fondly say now, and, therefore, the questions are getting shorter

What can GPO do to support flexible management of depository operations -- I'm almost afraid to ask -- that we haven't mentioned already?

REBECCA HYDE: Rebecca Hyde, University of California, San Diego. And I don't know if this is something that GPO can actually do or if it would require more changes, but one of the things that I've been thinking about, as everyone has been talking about their roles as regionals and the things that they do, so it seems like there's really two big parts of it. And there's the collections part, and the part where they're really supporting the selectives with training and information.

And it seems like there could almost be something other than regionals. I know I'm lucky to be in California where David is my amazing regional (applause) but -- he has more selectives than any other regional in the U.S., and there's just no way that he can do all that is required.

And we talk in California about how could we have another regional, but I know everyone that I've talked to, there's no way they can convince their administration that we should become a regional, and now we have to keep everything tangible. But could there be something that's not a regional but has the same -- that has to do the training and the

support of the people in their area. Could that be something,
another network of libraries that, maybe, doesn't have that
collections part, but has the expertise and the training part
behind it?

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Any other thoughts?

NAOMI HARRISON: Naomi Harrison, Rollins College,
here in Florida. And we have in our area, Central Florida,
very similar to what the person before me was talking about.
And that is, yes, we have a regional in Gainesville, Florida,
but within Central Florida we have the University of Central
Florida. And it acts as the go-between; the selective, my
library and others selectives, and University of Florida in
Gainesville. And it works perfectly.

Richard Goss, who is the librarian over at the
University of Central Florida, is our expert for Central
Florida. And within Central Florida we also have a group of
us, who meet at least three or four times a year, to discuss
activities and meetings such as this. We will go back and we
will have a meeting in May and share information with those
librarians who were not able to come to this conference.

So we have, we think and I think, a very
cooperative, supportive relationship to support one another
within Central Florida, and we can depend on our regional to
assist us when needed.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

PAT RAGAINS: Pat Ragains from University of Nevada, Reno, and I thought a bit about the question posed: Will regionals have to retain everything? Well, we continue to have that requirement, and I think that's something, kind of following on some comments I made earlier, that we really need to see some progress on perhaps when authenticated digital copies of things are made available, then regionals would no longer be required to retain that tangible copy, because -- because it is available. It's authenticated. It's as permanent as a paper copy could be, presumably, because it would be backed up as part of the authentication process.

I think it's important for GPO to realize, as has been made pretty clear by others making comments today, that library administrators, the deans and directors, are -- they're looking for value in library services that their publics need and the libraries can deliver today.

And the models set up in 1970 and that we were used for many years, really don't work anymore. They're putting a lot of pressure on libraries. Libraries are looking for ways -- and they are finding ways -- to get out from under those requirements. And sometimes it means leaving the system.

I think that's going to be unfortunate but true, during this economic crisis that we're in, as local governments and funding entities cut back libraries. And I

would hate to see in many instances Government information

service being marginalized or completely cut from library

services, in part, because Title 44 hasn't changed as it needs

to.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Any other thoughts? Yes.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of

Kentucky Libraries. Following up on what Pat said, if

regionals could eventually discard or divest themselves of

copies, because there is an authenticated electronic digital

copy, I wonder if we would want to consider or we talked about

a CRL-like model.

There's also the NARA Regional Office Archival

model, and I'm -- your collection is already at NARA. Is

there a way regional offices, within the NARA Regional System,

could accept copies of Government publications from regionals,

if we don't want to lose that tangible copy?

JIM WILLIAMS: Jim Williams, University of Colorado.

It was interesting to hear Bob talking this morning about the

number of contracts they're able to let, which tells me that

GPO can fund things. And here, on this one, I think, if he's

asking us for suggestions on things that he's going to talk to

Congress about, day after tomorrow, one of them could be the

development of a technological tools to get us beyond the

brain damage that's related to accessioning and deaccession,

the develop of a management tool, technologically-

based management tools to get there, that he could put in his
budget and fund that contract.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you.

SARAH MICHALAK: I'm Sarah Michalak, from the
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. And I was
wondering if GPO staff, one or another of you, could take just
a few minutes and talk about some of the ideas that you have
had, to support flexible management of depository operations.
Where is your thinking taking you?

CINDY ETKIN: Cynthia Etkin, GPO. We've actually
been brainstorming a lot of different things, and some of the
ideas that were mentioned today, with the different ways that
the disposition lists have been handled, there's a lot of
flexibility there.

We've also been talking about "must" and
"requirements" versus "may" or "shall" or "should" or "could"
or "maybe." We're not really sure where we want to go with
that yet, so there are some things that perhaps could be made
a little more flexible in some of the areas that are now in
the handbook.

Anybody want to add anything else? Oh, the former
inspection program, becoming the public access assessments,
far less rigid.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think you hit the
nail on the head. What I want to add to that is, when you

look at the transition we made when we superceded Depository Library Instructions and Manual with the Handbook, our idea behind the Handbook has been to enable flexibility where we're allowed to in administering the program under the law and to push decision-making whenever we can, down to the local level.

So I think Cindy's point is right on target about less in the way of "must" and "shall" and more about guidelines. And that's the direction that we're trying to go in.

SARAH MICHALAK: That philosophy is much appreciated, but it seems like everybody out here thinks that we should have more flexibility in dealing with the deselection list, and we, in North Carolina, certainly do. We're very, very overwhelmed with that workload, and it seems like you all think that we should do it.

What -- how can we -- how do you -- is it, just for my information, as sort of a newcomer to this. Is it the Depository Library Council that bridges the two of us and actually moves towards getting some of these things done, or is it GPO that takes the initiative and moves out to our community and says, Let's help -- let's decide how we can do this and write up an administrative waiver for these really rough requirements that we have with regard to deselection?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'll take a stab at this, since I'm standing. (Laughter.) Any of those

mechanisms, you can reach any of the Council members at any time and give them any of your comments or suggestions that you may have, and they will certainly provide that information back to GPO. And you can always contact anybody at GPO and let us know what you're thinking if you have an idea. The thing about the needs and offers process, the disposition of materials, is not written in stone and the law. That's probably one of the most flexible areas we have in Title 44. It just says that regionals will manage it.

So we have a situation where we have regionals all over the country, and I'm not sure that there are as many processes, but not everybody does it the same way.

One of the findings that we had from the regional report that we did was pretty much what Mary Martin stood up and said, that the needs and offers list is a pain in the neck. It's a pain in the neck for the regionals, it's a pain in the neck for the selectives, and all for different reasons.

And one of the things that we are looking to do is to find out exactly what all the different processes are that are out there in your regionals. Take a look at that. At least come up with some kind of minimum, so there's a bit of consistency of what might be expected, but also provide a lot of flexibility in how you can do this. We know it's very, very time-consuming process, but there is an awful lot of flexibility that can be built in there.

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia. This is more of a question to GPO Council regionals, and it's about State plans. I worked at three depositories now. I have not been involved in any of the State plan processes. Where does this fit in? Wasn't this where the flexibility came from? Do we think it's time that we go back to this process? Is this where regionals and selectives need to talk once more?

I have a feeling that's what the State plans were meant to do, but I fell like it's been a long enough period of time. We need to reconsider this process or be coming up with something else that this process in intended to resolve.

BILL SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina. I think a lot of people in the audience appreciate the hope that there can be some flexibility. I, as a former member of Council and this Council, I'm sure that they're looking forward to some flexibility in GPO.

There's another factor in this. If we come up with any kind of plan and even if we work with GPO on this, the waivers are granted by the Joint Committee on Printing. And so they have to be brought into the equation, too. And we can come up with the most flexible ideas within the community. Council can come up with the most flexible ideas. GPO can endorse it, but it's got to get approved by the Joint Committee on Printing. Okay?

JOHN SHULER: Okay. Mark, you've been standing in the back. Do you want to -- one last comment on this question. Mark, if you want to come forward?

MARK SANDLER: Hi. I'm Mark Sandler from CIC, and I'm not exactly of this community, although, you know, kind of like Margaret Mead or Levi Strauss, I've sort of lived among them for a few years, so. (Laughter.)

And I guess I'd like to respond to Sarah's question, and I think Bill Sudduth just gave half of the answer; that, you know, this is a legislated process, this distribution process, Title 44. So, you know, library directors can pretty much be of one mind about what needs to be done and GPO can listen to that and Council can listen to that, and they can get that feedback and decide, you know, we really need to be responsive to the community. But clearly there are Congressional forces and legislative forces that have to approve that.

I think, though, a second part is that the community itself is divided, and it's not necessarily the people here. There are probably 900 documents librarians that are not here, and they're not exactly of one mind about the best ways to move forward.

So some of the discussion really needs to take place back at those home institutions, between library directors and their documents librarians, because it is very difficult for

GPO or Council to simply dictate, any more than it is for library directors or provosts to dictate to faculty.

You just can't sort of tell the folks what to do and what to believe. So I really think there's an opportunity and a role at both ends for folks here. Council has shown good leadership on these issues. GPO had shown good leadership. We've been talking about this for years now, trying to move the community along; but, also, a very, very good opportunity for campus administrators and library administrators to also be working with their staff to help them see a bright future beyond the sort of current scenario.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Big clock is still ticking, so we've got to get to the next question. Here we go: I think William Faulkner is in the room.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's your question, too.

JOHN SHULER: Is that mine?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it is.

JOHN SHULER: My God, what was I thinking?

For more than 15 years now, certain members of the library community and the depository library Council have discussed redundancy and the number of comprehensive collections of content, needed to ensure permanent public access. Title 44 requires that regionals retain, at least, one copy of all Government publications, either printed or in -- I never say that -- micro forms, except those authorized

to be discarded by the superintendent of documents. In order to consider future models that may legally -- be legally permissible, as required by the library community, should regional depository libraries be able to withdraw portions or all of their tangible collection if they have access to digital equivalence? And what are the long-term implications for depository library collection responsibilities necessary to achieve the FDLP's primary goal of permanent public access to both print and digital materials? Oh, man, that was beautiful. Thank you. (Applause.)

Anybody? (Laughter.) Was there a question in there, your Honor?

PEGGY JOBE: I have an idea. It would be really nice, because a lot of regionals, C.U., Boulder, included -- I'm Peggy Jobe from C.U., Boulder. It would be really nice if GPO, in partnership with some of the vendors that all of us use to buy digital surrogate, if they can negotiate an acceptable clause that allowed us to serve up the information to people outside of our primary, you know, our licensed users; i.e., people on our campus.

So if there were like a standard clause, that GPO could work with those big vendors, that could be plopped onto any contracts that are being negotiated, and it could also be addenda to existing contracts, to allow us to really use those digital collections that serve, for instance, people

throughout their state.

And I know that University of Wyoming negotiated some such thing for the digital version of the serials set, but, you know, we're hampered in how we can use those digital collections, because of license requirement. And I'd really like to see some kind of model license.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. James?

JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Four quick points: Access today does not equal long-term preservation. Local digital collections and digital deposit are needed. GPO facilitation for building local digital collections and infrastructures would be a really important step forward. And networks of local digital collections enhance both access and preservation. (Applause.)

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Sounds like you practiced that.

JAMES JACOBS: I had to write it down.

JOHN SHULER: Anybody else? Bernadine.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: It's Bernadine. It's an opera. Bernadine Abbott Hoduski, writer and historian at the moment. I'm somewhat concerned, because I don't really see -- hear anything really discussed about the needs of the public and an avenue for consulting with the public.

I would suggest that you go home and have some house parties with the users of your libraries, particularly with

the historians and the social scientists and others, that may or may not know that your collection exists.

I mean, I'm writing several books right now. I'm going all over Montana, North Dakota, using all kinds of libraries and historical collections and museums and county courthouses and all. And a hell of a lot of stuff is not digitized, and it's not available to the public.

Now, even if everything was digitized and every regional in the state had an 18 wheeler at their door, I'd haul everything away, which I don't think is a bad idea. We've got some caves in Kansas City, which would be a good place for a central location for all of the regionals' collections to be there and protected for a while, until this community comes to its senses and decides what they want to save and what they don't want to save and whose got the best copy and so on.

So even if you digitize everything, that doesn't mean it's going to survive. We have an electrical grid problem that could be sabotaged by the Russians and the Chinese. You've been reading the paper. Google is digitizing everything and will own everything, including Government documents.

We've already allowed a lot of commercial publishers to own Government information in a more usable format, and we're talking about spending the money from our institutions

to buy that Government information back. Now, we've got to
decide whether we want everything digitized and continue to be
publicly accessible, and if we do, we've got to go out and
raise -- we've got to get Congress and others to give
libraries the money to do that and to provide that on an
ongoing basis. This patchwork thing of talking about getting
some publisher, who is in there for the profit, to give us a
break on leases and so on, it's not going to work in the
long-run.

So I think that we've really got to think about why
was the program set up in the first place. I don't really
think that the people, the Congress people in 1895 and 1962
didn't really understand this country, and didn't understand
we are the United States of America. And each state has
State's rights. And this is a relationship between the
Federal Government and the State Government. That's how the
program was set up, initially, and that's still the way it
works, in some states, like my state of Montana.

We really want to make the decisions in our state,
about what we're going to do, and we would like to see
flexibility, the users of the libraries would like to see
flexibility. But until we really know what we're talking
about, as a lobbyist -- and I lobbied the State Legislature
and the Federal Legislature. I have for the last 15 years.

I would not be able to go lobby my two Senators,

because I really don't think the community has come together

as to what you want, except that I hear some people saying, We

would like to pitch everything. Or some people saying, We'd

like to share everything. Or some people saying, We'd like to

store everything.

If we could come together with a plan, we could do

some of all of that, then maybe we, who lobby, can go in and

talk to a member of Congress and really tell them what the

community wants. And I'm hoping that all of the ideas that

have come forward, that we can go back and really start

talking and telling the truth about what's going on.

I mean, I started out in 1965, and we didn't even

have a telephone when I was a depository librarian. I did

have a typewriter, and I had student help. But I still

cataloged every document in my collection and bound every

document in my collection. So we didn't have any money at all

in '65, in the State universities.

You are all living in hog heaven, as far as I'm

concerned, because you've got OCLC. You've got online

cataloging. You've got all kinds of great services that we,

dinosaurs, didn't have when we started. So I'd like to hear a

little more optimism about how we can resolve this problem,

and go get the money we need to preserve these collections in

all formats, not just one, not just digital.

Because we don't know what we're going to have after

digital. We're just at the beginning of the technological
revolution. If we don't keep the only permanent format that
we have -- which is paper -- long enough so that we can keep
using it -- I mean, I'm using newspaper on microfilm. They're
unreadable and those newspapers are gone. You can't go back
and digitize those newspapers. It would have been great if
those libraries had kept their original newspapers, so we
could digitize them now.

Let's not make the same mistake and get rid of our
valuable collections before we know for sure they've been
digitized, and they're going to be permanent. There is no
such thing as permanent electronic at the moment. Thank you.
(Applause.)

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. Anybody else? Next
question? Somebody?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To follow up on what
Bernadine said, I want us to keep in mind that a lot of the
materials that we'd like to digitize, people don't know about.
They're not cataloged. They're not searchable. And once they
are cataloged there might be more interest in the print,
because you can find it. And the same with digital, and I
think that's one of the things to keep in mind.

The other thing, and I don't know what implications
this has, but I just keep thinking there was a long period
where the library community thought it was okay not to catalog

Government documents, and we're living with that now. And so I guess we're not going to know exactly what the future will need, but it's just, I guess, something to keep in mind.

JOHN SHULER: Okay. We've got three minutes, three question.

CAROL DIEDRICHS: Carol Diedrichs, University of Kentucky. I just feel like I need to respond to the fact that we're laying a lot of, what would you call, weight in a legacy collection. And we're talking about it's only -- the permanency. As my Government documents librarian was just telling me, we have disintegrating paper in our paper -- you know, in our Government documents collection. So it's not going to last, despite the fact it's on paper.

The other point I'd like to make is, we're talking about how critical the legacy paper collection is, at the same time there are items that are only published now, digitally, and so we have to, as a community, solve the digital preservation policy -- problem. And there's been a lot of progress in that, because there's all kinds of things being published today that there is no paper equivalent of.

JOHN SHULER: Thank you. May I suggest we put the questions quickly on the screen, and that we use these last two minutes to respond to either of them. So there's Number six, Number seven, man, and Number eight. I was hoping to -- because we're running out of time -- rely on the reading on

our own. Okay.

JOAN GIESECKE: Joan Giesecke, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. So let me answer all three -- give you comments on all three questions at the same time, while I try to remember what they are.

In terms of what makes a strong regional, I think our colleague from Kansas very eloquently pointed out, the support that she gets from Oklahoma. I think what makes strong regionals is that we do cross our state lines. We do talk to each other within the community, and so if you can get the advice from the best place -- the closest place you can, the best place, whose got the time to help you, etc.

So when I think about the next two to three years, I think about the ways that we can share our expertise across the system and not worry about the state lines; that we talk about how we can have collections that we can afford to maintain.

If you actually read the agreement between Kansas and Nebraska, which I realize most people in the room have not sat down and read, we are talking about having one set of the Federal Marine Commission between the two states, because there are very little marine research being done, almost no oceanic research being done in Nebraska and Kansas, and if it is, the rest of the coasts are in deep trouble.

So we're not talk about eliminating well-used paper

collections. We're not talking about not having duplicate paper collections. We're talking about having rational print collections that we can take care of in a rational manner, so that we can continue to be strong regionals.

Strong regionals are the ones that are helping their selectives, as we have heard; that are getting out and talking to them; that have found creative ways to work within the system. Those are our strong regionals.

That's what we're trying to preserve in the Midwest, and we would like the ability to do that. That's what I'd like to see happen over the next two or three years, despite the comments that come from various parts of our community, inside the Beltway, and in places that have never seen the Midwest. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: Anybody else responding to the last three questions? We've got 30 seconds left.

Like how does local expertise --

JIM WILLIAMS: Jim Williams, University of Colorado. Your last three questions are the foundation of an RFP to do that study on what is the most appropriate next best model for the FDLP.

JOHN SHULER: Okay. Thank you, sir. Anybody else? It's now the witching hour, where we get to go eat metaphorically and otherwise -- oh, one more.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll make a suggestion that

seems to me to relate, overall, to the last three questions.
I thought the film that was shown this morning about documents
librarians -- this afternoon about documents librarians, who
feel the value of this work and what good that our collections
do for the people, I think a second one should be made that
has the people on it, that has customers talking and saying
what's good. You could even reach out a little further and
say, Okay. What else would you like?

But I think it would be so wonderful to have one of
those same films that -- it's just one after another of our
users telling about their successes and their failure with our
collection.

JOHN SHULER: Cindy just indicated they just --
they're begun to release a series of exactly those kinds of
interactions with the public and put it on YouTube, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's on the Desktop, now.

JOHN SHULER: It's on the Desktop. There you go.
Anything else? Are we done here, Tim?

A comment and then I'll thank everybody.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to
remind everybody that these questions are up on the Desktop if
you want to continue the discussion beyond today. I know some
of you won't want to, but some of you may. (Laughter.) And
we will appreciate any feedback that we get, and I just want
to -- thanks to all of you for hanging in here for the last

three, four hours in helping us do this.

JOHN SHULER: And in my burn-like moment, I declare this first day of the Depository Library Council finished. Focus with a fork. Let's go eat.

(conclusion of session at 5:30 p.m.)

FDsys UPDATE

Tuesday, April 21, 2009, 8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m., Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: Back to day two. This morning we're starting off with the report on the Federal Digital System, so I'll turn it over to Selene.

SELENE DALECKY: Good morning. Thank you very much for coming to the presentation this morning on the Federal Digital System. I will be speaking a little bit about the current status of the program.

My name is Selene Dalecky, and I am the FDsys program manager. And then I'll be turning it over to Carrie Gibb, who will be give up an update on the Outreach activities, and to Lisa LaPlant, who will go a little bit more in detail on the Access portion of the system and where we are with that today.

So I'm going to start a little bit before the where-we-are and the update portion of FDsys, because I want to just refresh us on why we got to where we are today. I think we're all pretty familiar now with the challenges in the Digital Age with disseminating information.

Access to Government published information is widely expected to be electronic now. People go to their system or to a library, and they access a terminal. And they expect to be able to find what they need through a common search engine or by going directly to an agency site. They don't

necessarily only think that dot-Government documents are in print. But this digital information is out there, and it's everywhere. And it needs to be authentic and verified to be the correct version, if we're talking about official Government information.

And if people are going directly to a source, like they come to GPO or they come to the Department of Education and they download a file from one of these websites, directly, they have pretty good faith that this content is authentic, if you will, or official.

But what if this content has been e-mailed several times over or is posted to somebody's website and, again, downloaded and handed off and handed off and handed off? You no longer have that sense of connection to the official source or to the official distribution channel. And so making sure that that content can carry along its authenticity, as it's passed from person to person and as the years go by, is very key in the digital world.

Digital information needs to be available almost immediately. People don't want to wait three or five or seven days for their Congressional Record any longer. They want to come to GPO Access at 9 a.m. and be able to read it.

And information needs to be preserved. We know we've got books that are hundreds of years old that are still readable and usable. There are disks, I'm sure, that

everybody has under their desks that are no longer any good, and they're only a couple years old. So what we need to do is make sure that information we have in digital form -- and some of it is only in digital form -- that we have it available for users five years, ten years, 50 years from now.

So the -- those challenges are -- and other challenges, but those were the main ones that drove GPO to reassess GPO's digital information management process. And as GPO transitions away from a print-centric environment, where the print form drives the entire life cycle of the data, into a content-centric environment, then the -- it's essential for GPO to have a flexible digital system that will automate many of the electronic content life-cycle processes that will streamline GPO's internal business processes; that will provide permanent public access to this content and that will deliver this content to the public in a way that suits their needs. No longer will we dictate the one distribution means, but we'll be able to provide the content in many formats and in many ways so that users can make the most of the content that they need.

So what exactly is FDsys? What are the components that make up the entire system? Well, first, FDsys is a content management system. The content management portion of FDsys, makes sure that we can securely control the digital content throughout the content life cycle to ensure the

content integrity and the authenticity. This means we know exactly what content we have at any given time, we know who has access to that content at any given time, and we know what actions have been performed against that content. So being able to control it, to record any kind of actions against the content, and being able to make sure that we authorize users to perform such actions, allows us to ensure the integrity of the content that we're managing.

Second, FDsys is a preservation repository. We do a lot of management to the content in our content repository. We create new renditions. For example, a PDF file to send out to the public side so that people have an access version of content, or we add metadata or edit metadata that's associated with the content. But all those actions against the content could lead to issues with being able to preserve that content later.

So what we've done is establish a separate preservation repository that is synced with our content repository. Preservation repository is not touched, except for preservation purposes, and it's very strictly controlled, as to who has access to the preservation repository and what actions they can perform.

And, third, FDsys is an advanced search engine. We've got the content. We're controlling the content. We want to make sure that it's very easily findable by the

public. And so FDsys combines extensive metadata creation, both automated and manual, with modern search technology to ensure the highest quality search experience.

Just to dive a little bit more into the aspects of FDsys, if you look at FDsys and submission, we see content coming into FDsys from three sources. The first is content that is submitted directly into FDsys. We will have relationships with our content originators. They will have accounts. They'll be able to, you know, securely log in to FDsys and directly deposit their electronic content. And their orders, if they want to have the content printed or otherwise distributed by GPO, and then we'll be able to ingest the content and move it along the content life cycle.

The second way is to have content harvested automatically from Federal websites. We know that we're not necessarily going to have a relationship with every agency who -- you know, that not everybody is going to come and deposit content into FDsys. So there's content that we're going to want to go get, and that's where the harvesting comes in.

And then the third source is from converted -- its content has been converted from previously printed publications. We have a lot of printed documents in the collection that will be more usable to a wider audience if we can convert those print files into digital files and make them

available, along with our other content collections.

FDsys and Access: Access is a very important part of the system, because it's so visible. This is really what people associate with FDsys, even though there's so much going on behind the scenes, this is what's visible to the public. So with FDsys, through our requirements work and stakeholder group work and focus groups, we've kind of boiled down FDsys access into a simple -- a search philosophy that we use.

The first is to provide simple search with advanced results. A large portion of users are very used to the Google box. You have one box, you type in your search terms, you hit search, and you get your results. And so we wanted to make sure that we were able to support that type of search across all of our content and all the collections for our public users.

The issue with the simple search is that you get a lot of results, and so in order to make it easier to drill down into the content that you are actually looking for, we make -- on FDsys we've addressed it by having you be able to filter and sort your results, to drill down into your results to get to a smaller result set.

The second search philosophy is to provide advanced search features so users can efficiently retrieve specific documents. This is kind of the reverse situation where we've got information professionals who are really power users, and

they know what they're looking for. And they want to type in a more complex search, and they want to be able to get to a more precise set of results. So in order to accommodate these users, we have a specific advanced search page, where you can search across one or multiple collections and their metadata.

We support Boolean operators and field operators. You could type a very complex search string in the simple search and get precise results. And we also have the citation search, so if you know exactly what document or article you're looking for, you can type in your citation, and it takes you right to that document.

And, third, we want to provide relevant results fast, so we want to make sure that you don't have to scroll through 10,000 documents, if that's what you get back; that your results, what you're looking for, is probably within the first page or two; and we needed to be quicker, because people don't want to wait.

Content Authentication: We kind of talked about how important that is in our challenges. Within FDsys, we've addressed it in a couple ways, but from a system perspective, making sure that we tightly control the authorized users, who are either submitting content or performing processes against that content, but also by authenticating the content, itself, as it goes out the door to the users.

So we affixed digital signatures to the content, so

our users can have assurance that the content has not been --
first, it's been approved by, contributed by, or harvested
from an official source, and that it's been verified by GPO to
be complete and unaltered. So if it gets e-mailed, time and
time and time again, that seal of authenticity is conveyed
with that document, and people can have assurance that that
document is official and authentic.

And preservation is very, very -- a very key
component of the system. The GPO -- we do have a commercial
content management system. We are using Documentum for our
CMS, but above and beyond our off-the-shelf CMS, GPO is
employing the Open Archival Information System Reference
Model, which outlines the relationship of information
producers and archivists, and it affects sufficient control to
insure long-term preservation and access.

So what we didn't want to do was tie ourselves down
to a commercial product. We wanted to make sure that we could
preserve this content outside of any type of commercial COX
product. So we're taking content and taking the metadata
associated with that content, they're packaged together, and
those packages are stored in a separate preservation
repository and can be taken out of that repository and put
into another repository at a later date.

And this is key, because we want to safeguard it.
We don't want there to be a lot of access against it. We

don't want there to be a lot of ties to this content. It
needs to stand alone, so that we can monitor it, we can pull
it, we can preserve it, and we can make sure that it persists
going forward into the future. So this kind of just outlines
a little bit about the FDsys implementation approach.

You've probably heard over the years a lot of talk
about releases, Release 1, Release 2, Release 1.B, Release
1.C, Release 1.C.2, all the different numbers that we've used,
but this is the approach that got us to determining what the
key releases were for FDsys.

We started with a very large set or requirements,
just a pool of requirements that have been gathered from
stakeholders and, you know, internal and external stakeholders
and had been refined over a long period. And we took those
requirements, and we started dividing them into key functional
areas. And then we took a logical approach to actually
building the system, because everything that it needs to do,
to try to put it all together into a system at once and launch
it, just wouldn't be prudent.

So we knew that the first release had to build a
foundational infrastructure. We had to have all of our
servers in place and the data center built out and the
redundancies in the system and we had to have the bones in
place. We had to have the preservation repository, because as
soon as you start bringing in content into that system, you

have to be able to create your archival packages and lock that content away, so that we can make sure we can perform preservation processes on it.

And then we needed to start replacing the current Public Access site, GPO Access. It's been around for a very long time, and it's been used a lot over the years. But we needed to make sure we could modernize the access to the content that we have, and then go ahead and sunset the existing infrastructure.

Once we had the basics down, we had the system and the architecture, we had the content that's being brought into FDsys, and we had the process to replace GPO Access, we wanted to enable submission of content from additional sources. Right now, the content that we have is coming in from GPO, from our plant operations area.

We wanted to be able to go directly to our content originators and have them start using the system directly. And so from a release standpoint, we're starting with Congress, because we have very close relationships with the offices, the Clerk for the House and Secretary of Senate, and then start expanding into agencies once we've got kind of a rudimentary submission functionality in place with the next release.

We also then wanted to extend Fdsys functionality to interface with external systems, so once we've opened it up to

external users to come in to have GPO -- to have FDsys

accounts and be able to deposit content, we wanted to talk to

other systems. And that's both on the submission side, so we

can talk to, you know, automated procurement systems within

agencies; and, also, on the access side, where we're talking

to -- you know, we're creating APIs, or we're doing the

digital distribution. So broadening the access to the system

from both sides.

Now that we've built our preservation repository and

we're putting content into it, we have to get to a point where

we start performing automated preservation processes on the

repository. Right now we have the ability to do manual

preservation processes. You can go in, access a package, add

a rendition or do what you need to do to that package, but

when we're going to have millions and millions and millions of

content packages, you need to be able to do this in a

systematic way. So that's what the automated preservation

processes will perform.

And then we have requirements to tailor FDsys to

better meet individual user needs. This is where we get into

the personalization and the customization to make FDsys very

usable, interoperable, really putting in -- making it even

more user friendly, and, really, this is a lot of the fun

stuff, too. And this is where it gets to be a lot more

functionality from the user side.

And so those are the major releases of FDsys, but in between those major releases of key functionality, we're planning to continue to improve and enhance the functionality that is already in place, based on user feedback. And there's some flexibility here. It's been really interesting, since we released the first release, we've made a lot of improvements -- and Lisa is going to talk to those in a little while -- but being able to continuously improve and enhance in between our major releases of functionality, is going to allow us to continue to make it more and more and more usable as we go forward.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Selene?

SELENE DALECKY: Yes.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. Can you go back to that slide for just one second.

SELENE DALECKY: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Can you tell me where you are on this list?

SELENE DALECKY: Sure. We are -- right, where are we? The first bullet, the Foundational Infrastructure, that's the first release. So where we are is, we have our infrastructure in place. We have our data center and all the hardware and software. And we've released the first release, which is going to be replacing GPO Access. And that's going

to be over the period of the next couple months, as we bring in more content, and then we will sunset GPO Access. Release 1 will be complete.

We're also starting to develop the next release. And so we're in the planning stages for that. These next couple slides talk to that. That's where I was kind of -- going forward. Where are we now?

FDsys is live. We did launch Release 1 on January 15th -- publicly launched it. We did have a beta period prior to that. We launched with eight collections. We've been able to identify 50 collections on GPO Access. We launched with eight, and we're going to be migrating the rest of the collections in, through about September, at which time we'll be able to then switch over from GPO Access.

Release 1 was a major release. It was our foundational release, and it was the beginning of the replacement of GPO Access. But shortly after we launched with that major release, we had a minor release, and that's when we brought in the daily compilation of Presidential Documents, which was a new collection that was developed with -- between GPO and the Office of the Federal Register. It replaces the printed weekly compilation of Presidential Documents, and it was released about a week after our public launch.

So what's next? We're planning for the future. We're not stopping. We haven't taken a break. We're

continuing to go forward and add to the functionality of
FDsys. We are -- we've kicked off the second release
development -- or design. We are collaborating on advanced
interfaces to FDsys. We're establishing an offsite backup for
FDsys, and all of this is going on right now, all the planning
for all of these activities.

We've also been conducting and continue to conduct
outreach activities to support future enhancements and
development. And at the same time, we're closing out
Release 1, because not all the content is in FDsys yet from
GPO Access. So we need to complete the migration process and
sunset GPO Access.

So from a Release 2 perspective, we have -- we had
our kickoff for the second release of FDsys in -- at the
beginning of the month. The Release 2 focus is on the
submission of content from Congress into FDsys. We were going
to provide Congressional offices with an interface to
electronically input their Bills, along where their ephemeral
materials like letterhead and envelopes. And they'll be able
to submit that directly to GPO in electronic format through
FDsys, and then this content will be brought into the GPO --
the FDsys workflow to be able to make this content available
to the public; or given to the Congressional Services side,
where they would take this content in to be printed. We are
planning to release Release 2 this year in late-2009.

From the Access side, we are looking to do some work on advanced interfaces to FDsys. Bob Tapella talked a little bit about this yesterday, in conjunction with the Transparency Initiative in the Obama Administration. GPO is working with the Administration and other Federal organizations to -- on advanced data access interface and initiatives.

In doing this, it helps GPO expand and refine existing requirements around interoperability, and it helps us develop a collaborative implementation approach. And this is key because we want to make sure that we're working with partners, that we're developing interfaces that are reusable, that we are not duplicating efforts, because there's a lot of activity going on around the transparency push in the Federal Government right now.

So what we're looking to do with FDsys is position it as the official repository and access locations for the Federal Government publications and develop pilot concepts and APIs with the Open Government Office, within the Obama Administration to demonstrate how FDsys can serve as the official repository and how outside users can have their own interfaces to get into the content repository that's being managed by GPO.

And, also, on the other side, look at bulk data distribution, and how do we have partners hold content that others can get into as well. And so GPO is participating in

Legislative Branch Task Force to study the bulk data
distribution and develop a recommendation to Congress on how
GPO and Library of Congress can support data distribution to
the public.

Another initiative that's underway is that GPO is
establishing a Continuity of Operations or a COOP site for
FDsys. Since FDsys is going to be, you know, the -- it's
going to support the business of the entire agency, we need to
make sure that we have an offsite, secure, live, backup in
place, so that we can continue our operations should there be
some kind of disaster at the main site.

Right now we have lots of redundancies built into
the infrastructure for the live site, but we don't have a live
offsite realtime backup. And so that effort is underway, and
we should have an operational COOP site in July of this year.

And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Carrie
to give an update on the FDsys outreach activities.

CARRIE GIBB: Thanks, Selene.

Just as Selene mentioned and as we've done
throughout the development of FDsys, we're continuing our
outreach activities. These activities help us to enhance the
current functionality, as well as conceptualize requirements
for our future releases.

Some of our planned activities, coming up in the
near future, include formal and informal beta testing prior to

all the major releases. Conducting user focus groups for the
public site. I'm happy to say we held one here last night,
which was very successful as well. And we've been using those
at almost every conference for the last few years, and it's
given us a lot of great feedback to put into the system.

Stakeholder meetings to elicit requirements,
including meetings with the Secretary of the Senate and the
Clerk of the House, for Release 2 functionality, the
Congressional submission side. And to get feedback on how to
improve the existing publications available on FDsys, such as
meetings with the Office of the Federal Register for the
compilation of Presidential Documents and some of their other
products, and the Council on Economic Advisors.

We're working with LSCM, closely, to host an event
at a depository library in the D.C. area, coming up in the
next few months. And if you're interested in holding some
type of FDsys event in your library, we'd love to hear from
you and try and put something together for that. You know, in
the beginning we had a lot of libraries interested, but wanted
to wait until the migration is complete and we have all of the
data into FDsys.

We're also in the planning stages of designing some
promotional material to distribute to the libraries as well.
We believe that posters and table tents would be very helpful
within the libraries, but if you have other ideas, we welcome

those. And we'd love to hear about those.

We're also planning on sending notifications as we complete the collection migration through multiple channels, such as press releases, the FDLP-L Listserv, FDsys Home Page will be updated as well, when we complete those collections.

We can talk a little bit about our beta testing for Release 1, and what we got back out of that. Our primary outreach activities for Release 1 focussed around beta testing. It's a vital part to the success and development of FDsys, and although we spent a great deal of time speaking to users and stakeholders to build the system around their needs, the beta testing allows us to find bugs and to also find other ways to enhance the system.

For Release 1 we had a two-week formal beta testing period, from January 2nd to January 12th. We had 117 users who registered to test the site, and we received almost 50-percent responses with those testers, which is pretty good for beta testing. So we were very satisfied with that.

We've also had an informal beta test period since we launched, and in those few months, we've had more than 350 comments received. Some of them are access improvement ideas. Some of them are just "We really like this feature. We'd like to see this enhancement." So it's been interesting to see how those patterns develop, throughout the informal beta testing. And we'll continue to do this while we do -- complete the data

migration, but really as long as the system is active and
live, I feel like it's going to be an informal best test
period. We're always going to welcome those comments and try
to improve the system to meet the users' needs.

So feedback gathering is an ongoing process. It's
never going to stop with -- as long as FDsys is active. So I
really want to emphasize to you, please, go on, use the
system, and send us your feedback. We're listening, and we're
using it.

Since the launch we've noticed a couple patterns
developing in the feedback. Some of those are what users
really like, which they've told us about. The filtering
capabilities or the navigators, as we like to call them, when
you see your search results on the left-hand side. The browse
Government publications options are available. The
breadcrumbs, faceted searching, the speed of search results,
and also the Help options that are available. We've tried to
make Help options available throughout the site, whether it's
a mouse-over to give you a definition of what a metadata field
means, or the RoboHelp« file that opens up and lets you search
the Help files, to find what you're looking for or browse
through them.

Some of the things that we heard a lot about, that
users requested or what they want in the system, one of which
was the dates available for each collection. If you're

familiar with the FDsys Home Page, we list the collections
currently available in the system, so we added the dates to
those, which users seem to really like.

They requested to add Find-a-Library link in the
actions box on the content detail pages, which has also been
completed. If you use the system now, you'll see that there.

We also had some feedback on the Help files, that it
was great that we made them very extensive, but power users
also wanted a simple Boolean operator chart to keep within --
for each collection. So we've completed those. They will be
available later this week on the GPO website. I have a few
copies at the table, if you want to look at them, and you can
also come by and sign up, and I will e-mail them to you,
tomorrow, after the conference, if you want the PDF files of
those.

We had a number of requests for content
notifications by e-mail or our SS in the linking of related
documents, both of which are features planned for Release 3.
So we're on the right track. We're hearing things that people
want, that we already have in the works for future releases.

The ability to save searches was also requested by
several users, and this will -- is planned for Release 4.
Sorry. I'll go back.

We also had functionality requested that was not a
current requirement, and as we received feedback which

constitutes a new requirement, we analyze that and see where
we can fit it into a release and how it's going to impact the
system development.

Some of those include highlighting the PDF -- the
search term in the PDF document, and the ability to bookmark
documents for a personal library, as well as the ability to
view your search history. So we're looking at some of those
things that we get back, that aren't currently planned and can
see how we can fit them into the system.

As I said, what can you do now? We'd really like
for you to go on and use the system. The website address is
FDsys.gov, and send us your feedback, your ideas, anything
that you have. Like I said, it may be something that you know
is coming in a future release, but you may have a different
idea of how we would implement it. Or the patterns that we
see develop are very important to prioritize where we put
things in between the major releases as well.

And you can stay up to date on the activities that
we're working on through the blog or through the GPO FDsys
pages. I know in the tech line it has the GPO.gov/FDsys link
there. We are redoing our website, and the new GPO.gov is
going to launch in a couple weeks, so. That link, hopefully,
is going to stay consistent or may change. So, for now, the
blog is definitely the link that's going to work, and it's not
going to change in the next couple weeks.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Lisa to talk about Release 1 Activities.

LISA LaPLANT: Good morning. I'm Lisa LaPlant, and I'm also with the Program Management Office. I'm going to go through and talk a little bit about what we're doing to -- with our Release 1 activities to really finish out and close out that release. And then we'll go into some of the access enhancements and some of the information and feedback that we received and show how we've kind of put those into -- actually into the production system. And we'll finish it up with a demo of those access enhancements, so you can actually see some of the things that have recently changed within the last couple weeks.

So one of the key things that we're really working on right now are, is the migration of the remaining collections from GPO Access. We launched with eight collections, and as Selene had those listed out in her slides -- and we'll also see them listed out on the website when we go to it. One week later, we were able to launch with the daily compilation of Presidential documents. And this is an example as I go through some -- or my information that I'm presenting, you'll hear me talk about enhancements versus major releases, or enhancements versus, you know, things that are requirements and large chunks of functionalities. And, hopefully, by the end, you guys will get a pretty good feel

for what's an enhancement and what's a large chuck of
functionality that will be rolled in with a major release.

So the additional collections, we are in the process
of actually developing the design documentation, developing
the parsers, extracting out the metadata, testing the parsers,
developing the user interfaces. For each one of the 50
collections, that Selene mentioned -- and we actually have 27
of them in the works right now. So they're spinning. They're
swirling -- 15 of those will be available in the near term,
and the goal is then to have all of the collections migrated
through September 2009.

So for our first group we have, coming up,
Congressional Calendars, Ways and Means Committee Prints,
including -- or Congressional Committee Prints, including the
Ways and Means Committee Prints, the Blue Book and Green Book,
History of Bills, Congressional Record Index, List of CFR
Sections Affected, and Economic Indicators.

So these are the ones that the design documentation
has done. The developers are working on them. We've started
seeing initial feedback on the parsing process and metadata
extraction. We're starting to develop user interfaces on
these, so we're really excited about this. The target for
this is to have these available in the May time frame. So
these will be the first group of new collections you'll see.

Second group, we have Economic Report of the

President, Bound Congressional Record, GAO Reports and Comptroller General Decisions, the Statutes at Large, Congressional Directory, and Government Manual. And we're looking at that in the June time frame.

And the third group would be a big group, so we don't have as many collections listed here, but that's when we hope to bring in the United States Code, the CFR, and the Public Papers. And we're looking at that in the July time frame. So this is a large chunk of the collections that we're hoping to -- you know, that we're going to migrate in, in the next couple months.

There are some collections remaining after this, but more of the collections beyond group three are either smaller collections or individual publications. An example of a collection beyond this group would be the Plum Book or the Senate Manual, which are very important publications, but the amount of content associated with those and the complexity of the parsers and the development and design process, it's not to the level of, say, U.S. Code or the Code of Federal Regulations.

Let's talk a little bit about our access enhancements. So through our beta feedback process, we were able to -- as Carrie said, there were 350 or so comments, plus the comments received as part of our beta feedback. We were able to kind of categorize those enhancements into various

areas, such as search results and navigators, advance search and field operators, general site search and Help updates, retrieved by citation, and then collection specific enhancements.

So I'll spend a little bit of time and tell you about the process, what happens when you send us -- when you send a comment to GPO. So let's -- say you send -- you see something on the site. You go to the Comment Forum and you -- or you go to PMO@GPO.gov, and you describe an enhancement or you describe a feature that you'd like to see. That comes into us and, actually, Carrie is the first person who sees that. And she filters it out to an appropriate person in the program management office.

If it has to do with access issues, it generally comes to my desk. So I'll take a look at it. If it's a piece of functionality that I know we have requirements for already -- so if it's something like, you know, to -- if it's, you know, a collection that we already have scheduled or if it's a major piece of functionality, then I'll take a look at that, and we'll respond back and let you know when that is planned to be in the system.

If it's something that's closer to the line of an enhancement, say, add the date information available for each collection; or change the -- add information to your Help file about a piece of content; or something along the lines of, you

know, you have a pulldown box with all these metadata values.
It would be really great if you put that pulldown box in
alphabetical order.

So we'll take a look at that. (Demonstrating.) So
let's use that one. So put a pulldown box on the advanced
search page. Instead of being in random order, put it in
alphabetical order. We'll take that to our change control
board, which is a process that we have set up within GPO to do
an impact analysis on any of the requests that come into the
system.

So we'll take a look and see, you know, where does
this fit within the scope schedule and budget, and what are
the impacts of this? Is this something that needs to have,
you know, major development associated with it? And there are
members of -- you know, the program management office is on
there. There are also folks that are part of the development
team on there. So something that I might think is something
little, when I bring it to one of the developers or the
architects, they might look at it and say, "No, that's --
that's kind of something that's a little bit bigger."

So it goes through the whole process, and then it's
able to be scheduled in, either as an enhancement, or we do
additional work to derive requirements and to actually put
together the design documentation, so the developers can build
the new functionality associated with the system.

So I know that was kind of -- kind of a little bit
of a tangent, but I think it's important for folks to know
that, you know, when you do send us comments, that it just --
it just doesn't sit somewhere. It actually goes through the
whole process and is tracked. And, you know, we want to hear
what you want to have to make the system better.

So I won't go through these slides, because I have
quite a few of all the enhancements that went through, but
I'll point out a couple things from each one of the slides and
then we'll go into the demo, because I think we're starting to
run short on time, and I want to leave time for questions.

So one of the things that we did on the search
results and navigators, we've improved our relevancy ranking
for citation searches. So when you're working with a search
engine, one of the main things you really want to do is,
continue to tune your relevancy. So as you have more searches
coming in, you see how people are searching, how the system is
performing, and you continue that process of tuning it so you
can get more and more relevant results.

Then we had some things where we -- we have some of
them that are actually still in the works, so we're adding
nominees and witnesses to the person navigator updating the
Did-You-Mean functionality. Another big thing that we did is,
we persisted our sorts across -- when search results are
bookmarked. So that's something I'll demonstrate.

On the advanced search and field operators, we had quite a few new requests come in for various field operators or advanced search field, so the -- we added say -- you can search by RIN number for both Across the Record and the Federal Register.

Another big enhancement that we made was, on the advanced search screen, you're not required to select a certain day. Now you can search by year only or year and month only. We made quite a few enhancements to the Help page. As we get the feedback in that says, you know, explain this a little bit better or give us more information, we add that to -- into the Help file.

On our Retrieve by Citation page, we had a lot of feedback that said, you know, it doesn't make sense that the years and volumes are in chronological order -- aren't in chronological order, so put them in chronological order. And this is an example of, you know, the importance of -- in terms of working -- something that I've experienced in working with, you know, developers that unless you really specify something, you might not get exactly what you want. So from here on out, I'll make sure that I tell, you know, developers years and volumes, you know, need to be in chronological order.

Another thing we did was to open -- have the Retrieve by Citation open to an exact page in a PDF; whereas, it used to just open to the first page. And then this gets

into some of our more specific -- collection specific enhancements. So something -- an example, with Congressional Bills, we added long titles to Bills in the browse if the short titles weren't available. For the Federal Register, we corrected some title casing problems. We added the readers aged file so that is now accessible from the table of contents.

For public and private laws, we did quite a bit of few updates on the browse page and in the Help file, and have been working with Office of the Federal Register, just like we -- we -- you know, we think it's important to meet with all of our stakeholders, that includes the content originators. So we meet with them. We, you know, said, "Here's the first launch of the system." You know, they were working with us all along to help develop the requirements and the design documents. So we had a feedback session with them, where they were able to provide information about how, you know, how they wanted to see their products enhanced. So we were able to do a couple enhancements for them in the short term.

For the compilation of Presidential Documents, one of the big things we did -- and this was actually at the request of the Office of the Federal Register, we were able to provide a browse by month instead of a by week, because it's, you know, no longer the weekly compilation of Presidential Documents. It's viewed as more of a daily or, in the instance

of browse, a monthly-type collection.

We, in addition, are providing links to supplementary materials directly on the browse page. Congressional Reports, we updated the system to handle multiple volume reports that also have an errata. So the situation doesn't happen all that often, but when it does, the system knows what to do with it.

Congressional Documents, we arranged the browse by Congress with the current Congress listed first and hearings displayed in order of hearing date.

Record, we did a lot of really, really great enhancements. So we're now able to display the daily digest category and summary on the More Information Page, for all the Congressional Record documents that contain votes. And we also provide the ability to download an entire section off of any granule More Information Page. So I know this probably doesn't have any meaning, but when I show it in the demo, you'll see what we're talking about.

Okay. So some of our planned access enhancements in the short term, applying an Ordering to the Date Published in the Congress navigator. So one of the -- a large piece of feedback that we got was, when you do a search and you filter your search, the date published, it comes back, you might have January and then March, then December. And the way our filters are working, right now, is that if you have -- it's

based on number of hits. So it's working with the development team to make sure that, for certain navigators, we're able to arrange these in a chronological order and, also, make sure that we don't cut off any relevant results, that could be at the end of the list.

We're also OCRing our PDFs and adding those images to the HTML files. We're updating browse to support upcoming collections. So the browse for CFR is going to be a little bit different than our current browse.

We're enhancing the Advanced Search Page, based on user feedback, so if you guys are out there and you're using the advanced search page, and you have ideas for how to make that better, that's something we definitely want to hear from you all. It was something we focussed on in the focus group last night.

We're also updating Help information. So if -- as you're seeing something on the site that doesn't make sense, send that in. We'll get that into the Help documentation, and then implementing our collection specific updates.

(Demonstration) Let's do a quick demo, and for those who haven't seen, this is the FDsys Home Page. I'll start out, and I'll do a search and try to show you some of our improved relevancy ranking. Okay. Did a search for H.R.1. So with the improved relevancy ranking, we've boosted the -- however we're -- the citation that's associated with a

document. So we have more relevant results at the top.

We've also refined our Search Within feature, so I can check a box. And we'll do a Search Within for recovery. I'm going to go use the filters, and you can see this is one of the great uses of the navigators or the filters. I'm going to narrow this down to Congressional Bills. We've changed some of our spacing within the navigators, based on feedback.

Once you select a collection specific navigator, we have additional navigators that appear at the bottom, that are specific to that collection, such as Congress number or bill type or bill version. So we'll select the -- expand this out and select the 111th Congress. And let's go through and expand out the House Bills navigator, and under House Bills we have -- there are eight Bill versions for H.R.1. And we can change the sort. Instead of relevance, let's change that date new to old.

Now, another thing that I mentioned that was an access enhancement is, during our bookmarking process -- in terms of being able to bookmark search results, our bookmarks are persisted across various -- I'm sorry. The sorts are persisted across when you bookmark information. So I bookmarked Enrolled Bills from 2009, and our sorts and our number of results per page are persisted now.

For Retrieve by Citation, I'll show you how it opens up to a new page. So a Retrieve by Citation is really

targeted at the more advanced user, who knows exactly what they're looking for and doesn't want to have to weed through search results. They want to go directly to a document.

So we'll go into the Federal Register. Do Volume 2009. So we've added dates associated or years associated with Volumes, and we'll do page 1339. So it opens up to its Page 60 out of 174. Okay. On our advanced search --

Okay. One of the things we can do now with the Date Search is, we can do a search for Date Is, and we'll select -- you don't have to select the day now, so we'll do -- the year is 2009. The collections is the Congressional Record. Do a search over the Daily Digest category. So you notice that we have our pull-down boxes now in alphabetical order.

And we'll do a search for Recovery Conference Report, and add a little bit more search criteria -- another search criteria, Congressional vote number, and that gets us to a very specific search result.

If we click on the More Information link that's at end of each one of the search results, that brings us to the More Information Page. And this is the page where we provide access the text, the PDF, the MODS metadata file, the premise metadata file, and a Zip File for the entire package, so. So if you click on Zip, you'll get everything associated with this issue of the Congressional Record.

One of the things that I mentioned, we've added onto

the Congressional Record area, is we're now displaying the
vote information associated with a Congressional Record
document, along with the Daily Digest category and the summary
for that vote.

We also have links off of every Congressional Record
page, so you can download the entire section, the entire -- of
the House section, Senate section, Daily Digest section and
remarks. We also have our document in context area, where you
can see where this specific falls within the entire issue of
the Congressional Record.

And when we did our search over, daily digest,
category -- I can actually open that. So this is what we were
actually searching over. The other thing that we have been
able -- that I don't think we've demonstrated before is -- in
addition to being able to search over the fields that you saw,
an advanced search in our field operators, for the very
advanced searchers and users, who are looking for a very
specific piece of information in metadata, within our MODS
metadata file, you're actually able to search over any field
that's displayed.

So, for instance, if you wanted to find -- one of
the fields that's within MODS is date ingested. So I can do a
search for MODS. I'm searching -- directing the search engine
to search over the MODS file in the field called Date
Ingested, and I'm using the standard month and date format.

And this brings up all of the content that was ingested on the specific date.

And the last update -- last piece of information, I'll go ahead and take a look at the Help file and show you some of the information that we've added to that. So for each one of the collections, we have information about -- the field operators are available to search. So if you saw me kind of doing a collection specific search or wanted to see the input values for the various fields, it's all available in the Help file now. Okay. Thank you.

(Demonstration concluded; applause.)

SELENE DALECKY: So just to summarize where we are, right now, we've got lots of activities going on and lots of more improvements coming on FDsys. We are completing the first release bringing in the remaining collections and standing up our continuity of operations site and closing down GPO Access, but also continuing to make enhancements based upon feedback.

We want to make sure that the system fits the needs of users, and so we want to be able to do as many enhancements as we can, over a minor release process, and also incorporate major changes to functionality within our major releases. We are working on our next major release. That's Release 2. It will be released in late 2009, and we'll begin to enable our submission directly from out content originators. And with

that, we can open it up to questions.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer from NCO. I have a number of questions. Maybe I'll sprinkle them with other questions from Council. The first one is kind of a higher level question. And I want to congratulate the team on a terrific job. The progress is very strong. The site is looking quite good, but -- an, appropriately, you focussed on the ingest side of things for the time being, because dissemination is not an issue until you have something to disseminate. So that's been entirely appropriate. And you described FDsys as three things; content management, preservation, and an advanced search engine. So on the dissemination side, it's been focussed on search capability.

We heard a scenario yesterday. You have a, you know, a citizen in Utah or Wyoming who goes to their State library and wants all the information on a particular specific land management issue. And a librarian brings together a package of documents; some from the Federal government, from State, some local, some regional, and all of those things together to answer the question. The patron doesn't care if there's some special arrangement between GPO and the library to provide that. They just want to have the information together.

In a digital world that means that you need a network for mashing up all that information, so you can do a

single query of all of those corresponding databases. The
only way you can do that is if there is an appropriate API
capability for FDsys.

And the reason I'm bringing it up now -- I know that
it's part of the plan -- is that the libraries need to think
about this: What are they -- what do they want? What are
they willing to do to get that process started? In the analog
world, this business of bringing all these papers together was
sort of the business model. And in the digital world,
bringing -- mashing up all those digital capabilities is, in
some sense, kind of new model that came up yesterday, but it's
really just the digital equivalent of the old model, if you
will.

So an important question is, how will that
interaction between the libraries and their need to develop
digital capabilities and FDsys in supporting those
capabilities, because you don't want to get several years down
the road and discover the architecture precludes some of the
solutions.

SELENE DALECKY: And that is a good point about not
only making sure that the business model fits with FDsys,
currently, and the future of FDsys, but also the architecture
fits. And so one of the major initiatives that GPO has been
undertaking is working with the Open Government Office in the
Obama Administration on some ideas for or some concepts of a

pilot for APIs.

And so we're looking at many different options, most likely opening it up to interested parties to say, okay, what kind of partnerships can we develop so that we can test some of this extensibility of the system and make sure that we have architected it correctly, and we don't go down -- any further down paths that are going to preclude this inoperability.

So there's been a lot of discussions over the last, I'd say, 60 days, and there's going to be a lot more as we try to move forward quickly to do -- to pilot the concept of the API. So I think that it's going to be a major focus from the Public Printer and from our CIO over the next few months.

CHRIS GREER: I'm glad to hear that, but the major pilot I'm interested in is one that engages one of the FDLPs, and that's, I think, crucial. And that's a lot harder in some sense.

So a related question, then, you said that the -- this -- that the FDsys is envisioned as the official repository and access location for Federal Publications. What's the relationship between FDsys and the President's Data.gov initiative? How do those work together?

SELENE DALECKY: It's -- we've been talking with them or with the Open Government Office. We don't really have any details yet on how they're going to work together, but there will be -- and we've talked about putting data up on on

data.gov. And I think just working out the policies and the details are still to come, but we are in contact with them. And we are going to be participating in that initiative.

CINDY ETKIN: A point of clarification on data.gov. My understanding was that it was the individual agency's responsibility, so where -- Chris, where do you see GPO's role in this, I guess?

CHRIS GREER: I think that's an important question. The data.gov initiative is evolving. You know, the point is to have effective access and participatory government for citizens, and one-stop shopping for that. Whether that means the Registry or it means actual, you know, deposition of data remains to be seen. I think it can't be an agency-by-agency solution, because I think it becomes too complex. So I think working carefully with the data.gov folks is going to be crucial, so we don't duplicate effort and resources.

SELENE DALECKY: Right. One of the things -- one of the reasons that GPO has been very proactive with Open Government Office is, that we don't necessarily want to be kind of just participants in providing the data or providing the registry. We want to be able to drive, you know, what it actually is and what it can accomplish, because as a major content owner, really, and manager, within the Government, we have a lot of experience with it at this point with FDsys and even previously to that. And when you take GPO and you throw

in Library of Congress and NARA, there's a lot of expertise there and there's a lot of knowledge that can be shared. So I think that knowledge sharing and defining, you know, what is the best path forward, maybe on an agency-by-agency basis or if there's some kind of, you know, high-level description of how this data should be managed Government-wide, GPO wants to be a partner in helping define that concept.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer from NCO. A couple of specific questions. You probably answered this for me before, but I don't remember the answer. Do you imagine the full content of FDsys being exposed to crawlers?

SELENE DALECKY: Yes, that is -- in another one of our enhancements that's going to be happening shortly, is to develop and publish our site map. And so we are planning to have all the content open.

CHRIS GREER: Okay. And another very specific question: Who is doing QA/QC on the major and minor releases?

SELENE DALECKY: I'm sorry. What was that?

CHRIS GREER: Who does the QA/QC on major and minor releases?

SELENE DALECKY: Oh, the system testing and the --

CHRIS GREER: Yeah.

SELENE DALECKY: Okay. GPO actually has, within the CIO's organization a quality branch and a system testing branch. And so we're using internal resources to do that.

CHRIS GREER: It's not contracted?

SELENE DALECKY: It's not. It was contracted at one time, but we wanted to build up the expertise internally so that we could perform the QA and the testing internally.

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. Lisa, you mentioned OCR checking of PDFs. Can you say a little bit more about that and the quality control on that?

LISA LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant. One of the -- one of the things we know we have with our collections of content, say, a hearing, for example, is we receive a lot of content that's scanned in and is not currently OCRed. So we have requirements to go through and, actually, OCR that content, extract out any images, and to put those into HTML files.

GWEN SINCLAIR: I'm specifically interested in whether there's any checking going on?

LISA LaPLANT: So are you asking about like the OCR bubbles and the -- to check what comes out of the OCR to see if it's like 50 percent quality --

GWEN SINCLAIR: Yeah.

LISA LaPLANT: -- versus 90 percent quality? So that's something that we're still working on right now, in terms of a level and what we can expect out of our OCR software. So we're actually going through and looking at

different types of OCR software and seeing what they will actually give us.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay. The reason I ask is because I'm certainly familiar with a commercial vendors Congressional Record product, where they really -- a lot of the OCR is just done not that well, let's say. I mean, it hasn't been checked. So I think it's misleading for users if PDFs have been OCRed and they are searching on it and thinking that their retrieval is going to be good. And then if it hasn't been checked, it really -- the retrieval is going to be adversely affected by that.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. Just to follow up on that, I recommend looking into the recapture technology for taking care of some of that OCR interpretation. It's a really useful crowdsourcing approach. It's turned out to be pretty effective in an awful lot of archived digitization things, and it has a lot of other advantages, too.

LISA LaPLANT: Excellent. Thank you.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I have a comment and then a question. The comment is I think that there's been a lot of discussion about why the implementation of FDsys is taking so long, but it really became clear to me, maybe for the first time today, why that is, is because of all of the -- these collections have different problems. The field specific operators for each

collection are different. The fixes are different for each
collection. A fix for one collection doesn't apply or fix to
a different collection's problems. And so I want to
congratulate you on the meticulous approach that you're taking
to these problems and the search capabilities of each
individual collection.

My question is, it -- you have reached out to the
depository community to test this product and to provide
comment. Have you also reached out to other users? Have you
developed focus groups or sent requests for use and comment to
Federal agencies, to nondepository libraries, to law firms, to
law firm libraries, to other potential users of the system,
because it's not going to be used just by depository
libraries?

CARIE GIBB: This is Carrie Gibb. I'll speak to
that. We did -- in the 117 registered beta testers that we
had, they were across all areas, not just libraries. We had
employees from Federal agencies, within libraries and Federal
agencies and just general employees who used GPO Access at
some point for their job. We had contractors or legal
researchers from private law firms participate. So we had
people from the public come in and register, and we posted the
request for beta testers through multiple, multiple, channels.
So we had a very good mix of those participants and will
continue to do that.

CHRIS GREER: And just to follow up on that, if you had to come up with a percentage of, you know, the responses that came from the depository community, as opposed to the responses from all of these other groups, what would that percentage be?

CARRIE GIBB: Offhand, I would say that the responses that we received, about 60 percent were from depository librarians and 40 percent from other sources. The legal research community, those private vendors, were very responsive in the beta testing.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. You know, we've been hearing for years from our students when we try to teach them GPO Access -- we teach legal research to the law students, and, you know, why is GPO Access so bad. And so this year, when we were doing the assignment, I put the question in the spring on FDsys, and they do like that a lot better.

One thing that occurs to me that when you do your outreach to, you know, publicize this to somehow get to the people that are teaching in research in all fields, including legal. We just got our new edition of our legal research textbook, which has, you know, several pages about GPO Access with screen shots. That person who wrote that book should put something up on her website to -- because I can imagine it's going to take a while for instructors to catch on to this,

because not everybody is checking everything they teach. And they may go to be teaching GPO Access next fall, and if it's not there anymore -- so some good instructional materials. And I really would compliment you on the advanced search in FDsys. This is what we were showing them, and they really did like that, so. Thank you.

CARRIE GIBB: Great feedback. I thank you. We'll definitely do that.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Thank you.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. There was a slide you had about asking Congress about a data dump or something -- data distribution. Can you explain a little bit more about that?

SELENE DALECKY: Sure. In the -- let me make sure I get this. In the Omnibus Bill that was released by Congress, there was language in there about GPO and Library of Congress and NARA working together to come up with a recommendation on digital distribution, on bulk distribution of content.

And so there's a task force that's been created, in order to address that very issue. How, you know, we are taking one route, and GPO being a, you know, official repository of Government and a proration and having people to be able to tie into that repository through APIs. The other side of that, of the data issue, is giving the archive, the repository, if you will, to another party and having them

maintain it, either for access or for preservation purposes,
so, you know, replicating multiple data repositories. And the
ideas behind that are being discussed in this joint task force
at the direction of Congress.

And the language, itself, I'm trying to see if I
have -- the document is up on -- on FDsys, but it's -- the
language for the task force was "Public Access to Legislative
Data: Their support for enhancing public access to
legislative documents, build status, summary information and
other legislative data through more direct methods, such as
bulk data downloads and other means of no charge to digital
access and legislative databases.

"The Library of Congress, Congressional Research
Service and Government Printing Office and the appropriate
entities of the House of Representatives, are directed to
prepare a report on the feasibility of providing advanced
search capabilities. This report is to be provided to the
committees on the appropriations of the House and Senate
within 120 days of their release of the Legislative
Information System 2.0."

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: So nothing in current law
prevents you from doing bulk distribution of this information,
does it?

SELENE DALECKY: No.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: So they're just asking you to

find ways to make that happen?

SELENE DALECKY: Exactly. Correct.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: And that really only applies to legislative materials?

SELENE DALECKY: It does. That's the direction.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Okay.

SELENE DALECKY: But it would be -- I believe, the task force is looking -- at least GPO, would be looking beyond that. The partners, the Congressional Research Service and the Library of Congress -- well, Congressional Research Service for sure, really only has legislative data, but since GPO has more data, we would apply whichever process we come up with, the recommendations that we have on bulk data distribution to the full repository.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Because I think, you know, this would be like the API. I would encourage you to make that available to people.

SELENE DALECKY: Yes. And it's something that has always been in FDsys requirements. I think it's always been in the vision. And so things like this task force and the interactions with the Open Government Office are allowing us to actually look at concrete ways to do it. So I think it's really good to have both of these initiatives underway at that same time.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: And an opportunity to showcase

your expertise.

SELENE DALECKY: Yeah.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
California State Library, again. Most of the content that is
on the first release are serial publications. Eventually,
it's my understanding, that FDsys will encompass the universe
of Federal publications, including monographs. I can assume
that when one searches the catalog of U.S. Government
publications, eventually, the URLs or PURLs or handles, or
whatever is going to be used, will point to FDsys instead of
GPO Access.

Now, what is going to happen when one searches the
CGP for a monograph and the full text of that monograph is on
FDsys, what kind of mechanism is going to be enabled to have
the catalog of U.S. Government publications talk to FDsys and,
maybe, even vice versa, so that one -- when one searches
FDsys, one can find out which libraries have a particular
monograph?

LISA LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant. So I just want
to make sure I've got the question right. So when you search
within the CGP, what kind of interaction would that have
within FDsys, and then when you search within FDsys, what kind
of interaction would that have within the CGP?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: Yes.

LISA LaPLANT: Okay. So I can -- I'll answer from

the perspective of when you search within -- within FDsys, what kind of interaction will it have, and then it might be kind of a better question for the library technical folks to answer, you know, on the reverse side of that. But in terms of access within FDsys, we do have a set of requirements to make sure that we get the cataloging records from the ILS and have those added into and available as MODS records.

So if we have a monograph in the system, then -- and it's cataloged, and there's a marked record for it in the CGP, then we'd take that marked record and also -- take it and convert it into MODS and make search available over that MODS record, and, also, over the full text of that publication.

JUSTIN OTTO: Hi. I'm Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University. One of the, you know, philosophies that librarians have, and I believe in this too, and especially like with print materials, the more copies you have with something, there's less likely it is for anything catastrophic to wipe out every, you know, record or every copy of a document. So I'm sure that -- and I don't know that much about data backup. I know what a RAID array is, and that's about the extent of it.

But if depository libraries wanted to act as like a mirror site, or something like that, and some arrangement could be created for that, so that there are multiple backups of FDsys, how hard would that be to set that up? Even if

they're, you know, not trying to be an active host of it,
because that's what you're doing, but just to, you know, set
up servers, or whatever kind of storage facilities they would
need to act like that, how -- is that something that could be
done without too much trouble, getting them the data to do
something like that?

SELENE DALECKY: It's difficult to say at this
point, I think, because there's lots of different elements
involved in backup and getting data out. One thing is we
said, you know, exporting all of our archival information
packages and putting those all together and sending them to
somebody to then import into their own CMS and make use of, we
can do that. We can get the data out. We do backups of our
content all the time now, in lieu of having our fully
functional live backup site offsite from GPO. But the
usability of the content, the checking of the content, is
going to be more difficult.

So I think that from a bulk data distribution
strategy, that these are all questions that we need to answer.
So there's the extreme model of really building your own
FDsys, if you will, and bringing in the content and managing
it and preserving it and really being a full mirrored site,
there's taking offsite -- you know, taking a copy of the
repository and just holding it in a dark archive, for example,
and hoping that we'll be able to pull that back out if

something should happen to the other existing sites.

So coming up with a comprehensive strategy is going to be key. There's a question of do you want to hold only the access content? There's people who are only interested in that. I only want the content files that people are going to want to use, the PDF files or the XML or the HTML files. And then there's people who, maybe, want all of the TIFFs from the converted content or all of the locator coded format -- files from the printing process. So what levels do people want to capture and then hold or preserve is a question as well.

But there are questions that need to be asked and answered and strategy needs to be in place to allow the repository community to be partners in this data management and ownership and distribution. I hope I've answered it. It's a very complex question, and it's a good question and it needs to be addressed.

JUSTIN OTTO: Oh, yeah, I don't doubt it, but, yeah, so thank you for addressing that, so.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer for NCO. Maybe this is too deep in the technical weeds and Government weeds, but what FISMA provisions apply to FDsys? FISMA is the Federal Information Security Management Act. What's the process for addressing that?

SELENE DALECKY: We have a GPO I.T. Security Department within GPO, and they manage all of the security

auditing and testing. They develop our certification and
accreditation and issue our authorities to operate, so, and
they do -- I'm not sure what the exact FISMA requirements are,
but they are defined by our I.T. Security operations, and they
do the audits against FDsys to be sure that they're being
followed. On top of that we have an independent verification
validation team that come in and audit our security and make
sure we're following all laws and regulations the GPO has to
be held to. So from a security perspective, I'm not sure of
the details, but I can get them to you if you'd like.

CHRIS GREER: The answer is what I had hoped, so
that's good.

TIM BYRNE: Do we have any questions from the
audience?

PEGGY JOBE: I have one, and I'll try to make if
fast, just as a suggestion. This is Peggy Jobe from the
University of Colorado, Boulder. And I realize this is a very
large task, because you've got 50 collections that you are
planning to put into FDsys, but one of the common features of
the commercial databases, that libraries buy in increasing
numbers, is that you've got some kind of citation management
feature built in. So you've got either direct export to ref.
books, which is really common in academic libraries, or, you
know, downloads for import into biblio file and other citation
management things. And that's one of the biggest challenges,

I think, for users of Government information, is to cite the
stuff correctly. So some kind of feature that allows export
of that citation information would be a great feature to add.

LISA LaPLANT: And, actually, I'd like to comment on
that. This is Lisa LaPlant. So that's -- this is an example
of -- we've actually gotten that piece of feedback quite a --
in quite a few different places. We got that as part of our
beta testing. It came up as a discussion topic last night at
the focus group. And it's actually something that we don't
currently have as a requirement, but it's something that, you
know, when I go back I'd like to put that in and propose it to
our change control board and have it added in as a
requirement, so that it can be scheduled into one of the
releases. So keep up with those suggestions and keep sending
us your feedback. Thank you.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of
Kentucky. I'd like to follow up on David's point to some
extent. I'm still trying to understand the relationship
between FDsys and the ongoing archiving that's been happening
since 2002, related to the creation of PURLs. And my
understanding is the PURL indicates GPO has archived a copy of
that material. Is that in FDsys? Is it somewhere else? And
if it's somewhere else, do they talk to each other? I
still -- I've asked this several times, and I either am not
understanding the answer, or I don't know.

LISA LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant. So the
information that we've harvested today, and that we currently
have PURLs for -- and I'm looking to Robin to jump in if
I'm -- because this is -- but in terms of, you know, where
that content is now, that content is not in FDsys yet. It's
in a separate secure, you know, storage area. There are
requirements to move that information into FDsys, and that's
actually what's next on the list, after we get through the GPO
Access collections. So the priority was to get everything off
of WAIS. Have another set of requirements to move the
information off of what we call the permanent server and move
that information into -- into FDsys.

CATE IRWIN-SMILER: Cate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest
University, Professional Center Library. I have a question
about the content that's being uploaded directly from the
content producers and providers. It sounds like we're going
to be relying on metadata that they provide. Is there any --
first of all, am I understanding that correctly? And,
secondly, if so, is there going to be any kind of quality
control on that metadata provided?

LISA LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant. So that's
something in terms of digital deposit and the agencies or
Congressional folks providing content into FDsys. Some of the
metadata will come from the same sort of -- kind of like what
we have now. Some metadata would come from parsers, so

whatever we might be able to extract out. We might not be able to extract out as much, because we -- depending on the type of publication, we might not be able to write the rules to be able to extract out the information.

We would rely, really heavily then, for a lot of that information to be pulled in from the ILS. So similar to the question about the monographs. So if we have the cataloguing records, then we can pull in, you know, that information in and make it available for search and make it available, you know, as MODS metadata. So that in that metadata, actually, already has a very intense QA process associated with it, if it comes from ILS.

In terms of any information that's entered by the content originator, we're still going through and developing what type of information would be entered by the content originator. We know that there are certain types that would be associated with, say, a print job, that they would enter in, because they would know, you know, the size of the publication, and what they wanted it to be printed on. And we're still going through and developing, you know, what type of additional information we would want to try to have the content originator enter.

It's always kind of been our thinking with the content originators, to keep it as simple as possible for them, unless they've specifically requested to want to be able

to enter information. So we're really going to rely pretty heavily on the ILS for a lot of that metadata.

TIM BYRNE: Well, this has been a really great presentation this morning. I think that after all the years of getting FDsys reports at these meetings, it's nice to see a product. It's nice to have a presentation we can actually understand. (Laughter.) So I congratulate all of you on this product. Thank you very much for your presentation. (Applause.)

(Conclusion of session at 10 a.m.)

Transcribed by:
Sherry A. Belliveau
Liberty Court Reporting
112 N. Pine Avenue
Inverness, Florida 34450

COUNCIL SESSION: COUNCIL AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

Tuesday, April 21, 2009, 10:30 a.m. to 12 p.m., Tampa, Florida

SUZANNE SEARS: We, in the room, we are going to try to go ahead and get started on time, so. My name is Suzanne Sears, and I'm from the University of North Texas. And with me, today, to help explain the Strategic Plan are Sally Holterhoff and Gwen Sinclair. Council has liaisons that work with GPO, and the three of us are on the liaison for the Strategic Plan, along with Denise Stephens, who couldn't be here this week.

So we're going to give you a brief overview of the plan, and then we're going to submit to Council for comments and to the floor for comments. Instead of going over it piece by piece, we'd like you to look at the entire document as a whole and give us comments that you have over the document. Hopefully, you've had a chance to look at it. It is in your packet that you received of handouts. And Cindy Etkin is in the audience, and she also has worked very heavily on the plan. So hopefully she'll stand up and help us answer your questions as they come. (Laughter.)

Okay. So a brief overview of how the plan has come about. At the Spring Meeting in April of last year, the plan was -- the processes was begun for the plan, and in the October Meeting, if those of you were there will recall, there were extremely heavy discussions on the Strategic Plan.

And at that meeting we decided to change the goals, completely, and we came up with the three goals that you'll find in the plan and let me navigate to those. Three goals on the bottom of Page 8. You have Goal A, which is developing new models for Federal depository collections. Goal B, which is develop new models for Federal depository services, and Goal C, which is develop new models for communication for the depository library community.

And those of you who were at the Fall meeting will recall that that's kind of where we left it, was with the goals, and then the committee of -- the liaisons from Council and Cindy were charged to take the strategies and rearrange those under these new goals and to try and flush those out a little bit and bring it back to the Spring Meeting.

So that's what we've tried to do. Cindy did a really good job of taking all of the strategies and trying to reorganize them. And then the subcommittee worked with her on some of the wording, and then we brought it to full Council. And the Council has worked on it, and I believe that a draft was posted in March -- February-March on FDLP. And there was a message that went out on FDLP-L to let the community know that the draft was up, and we received comments. And we've integrated some of those as well.

So that kind of brings you up to speed. So I'll ask if Council has comments or points of clarification that they

want to make on the Strategic Plan?

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I'm just trying to figure out what we are doing process-wise at this point. Do you want us -- we don't want to necessarily wordsmith, but do we want to relate back some thoughts we had from yesterday's conversation to this? Or what would you like us to do?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As you wish.

SUZANNE SEARS: As you wish, yes. We would like to know opinions on the strategic plan. Are there some things that were brought up yesterday that definitely need to be put in, that aren't there? We're, you know, open to your comments to hear what it is that you think we're lacking. Where we need to -- we would rather not get into the wordsmithing, I think, at this point, but.

KEN WIGGIN: Well, then -- Ken Wiggin, again, from Connecticut. Goal B, then, I got the sense yesterday -- and maybe we should have been doing this all along. But I know this Strategic Plan is focussed on the FDLP, but maybe if we're going to be a little broader, Goal B should be maybe more along the lines of developing models for accessing Government information.

We limited ourselves in the Strategic Plan -- and maybe because it's a short period of time -- to just the FDLP, but I'm not exactly sure that's what I heard. We should also

be looking at the broader, how you get more libraries
involved. They're already providing access to Government
information, but how can we do that better. So maybe the
model shouldn't be limited to just the FDLP, as we understand
it today.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
California State Library. I show that concern, Ken. However,
the title of this document is "The Federal Depository Library
Programs Strategic Plan." It's not Government Information
Strategic Plan. I mean, I don't know how we can broaden
Goal B out, without broadening out the scope of the entire
document.

KEN WIGGIN: I can see that point, and that's where
I'm struggling, is to try to figure out if we should make it
clear that this plan -- albeit it's only going to 2014, which
is not that far away -- should be focussed on the program, but
a new model -- when we start talking about new models, should
we be a little more open in our thinking, than an FDLP -- FDLP
connotes a structure. And so a new model of it -- you know, I
don't know. I'm struggling with that. That's all.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois,
Chicago. I think we can handle both the traditional structure
that this plan begins from, but I also look at the conclusion
as something that's unfinished. Obviously, it's still a
draft, and based on the comments that we heard yesterday,

which emphasized flexibility, organizational restructuring, preservation, taking advantages of new organizational communication and technologies, I think the way we have approached this particular document, we've left the last pieces off the end; that we can begin to go into the area you're suggesting, but still respect the traditions and the obligations that we still have legally, under the law. To me, it's the best of both worlds.

I think what the folks had to say yesterday really energized the direction we're taking this document and affirm that we are getting it. We see where you want to go, and that we can incorporate those changes into a very powerful document.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer from NCO. On that same point, under assumptions, we talk about, you know, changes in the landscape, new paradigm for information dissemination and use, and that kind of thing. So I think it is fair to consider new models for FDLP in the context of a fundamentally changed landscape. And that change -- the issue in changed landscape is how to provide Government access to the public. So I think we do have to consider it, in the larger context, while, clearly, the goal of the strategic plan is to shape the FDLP program, itself.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. I think I heard, at least reflecting, I heard

two things yesterday, or two kinds of things. One was sort of
a discussion of how to handle the legacy collection and the
information that exists in libraries in print form now, issues
about pre-'76 cataloging, digitizing the old collection; and
then at the same time also call for this new model.

So it seems like there were two, sort of, issues
that I kept hearing about yesterday, and that I think that's
probably a place that we need to think about, you know, being
a little more explicit in the plan, itself about, sort of, the
past is one world, and the future as a very different world.

SUZANNE SEARS: Ric, did you have a comment?

RIC DAVIS: Yeah. Going back to --

Ric Davis, GPO. Going back to Ken's good point,
about broadening this to include the broader issue of
Government information, I want to encourage Council, also, in
considering this to think about that, in terms of broader
assumptions, and we do have this underlying commitment to
access the information that permeates the document. But what
I'd like to see, too, as we're looking at validating and
refining the goals and strategies, to think about them in
terms of the FDLP, because what I want to do with this
document is then turn this into actionable items, on things
that we can work on from the goals and strategies.

SUZANNE SEARS: Are there comments from Council?

KEN WIGGIN: Something else I heard yesterday, and I

think we're in agreement, but we need to put it in here somewhere, is to carry out particularly the goals on developing new models. Maybe Council ought to be recommending to GPO that they hire an outside consultant to carry that out.

I think -- I'm not clear. You know, we have this plan, and who is going to carry out the plan, I guess? Parts of it certainly GPO can do in-house and report, but some of this, I think, to have validity needs to have -- I would like to recommend that there be some outside consultancy brought in for that piece of it.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: It's David Cismowski, California State Library. I agree with that, and I think that that idea needs to be very seriously considered by Council, by GPO. And I'd like to hear more comments from the -- there aren't very many people in the audience, but, eventually, when we get to audience participation on -- I'd like to hear some more comments about the wisdom of hiring an outside consultant group and whether people agree with them.

DENISE DAVIS: This is Denise Davis, ALA. There is a concern I have; it's a caution. There are so many long-term players in this dialogue, that hiring an outside consultant has to be not only a rigorous but a stringent process. I think because, if any of the existing parties are involved in any of it, other than being participants in focus groups or something, that the process will be perceived as tainted. And

I say that as an ALA employee. You know, having ALA at the table is fine, but having organizations that have a vested interest in those, pushing the process is not wise.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. If I recall the history of this particular august group, we were created in the early 1970s just for that reason, to bridge the gap amongst the competing self-interests and bring them to the table, so that everybody in the community is represented at this table.

And that, really, if -- in an ideal world we would be the ones writing the study, if you will, not an outside agency, because we are, quote, unquote, the outside agency that advises GPO on these issues.

Now, I understand workload, commitments, time, and all that, I understand why other choices might be made at different times, but I think this group has a tradition and has a history of literature of making these bold suggestions in the recommendations, in the reports, and I happen to agree with you. There is a long legacy that we can draw upon here, and we don't have to reinvent the wheel.

KEN WIGGIN: But I would argue that a good consultant will bring back several recommendations -- well, several courses that could be taken, and it would be up to this Council to then weigh those. I think having some outside eyes -- we've been looking at this with the same set of eyes,

I think, for probably way too long. And that there, you know, are people out there who could synthesize what's going on, what's been written, but also do some assessment that we can't do, bringing in focus groups of users, and other people who should be consulted in this. And then -- but still leave the responsibility to this Council to make the final recommendations. A good consultant will not do that. So I just think there has to be some outside interest. We have to have somebody from the outside brought into this, because there's too many competing interests right now, that I think might taint whatever decision if it were solely done internally.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. If we agree then, that as part of this process we are -- we have a tradition of also asking for help, then, yes, I agree with your statements.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer from National Coordination Office. The Council has several mechanisms to forward its ideas and recommendations, and in this Strategic Plan document, we should probably stick with strategy, not process, but it seems to me part of the strategy, productively, can be what are the roles of the various stakeholders; the Council, GPO staff, the depository library communities, the public, the professional organizations. And in our strategy define a bit about what those roles are, including the need for neutral

parties in the process and still leave open the issue of process so that there's some -- we're not writing into a five-year Strategic Plan some detailed implementation issues, and then use our recommendation mechanisms to address the issue of, you know, when and how and what you do with a contractor consultant.

CARLENE ENGSTROM: Carlene Engstrom, Salish Kootenai College. I would support a contractor, in a sense that it would be assisting us to have a more global view, to look at the whole spectrum. While each of us has great talent, overall, coming from a closer vision from our own experiences, and I feel that a consultant can help us pull together the whole view and look at many various possibilities.

JOHN SHULER: Let me just move into a reverend mode for just a moment. Oh, I'm sorry. John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. I just -- the phrase that comes to mind, if we're looking for a single thought to capture, I think this critical moment in the program, we're moving from an age of advocacy, which we have been waging for the last four years, and into an age of consensus building. And I think that's what -- that's the critical leadership role that this particular group can serve.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. The other thing we need is the technology expertise that a group like that could provide that, too, taking into account the available range of

technologies and implications for the potential models that might emerge. So in addition to this third-party function, there are some expertise issues that could be a big help. As a token technologist, that's my take on it.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. Before we continue to talk about consultants, I don't know if it would be appropriate or not to ask the representatives from GPO, here, whether -- I mean, since we, obviously, as a group are not going to fund such a study, and -- I don't know -- is the idea of a consultant, which was brought up by more than one director in the audience yesterday, is that something that would -- that GPO would be interested in doing, should Council recommend that GPO do it? Because if you're not going to do it, we shouldn't even continue to talk about this.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, from GPO. The thing to keep in mind, of course, as always, is dollars. Where can we best allocate dollars for the program, and what trade-offs are we making in hiring a consultant? We have a consultant that's now on board for this examination of libraries by library type. I don't know if perhaps some of the activity that you guys are talking about today, could be an extension of a contract that we just let. That's one possibility.

I think what we would need to do is define the scope more specifically, in terms of what you would be looking for,

define the expected deliverables, and then see what the dollars are that would be involved in the process, so we could get the most benefit for the buck.

But just keeping in mind that what the trade-offs might be, in terms of other things, in terms of services. I think we would need to scope it very tightly.

KEN WIGGIN: I would -- Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. I would just like to comment, though, that in making that decision, that we put great value on what the future model development is going to be. Because, after all, if we don't know -- if we can't really define a good future, then you can spend all the money you want on communications, and all these other things, for the short term. But I'm just concerned that we put the proper resources in defining this -- you know, ending this conversation that's been going on for all these years, and trying to move us forward with a vision that can then be implemented. So I would just say that I think, when you're talking investment of dollars, that this might be a really good use of dollars.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. Let me second that, Kendall. In the face of a paradigm shift, community consensus that the current model doesn't work, a new model is needed, it's hard to imagine anything more important than getting a new model right. And so, you know, in terms of lists of priorities this has got to be kind of high on the list.

In the end budget decisions, of course, are made by GPO, so I think we should simply help with interpreting what the community message is, what we see as the top priorities, and providing that guidance and then let them decide.

SUZANNE SEARS: Further comments from Council? Okay. We'd like to open it up to the floor. Please, remember to state your name and institution.

LAURA HORNE: I'm Laura Horne. I'm at the University of Richmond. I would like to echo some of the comments I'm hearing from Council. Myself and colleagues, we have these conversations about what GPO is actually able to do.

I feel like this conversation, about trying to go in the direction for the future, while we're trying to reconcile our past, sometimes I really wonder if GPO is really capable of doing all these things. Not to say that it couldn't be done through partnerships, but I really do feel that we're doing a fair amount of doggy paddling. It's really hard to justify to your administration what this is going to be, that we do need to continue doing this.

And so I really advocate for some substantial discussion and focus on what the future needs to become. Because I feel like once that is set, we can make priorities for services. Does GPO need to be thinking about the future? Does GPO need to be thinking about the past? Who will

actually be the operators? Who will own these decisions? So
I do feel very strongly that we can do that, and I feel like
it makes a lot of the services just more clear, why they're
doing all these different things. So I strongly advocate some
sort of a study.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski
from Montana. I'm pleased that you have a consultant now who
is going to look at the different types of libraries in the
program and evaluate what they feel. I mean, I think we've
heard a lot from the regionals. We've heard a lot from the
very large libraries. We've heard very little from the small
libraries, tribal colleges, the public libraries, community
colleges, and all. So I think that's a very positive thing to
do.

I really support the Government Accountability
Office doing a thorough audit. I worked with the Congress and
the Federal Librarians Round Table, and others, to do the
audit of the EPA library system. And I met with the auditors
several times, and from my experience, starting an EPA library
and helping automate that system, they did -- I think they did
an excellent job of evaluating us. A much smaller situation,
of course, but you do have a precedent in that an excellent
study, and excellent audit was done. And it took them about a
year and a half to do it, but they did a very good job.

If you could get that same team, or somebody like

that to go in -- I'm concerned about the things like the cost of running the program, how much money is going to the different types of libraries. There has been a paradigm shift, but it may not be the ones that everybody's talking about. It's that you have intrinsically changed the program when you denied certain publications to certain members of the program, meaning the selectives no longer have freedom of choice.

The regionals, they are getting other things that some selectives would love to get, like the serial set and other things. And they get first dibs on all kinds of publications. They have forever. The whole line that was set up, favored the regionals. If you didn't get enough publications from an agency, they got the first things in the box, and some times even the regionals didn't get them. So the whole content of the collections varies, according to when you join the program, where you were in the line when the books were thrown, and so on, all that kind of thing for the past.

Now, for the future, it's kind of limited according to the technology that you have in your library, your ability in your state. Our state of Montana has a very poor infrastructure for the Net, and we would like to have some infrastructure built out there before you totally change the program, so that our people can actually get the information.

And that's not just Montana. That's Idaho, the Dakotas, Wyoming. We all need this infrastructure before we go to this future. So we are in that transition period, and I think the that General Accounting Office, if we got -- the Government Accountability Office, if we got the right people could really help and do some of these other studies that GPO is launching. So that when the community goes to Congress it really knows what it's talking about, and it's based on factual studies.

I don't want us to go to Congress in an emotional turmoil where we're asking for something that we really haven't looked at, what are the long-term ramifications of what we're asking for, because we could be persuading Congress to dismantle something that some of us, some of those 1200 libraries don't want dismantled.

So we really need to be careful, because this is the most important period, I think, in the history of the program. And when you go to Congress, you really need to know what it is you want them to do, because we do have some enemies in Congress. If they saw the opportunity to totally eliminate all paper for everybody, they would take that opportunity.

Now, I've been told by some people in the program that we're back to the 1880s. That's before Adelaide Hasse, 1895 Printing Act, because the National Archives is going out to agencies and getting the publications they need for the archives library. I know at Library of Congress they're,

again, going out to difference agencies to bring publications in, because they're supposed to keep everything. We tell the world that Archives and LC has got it all. Well, they don't have it all, and they're having a hard time getting it all.

So we've really got to include those national -- those Federal libraries; Library of Congress, the National Archives. They're all part of this, and we are assuming that they have the resources and that they have the collections to back us up. And that's not necessarily true. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. I want to push back a bit, Bernadine, because there's nothing in our discussions or nothing in Cindy's document that sells the traditions of this program down the river in the form you've described.

I think we're respecting all aspects of our community here, as well as recognizing the technological revolutions that are burning our institutions around us. I think this group has stated repeatedly of its commitment to permanent public access and broad access to free information.

And I don't think any of our discussions puts that on the bonfire in order to achieve some Utopia. So I just want to make that clear, as somebody who's been participating for the last two years. This is what I mean by moving from an Age of Advocacy to an Age of Consensus.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: I'm not saying that the

depository library Council is presenting the image of what's happening; the community, itself, and -- the whole community, itself, and all the debates that I've gone to.

I've gone to lots and lots of meetings. You know, I'm retired. I pay my own way. I come. I'm a historian. I come, and I listen to what people say. And, as a former Congressional staffer, I maybe hear things differently, than the way you think you're presenting them. I don't really for a minute believe that the library community wants to really trash all these publications and that you don't care about the program. You do.

I'm speaking as a politician, that what I'm hearing and what the members of Congress will hear may be something entirely different than what you mean. So I have great faith and trust and people for the people in this program. Like our former Superintendent of Documents, Judy Russell, is down here in Florida trying to make things better. She didn't get it all done when she was at GPO, so now she's trying to get it done from Florida, and I applaud that.

And so that's a positive. There's some really positive things going on, but I'm not hearing them when I go to these meetings, the positive things that the community is doing that makes the members of Congress proud that this is their program. So we need to have some of that.

I know there's some wonderful things going on with

the technology and all, and somehow or another that has to --
that good stuff going on, has to be highlighted as much as the
burdens of handling the program.

So I'm speaking as, you know, as an observer now.
I'm not a depository librarian anymore. I'm not a
Congressional staffer. I'm a historian and an observer of
what's happening. And so if I were to go home just from the
meeting yesterday, and I hadn't gone to a lot of other
meetings, I hadn't spent a lot of time in a lot of libraries,
I would have a very jaundiced view of what the people want to
happen.

So I'm just saying you have to present things in a
much more positive way, and you need to give to people like
me, who spend my life lobbying now -- you know, I don't get
paid to lobby. I'm lobbying right now for the digitization of
50,000 state documents in Montana with my Governor. And he
has started giving the money, and they're starting to do it,
because I cared as a citizen of Montana that we digitize all
the State documents, so they would get to my family in eastern
Montana who are not going to drive 700 miles to Missoula to
get their information.

So I want to present a positive picture to my
Governor and to John and Max, when I ask them to vote for this
program. So I really would like to see -- I mean, your
documents are very good coming out, but they have to be

flushed out and be humanly connected to the members of Congress that this is a program we're supporting and fighting for.

So give us something to lobby for. If we want to preserve and help the regionals, let's ask for a hundred million dollars to do it to save the Second World War documents, or let's ask for a hundred million dollars to back up what GPO is doing. Let's ask for big money. Let's ask for real stuff. Let's just not nickel and dime this program and stagger along.

Let's ask for what we really need, and that's you-alls responsibility to help GPO to do that. And we in the library associations -- I'm on the ALA Committee on Legislation -- and I sure would like to get our committee and our association to do something positive to help this program.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. Well, I think that's why we're advocating that we need to have an outside consultant come in and give us those recommendations for -- then us to move forward. The Strategic Plan should not be seen as that vision piece. It's how we're going to get to that vision piece.

I mean, I work with the legislature all the time, and I'll tell you that if you come in with a report that has a basis outside of your own self-interest, they're going listen to it more. And I think there will be more credence given to

a decision, based on some outside advice, than if we -- you know, we could do something and present it, but I think it may be seen as self-serving to many people as well.

I agree, Bernadine, that we need to have a really good -- something to sell that will get the members of Congress interested. And we're not there yet, and I don't think anybody should see the Strategic Plan yet as there. But how do we get to that vision, how do we get to that document we can get everybody behind and to sell, so I think we've got to take this in stages.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Bernadine, I deeply respect your devotion to this program. And you and I have talked a few times, and I always appreciate your comments.

I did not interpret yesterday afternoon's session as negative. I thought it actually was a very, very positive development, and I think that we can, as a Council, turn what was said yesterday into very positive results, as far as a recommendation to GPO and where to proceed. I think there's a distinction between intensity and negativity. We saw intensity yesterday, but I didn't see it as negative at all.

One of the things that you mentioned which make -- which I think was -- what was being addressed by the directors yesterday, is the materials that are going to regionals in tangible format and are not going to selectives.

As a regional, I know that we receive, basically, two things that selectives do not receive in tangible format; the serial set, and the Congressional Record bound edition.

We process those and add them to the collection. They're almost never used. What is used are the online equivalence of those, which are available to every selective, to every person who has Internet access. The reports and documents produced by Congress and the Congressional Record.

So what I think the directors were talking about yesterday is getting out of the mindset of feeling like you need to have the print, in order to have the content that your users need.

PAT RAGAINS: Thank you. Pat Ragains, from University of Nevada, Reno. And the discussion in the early part of this meeting, about the possibility of hiring a consultant has helped move my thinking along about it. And I'd just like to share some thoughts about how you might want to structure the work that a consultant could do, in such a way that a consultant could provide an end-product that is something different and has more value than what, perhaps, some of the other stakeholders could provide, either Council, GODORT, Regal, or the community at large.

And I think that, obviously, the consultant should identify preferred outcomes, but should perhaps identify preferred outcomes on a continuum. At least several options

should be identified, with costs, projected to -- for each option. And you can talk about specifics a little bit in terms of the components that could go into moving forward for the program, whether it's retrospective cataloging, digitization, digital distribution, creating legacy collections, print collections based on what's already out there in libraries. Basically, contracting the current regional system, if that's desired.

And the consultant might address the advantages and also the disadvantages of each option. Constraints on possibly achieving or moving forward with -- with each of those components, whether it be cataloging, digitization, distribution, or the other things I mentioned.

And that, finally, the outcomes that would be produced, or at least projected, for each of those components in terms of the public benefit. And, obviously, everything needs to be done in the spirit of recognizing the public's need for information, not in terms of the way that it's traditionally framed, in tangible library collections, but in terms of a way that the traditional system has evolved, I think. And we can easily project where that's going. We don't know a lot of the details, and that's what perhaps a consultant's report could provide.

And, finally, I think in terms of our values as librarians, I think what really has to inform the -- our work,

and that includes the work that the consultant might be
charged with, is that provision of Government information to
the public -- of course, that's the desired outcome. We need
to do that, as best as possible, but to do it in a way that
takes into account the current assets in the situation and the
way that we currently provide information, libraries being a
very big part of that.

And I think that the traditional idea of libraries
as being a safety net, still has relevance. And it probably
will have relevance in the future because there are many
people who are isolated, they may be in rural areas like rural
Montana or rural Nevada or they may be isolated in urban areas
without the ability easily to get to a depository library. We
all know these things, but I think we need to keep them in
mind as we move forward. Thank you.

DAN O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony from Brown University.
I just wanted to go back to your earlier points and discussion
about the Strategic Plan document, specifically, and
addressing the models for service in terms of broadening the
scope of the program beyond just the participating depository
libraries.

You probably could consider that to be under your
point No. 2, increased access and usability. That's such a
broad statement you could probably do anything under that, but
if this was a focus that in the short-term, within the scope

of this Strategic Plan you wanted to specifically focus on, you could add a point about reaching out to potential partners in the broader library community, in order to increase access to Federal information. And that might put a little bit of emphasis on the notion that every other potential library out there can be a partner to one extent or another, and, maybe, put a fine tune on the need for training and outreach to folks beyond just the immediate depository family.

PATRICIA CERVENKA: Patricia Cervenka, Marquette University Law Library. I just want to speak to the issue about hiring an outside consultant. I went to that meeting last night at 5:30 about -- with the consultant, where we were defining the types of libraries. The title of it was "To Help Improve Services to Libraries."

It seems to me that the best effort at this point would be to get the Council with more input into that particular consultant, because it's clear they're really at the beginning. They do have a timeline, so now is the time to get involved. Get those definitions in. I mean there were all kinds of problems with definitions of what kind of libraries are going to be in the different segments.

And if it's to improve services, I would just say get the efforts there, because the idea of another consultant sort of make my skin crawl, because a lot of times that just means things get tabled for a longer period of time. So I

would like to see the efforts put into this consultant that's there and get some input in. And if we're going to improve services, you know, we've got a vehicle. Let's use it to our advantage.

JUSTIN OTTO: Justin Otto, from Eastern Washington University. This question is to GPO. I didn't go to that meeting with the consultants last night. They're called Outsell; is that right? Or what was their -- yeah. I guess I could use some clarification, if you don't mind, on defining types of libraries. What's that -- how is that going to improve services? I mean, what do you see by doing this exactly how that's going to lead -- and what are you hoping it leads to, what are you hoping to learn from that, and how do you see that translating into services, you know, to FDLs? Thank you.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. In looking at the types of libraries, we've had the same types that we've been using for years and years and years and years; academic, public, State, Court, Military Service Academy, what have you, but we're finding that now, for instance, in academic, we have such a range of different academic libraries, including sizes. We have some of the smallest academic libraries in the country, as part of the program. And some of the largest academic libraries in the world, as part of the program. And the needs for the smaller

libraries are going to be very different from the needs of the larger libraries. So we're looking at a segmentation to better identify how we can type this to make sure we, GPO, can support different library types, the different libraries in the program, with services and support that they need. Does that answer it, Justin?

JUSTIN OTTO: Justin Otto, again, from Eastern Washington University. I guess it kind of answers it. I guess I'm -- once you've identified these groups, what do you think you're going to do with that information? I mean, so, yeah, now we know who -- and I'm not trying to be flippant or anything, but, you know.

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah. That's okay.

JUSTIN OTTO: But now we know who, you know, the really small academic libraries are.

CINDY ETKIN: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.) Yeah.

JUSTIN OTTO: So what -- how does that -- I mean, how does that translate -- do you then say, well, we know who they are, specifically, so now we're going to ask them, specifically, what they need --

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah.

JUSTIN OTTO: -- from us? Is that kind of where you're --

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's exactly

right. The second step is to develop a survey tool so that we
can determine needs by these various types. What initiated
this was a directive from the Deputy Public Printer for all
the business units to enhance and improve customer service.
And he asked, specifically, that we look at all the different
types of libraries that we're serving. So we thought this was
a good time to re-examine how we are typing libraries. And
the types may prove to be the same for some of your libraries
and it may change some, but we're also looking at a primary
and a secondary based on the different missions that your
libraries have. And then we'll determine needs from a survey.

JUSTIN OTTO: No, I may come back to it, but thank
you for now. Appreciate it.

DENISE DAVIS: With all due respect, Denise Davis,
American Library Association. The segmentation of the library
community already exists, so you don't have to reinvent this.
And it exists it a number of, actually, depository documents
that I'd be happy to talk to you about. And with regard to
surveying, please, talk to me before you move forward.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. From a broader
perspective as well, one of our major rationales for doing
this is as a result of the regional study done last summer.
One of the comments that we heard loud and clear was that it
was a GPO perspective, in terms of the writing of the report.
And we needed to look at the broader library community beyond

just regionals, and we needed some expertise beyond GPO to do that, so that it wasn't GPO focussed.

So the thinking, as well, was as much as the discussion has gone this morning, to have some external consulting expertise come in and look at the broader library community. I think as someone mentioned, this process of working with this consultant is very much in its early stages. We have some Phase 1 deliverables and expectations that we're looking for, but we also have an opportunity to tailor this and to go in a number of different directions on it.

We've heard yesterday and we've heard at other conferences that one size no longer fits all, and part of what we're doing is addressing that issue through the study.

KATHY LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, from San Francisco. Well, does that then fit into Goal B, develop new model? Could we morph this into part of the Strategic Plan? We are in 2009, and this is when this supposedly started. But if we don't use what you guys are doing now in this, then we're not following a Strategic Plan. And it does seem like you're at the beginning, so maybe we can work together to morph it into more of what we're thinking.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. Excellent idea, and since we've opened the door a little bit, I'd also like to suggest that we incorporate the Public Printer's letter to the President, as part of the

Strategic Plan, since, obviously, we don't need to work in opposition to the Public Printer's goals, we should incorporate them, as much as possible, especially in such a public document.

SUZANNE SEARS: Ken?

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. I'm all for including it, but if you noticed he never mentioned the FDLP in the entire document, so I'm a little concerned. I think we might write a counter one to the Public Printer pointing out how the FDLP could help address the goals of the President. I'm just upset about that letter, myself. I'm sorry.

JOHN SHULER: How about -- excuse me. John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. How about as told to the Council. (Laughter.) Excuse me. I'm sorry.

SUZANNE SEARS: Further comments from Council on this? David?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. When I hear of the plans for the consultant that GPO has just hired and what that consultant is supposed to deliver, the kind of report, I'm wondering how, since, Ric, when I asked you earlier whether GPO would perhaps be willing to fund a consultant to deal with the issues that were brought up yesterday, I'm wondering how the deliverables that are expected from that consultant will address the issues that were brought up yesterday.

And the issues that I heard were, specifically, intrastate regionals and how to authorize them, print management among large collections, cooperative print management. Those were primarily the issues I heard. Is this consultant, in the process of identifying these library types, going to deal with those issues?

RIC DAVIS: The scope of this first phase of delivery is strictly focussed on service aspects by library type. We're talking about a very limited funded contract, I think, of about 20k; however, the opportunity to expand that contract and to have a broader scope, with additional deliverables and additional phases, is an open opportunity. And I think seeing how the contractor, likewise, delivers on this first phase should help us in examining that issue. I think Cindy wants to mention something on the letter to the White House.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The Federal Depository Library Program is mentioned in the letter from the Public Printer to the President, in the third paragraph. "GPO is in a unique position to assist you in carrying out your transparency initiatives through GPO's Federal Depository Library Program and the online capability" -- yada, yada, yada.

SUZANNE SEARS: Thank you, Cindy.

KEN WIGGIN: Thank you for the clarification, but

it's not very clear.

SUZANNE SEARS: Did you have another comment, Ken?

KEN WIGGIN: Well, I'm just concerned that, you know -- I don't think we should be arguing over which consultant or how GPO -- I think our recommendation should be that they -- you know, to implement that piece of the strategic plan they consider an outside consultant.

Marketing consultants, which is what Outsell is, are not going to be able to address the kind of issues that we need to look at. I mean, you can look at market segmentation We don't even know what the new model is to even be worrying about. We're kind of like going off on, let's deal with the present -- and we may have need to do some low-hanging fruit and do some work there -- but how much effort are we going to put into the existing system, in terms of what, you know, this consultant is looking at versus how do we move forward?

I mean, the angst yesterday was let's get moving. We talk about this. We talk about this. How do we move forward? I think Council is trying to recommend how we think it can be done. I don't want to get into an argument over whether Outsell is the right person or not. And, certainly, other contracts can be let, and if it's really important to move this program forward, resources can be found.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. To follow up on this and from what Denise had to

say, I think if you could save the Council's time and money from the statistics gathering, if what Denise indicates is true -- and I know from my own research, it is -- all of this information is already lying on the ground ready to be picked up, so the consultant doesn't need to reinvent the wheel. Am I wrong? This is -- unless you're doing something so unique to the depository status of those institutions, these institutions have been surveyed to death by a number of mechanisms. Is the consultant going to do his own or her own statistic gathering or use existing resources?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. We know there are different hierarchies out there and typing mechanisms for libraries, and we are looking at those and taking advantage of what's out there. We're going a little bit farther than just that, and we want to know where the libraries see themselves in the those types. So it is a little bit different, because it may not be how we traditionally type them. And, again, to be able to extract any data we may collect and segment it in different ways, we're going to have a primary and secondary.

SUZANNE SEARS: Thank you, Cindy.

CINDY ETKIN: Does that answer you, John?

JOHN SHULER: Yeah, it gets closer, but I still would be interested, because it seems to me the depository status is somewhat independent of the institutional situation of the library. I guess I need to sort that out myself,

intellectually. I need to talk -- look at the consultant
documents a little bit more.

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah, well, again, that's just --
Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's just the first step, and the next
step then is to determine what the depository libraries need
so that -- and using those newfound types, so that we can
serve each of those constituencies, our constituencies being
partner libraries in a better way.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. If I could add just one
comment to that. If part of what you're looking at is broader
new modeling for the FDLP, I think the point that Bernadine
made earlier about GAO involvement, because you're going to
need Congressional support, it may be a direction to consider.

SUZANNE SEARS: Further comments from Council?
Joanne?

JOANNE BEEZLEY : Joanne Beezley, Pittsburg State
University. I listen to all of this, and I wonder how much
time is some of this going to take? I have a representative
that would cut us off tomorrow if we cannot come up with the
idea -- she's an accountant, and it's, you know, you have to
prove it to her. And I'm sorry. I'm not sure how much time
we have with some of these people that are in Congress, and it
sounds to me like we're talking about a year and a half, two
years to come up with this. And I don't know what Congress is
going to be doing. Money is a problem, and I know I'm not

represented by the best one in Congress, so thank you.

CASS HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington Libraries. I want to praise the Council on a very well-drafted Strategic Plan. I think this is wonderful. Looking under seven, Goals and Strategies, three of these have emerged to me as the absolute top ones, and they're three D's. I've tried to come up with something catchy; description, disposition, and digitization. Those are the three top things that we need to be doing now, and, actually, as we move through those three things, those will best position us for the future.

I feel like the description part, the cataloging part, is so critical and you keep hearing that and you know that. And I was pleased to hear about the million dollar allocation. And I feel like cataloging needs resources and money. The cataloging community is all set up to take care of cataloging. We need to give them resources and money. So that's -- I'm not as worried about that.

I am worried about the disposition and the digitization. I feel like those are two areas, and if we could work on them right now, the deans and directors that are with us now and were with us yesterday, would be impressed, and we'd be moving forward. Both of those things require cooperation and intense consultation with the I.T. community. We really have to get out of even beyond the library community

and have some very direct consultation with the I.T. community.

So I'm hoping that those ideas are already pretty evident. I'm hoping that I'm just stating the obvious, and that an outside consultant would come up with a similar conclusion on the need to involve the I.T. community.

Second -- so that -- those comments I made as an individual depository librarian. I'm coming to you, also, as a representative of the ALA Government Documents Round Table, and I want to put a little extra pressure on our process today, by pointing out another obvious thing. We're here to discuss Federal information, and I'm not going to skew us a away from that, but the current program, of course, has been a model, internationally, for depository programs.

In GODORT, we consider not only Federal documents, but, of course, State and local, international, foreign, and nongovernmental organizations. The model that this process comes up with is going to have a tremendous impact, I think, and a tremendous ripple effect. So we've got to do it right, extra pressure.

Having said that, I think that there are potentials and, again, I hope a consultant would find this, that there may already be best practices that are being done by States or localities -- or local municipalities, I mean, or other countries that would be worth studying, and I hope we can --

we can find that.

The second tidbit I want to throw out in terms of GODORT and this process is, you want to -- we want to, as a community, develop a registry of experts. Boy, can GODORT help with that, and I want to sign us up to help with that. We're going to be doing it, anyway, but we would not be doing it in isolation.

We've got tremendous -- this community is tremendously connected in with other library groups, such as FAFLRT, the Federal and Armed Forces Library; MAGERT, the Maps and Geographical; ACRL, LPSS, the Special Libraries Association Government Group, the Special Libraries Association Military Group, ARL, IFLA-GIOPS, and so on, help us. We want to help you develop the registry of experts, and we know that we will be consulted in that.

SUZANNE SEARS: Thank you, Cass. Just one minute, Ann. Ken?

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Cass, thank you for the reminding us. I mean, I think one thing we discussed -- the Council discussed yesterday, and we haven't really mentioned here, is that I think some of the items, particularly under our goals, some of the objectives, we need to identify as those things that can move forward now. Not everything is subject to this study.

I think we recognize that some of these things can

happen now. Digitization can move forward. What the eventual
depository system will look like needs further study, but we
can certainly be doing some of these. I think we need to
maybe find a way, Council does, to identify some of these
objects as being further study, or we need to get back, some
outside, and some things we can just move forward with now.
So I think we need -- thank you for reminding us.

SUZANNE SEARS: Justin?

JUSTIN OTTO: Thanks. Justin Otto, Eastern
Washington University. We started, you know, as we started
our discussion here, suddenly, this talk of outside
consultancy popped up, and I don't think anybody -- so I hope
I'm not out of turn here. I don't think anybody has just kind
of explained like for GPO's benefit exactly what it was we
were talking about yesterday.

So what we were talking about in our meeting
yesterday was, we listened to what we heard yesterday,
feedback from directors, librarians, and thought that there
are a lot of concerns out there. And people are finding --
and not everybody. I know for some people the system as it
exists now, it's fine, but there are people out there for whom
the system they just don't feel like it's working, anymore.
And so we were talking about having a neutral party examine
the Federal Depository Library Program.

And, now, I'm just speaking for myself. I would --

I'm -- I would hope that I'm still involved in providing Government information, helping support the public to get the information they want and they need, 30 years from now in 2040. I don't know how many of you think you'll still be doing that in 2040, but I hope to be, and I'm not sure that this system we're using now will be up to that in 2040.

So what I want to do is ask the big questions like if you were to just start from scratch with trying to get information that GPO collects, preserves, provides, get that out to the public, now, starting from scratch, you know, what would that look like? What would that system look like now?

When you don't have to have, you know, a library -- necessarily have to have a library geographically within driving distance of everybody, and you have to have so many copies of everything out there, physically, because there are other modes of providing information, PDFs, what have you, I don't know what that will look like in 2040, but I'd like to ask those big questions.

And that might be threatening to some people to even ask that, but I think by asking it and looking at it, we're at least thinking about what we have to do, moving forward, to be able to achieve, what I think is the ultimate goal of everybody here in the room, which is to continue to be able to provide free, permanent, public access to Government information, in, you know, ways that that information is

preserved, it's robust, it's backed up, and all of those kinds of things.

So I may be speaking in like grander terms than other people in this -- on this Council are thinking, but we were discussing that. And we were discussing those kinds of things yesterday, just so you guys know where we're coming from and kind of what we're thinking about.

SUZANNE SEARS: David, did you have a comment?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Totally off what Justin was talking about, but I wanted to ask Cass a question. I love your three D's. Could you define more precisely what you mean by "disposition"?

CASS HARTNETT: One of the -- Cass Hartnett, from University of Washington Libraries. One of the things I was hearing from the deans -- well, in particular, a mental image of an 18-wheeler has stuck in my mind from yesterday -- is the management of the legacy collection. And that, of course, is directly tied into what we have called the needs and offers process of disposition.

Actually, we're not alone in the library world in curating collections and having to decide what paper or tangible micro form things come and go. Many of the large institutions have whole gifts and exchange departments that have to make large scale decisions like that. Archivists have to make large scale appraisal and decision -- appraisal

decisions on a daily basis.

For years I don't feel like the needs and offers process has -- that modern technology has been enough a part of that. The example I always use is if you hang out at all with people who are collectors of anything, you can go online and get very detailed information, on sort of Ebay or something like that, on a baseball card and the condition of the baseball card. And, by gosh, if I can get all that -- if the antique dealers and the baseball card dealers have figured out how to leverage technology to swap baseball cards, why haven't the Government documents librarians figured out an easy technology to swap out rare and collectible pamphlets or large runs of serials.

You know, it just -- I feel like I personally don't have the technically ceiling -- or technological -- I have too low of a technological ceiling to understand how we could do it, but it just seems like with the right creative people, we could come up with a really robust system for needs and offers that could work.

SUZANNE SEARS: Ann?

ANN SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of Michigan. I don't have a whole lot of issues with this plan as it appears. One of my issues is sort of related to the order of things. I'm remembering that not too long ago I had to look at old biennial surveys from my library from a long

time back, and in one of them there's this incredibly
passionate advocacy for micro card, as the format of the
future. (Laughter.) Okay? And in hearing a lot of the
conversation about what is this -- let's decide what the new
model is going to be and then work towards it. I'm
remembering that biennial survey, and I'm also remembering
looking at plans for a new State library of Michigan that were
never used, and it really looks like a bad set for the
Jetsons, because people were trying to envision what was going
to be needed, instead of allowing a certain amount of living
growth to the thing that they were trying to manage.

So what that's making me do is come back to the very
last point you have under Goal C, which is reaffirm the
obligations of Federal Depository Libraries. In the last few
years for a lot of very good reasons, we have replaced a lot
of the "musts" and the "shalls," with "encouraged" and
"recommended."

And when we did that, a lot of the smaller libraries
and people who are operating at ground level, have lost track
of why they're doing this, because they're not being made to
do it, anymore. So tell me, again, why we're doing it, kind
of thing. And it's the libraries who have, instead,
institutionally affirmed their commitment to provide access to
authenticated primary source material to their patrons,
they're the ones that have grown and evolved and moved along

with us.

And when I look at the first couple of points under -- it's Goal A, talking about disposition and options for the regional and selective structure, I see the same thing there. The elephant in the room is that some libraries do this better than others. Some regionals do a really good job and some regionals are marching along as if it was 1969.

And I think that there's a need here to not necessarily try to predict the future so much, but let those who are willing to lead, lead. And let those who are willing to follow, follow. And everybody else can kind of get out of the way, because we're over analyzing some of what needs to happen here.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Just a point of clarification from the subcommittee, the reaffirming sentence at the Goal C, the last one, that was more from the discussion last fall, about having some kind of biannual contract that the libraries would sign up similar to what State data centers have to do that says, yes, we are still interested in being a depository and being part of this program, and we're going to follow these rules and having your director signing off on that. That's where that originally came from, just a point of clarification.

CASS HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington Libraries. I just wanted to follow up with Ann,

and perhaps clarify my own comments earlier that I was talking about the technical aspects of disposition, but, of course, there's the process and the regulations, but I happen to feel that the two are intertwined; that if we could develop a really wonderful and efficient method then perhaps the practice would follow.

JANE SESSA: I'm Jane Sessa, and I'm from the Department of Commerce. And we're a selective and quite atypical. I really would love to have a serial set in print. I would love to have the bound volumes of the Congressional Record in print. My clientele use print all the time. We do a huge interlibrary loan business with the law firms in D.C. I understand we're inside the Beltway, and not like anywhere else in the country, but there are a few of us dinosaurs still around that need this stuff and use it.

JUDY RUSSELL: Judy Russel, University of Florida. I've been trying to be quiet in this meeting and do a lot of listening, but I wanted to respond to that comment about asking directors to reaffirm their commitment every other year. We're going through a State planning process in Florida right now. They've not ever had one. And we're developing an action plan. We're not developing a typical State plan, where we're asking the directors to sign in blood that they acknowledge all the commitments that they have. There's lots of places where they know what those commitments are, and

we're really focussed on how do we make the program more useful, more meaningful, more valuable, as a way to focus our state. So it's actually a plan, a plan to do something, rather than a document which merely is a, you know, reaffirmation of obligations.

I think if you start asking some of these people every two years to resign a document that lays out in excruciating detail, or even in lesser detail, what their obligations are, that's an opportunity for somebody to say "Why am I doing this," and not sign it.

So I'm not sure that's particularly helpful, but, you know, I just thought I would share that we -- I steered our planning committee away from writing a document to circulate to all 44 of our selectives, trying to get the directors to reaffirm, even just at the level of the State plan, all those documents.

And I steered them away from statements that -- where if we had things in our plan, we were going to constantly be having to adjust it to changes that might come up in the handbook, or other kinds of things, and, you know, there's lots of places where that's well documented.

So I wasn't at the meeting where that discussion took place about the need for recommitment, but, believe me, every one of our directors and our selectives is recommitting every time they come up for budget, you know, so. The

commitments are there, and I'm curious about why you think that would actually be helpful.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas, as Sally was whispering in my ear. That came up from the floor during the meeting in October, last fall. So as far as, if anybody has the recall to recall exactly why, otherwise it would be in the transcripts of that strategic planning meeting.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I think that a lot of depositories reconsidered depository status every two years, because of the biennial survey. (Laughter.) And I agree with Judy that if we were to also, in conjunction with the biennial survey, as people to read a legal document and sign off on it, I almost dread to think what would happen to depositories. I mean, I think a lot of people would say "This just isn't worth it."

SUZANNE SEARS: Just one minute.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. I don't think it was signing some kind of contract in detail. It seems, my memory is, it was more like just reaffirm obligation to serve the public, in a more general sense; but I think, you know, there's not too many people in this room. The person that first brought that up back then, isn't here, I'm sure.

But, Cindy, do you remember, was this in before the

fall, or did this come into the document after the fall meeting?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Actually, it was a little bit before the fall meeting. It's something that's been kicked around for a while. And I think it sort of grew out of a lot of things that we've been hearing, and a lot of confusion in the community of what we have to do, what we don't have to do. And in trying to make a more flexible program, we were going to -- we were thinking about this reaffirmation and then just have it in very broad terms, in relation to Title 44 and providing service and open access, is my recollection.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I'm not opposed to the way it's stated here in Item No. 7, under Goal C, because it is very vague there. And I think that the obligations of depositories do need to be recognized and measured. And I would like to think that the assessment program is going to accomplish that, but I would be hesitant to identify any particular method of reaffirming obligations, in a Strategic Plan. It should be vague. And then the action -- actionable parts of this are -- they're perceived from the vague statements in the Strategic Plan, whether it's an assessment program, whether it's a two-year contract, where it's something else. It shouldn't be specified in the plan, specifically.

SUZANNE SEARS: Ann?

ANN SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan.
Yeah, it wasn't my intent to -- to open a can of worms there.
I was trying to use it to illustrate my point that the smaller
institutions that are not well represented at these meetings,
are still pretty much stuck in, what do I have to do and what
don't I have to do. And I think that's perfectly a good place
to use that.

The other thing is that some of you know me and have
heard me say this before, but one of the good things about the
old inspection program, as many faults as it had, was is that
it guaranteed a certain consistency around the country,
whereby somebody who moved from Michigan to Oklahoma could
look -- could expect a reasonably similar level of service.
And we've lost some of that in our desire to make things more
flexible, and I don't think -- I'm not advocating a return to
the huge long list of "musts" and "shalls." I'm just saying
that that's something that has to be kept in mind, and it's a
perfect opportunity as Council moves forward with this
document and develops objectives out of it.

As we were talking last night at the regional
meeting, there's a lot of low-hanging fruit there, in which
things can be made clearer. And if the end result is that
some very marginal depositories drop out, I don't view that as
a national tragedy. I think that that's something that isn't

part of this natural evolution into a newer model.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University of Law Library. I'm following up on John's reference to marriage counseling yesterday. I mean, I think that some us saw this as more like renewing your marriage vows, or something. Maybe it should say "obligations and opportunities," because, also, we're trying to convince everyone that there's still value. And the value -- so maybe the word obligation, somebody reading this that's not here would see that in a very negative sense, which is wasn't meant. Then maybe we should use another word and put obligations and opportunities, or something, just to make it sound a little nicer, but just a thought.

SUZANNE SEARS: Are there further comments from Council? Katrina?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: I was -- just in general for this document, we've certainly heard many similar things, over and over again, and I'm wondering if we shouldn't consider putting these things in some priority order, because I would hate for the low-priority items to be the easy ones to get done, and for the high-priority items to be left undone, while we wait for this new model or something, when it's really what people want. And I think those three D's are a great place to start.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North

Texas. I'd like to add a D. I heard very clearly, yesterday, discoverability, and I think that digitization and description both lead into discoverability, but I do think discoverability needs to be a large enough issue that it's looked at, because that's definitely -- when you have graduate history students who never even knew you had a depository at your library, you know, discoverability of that collection and knowing that those are great primary resources is important.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: I'm Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso Law. I think that that's a good point, Katrina. There was -- there's a next step of this, which is like the action plan or something to come out of this, and that's where I think we would put, you know, priority order.

Cindy, do you want to speak to that? What was the next part of this going to be called?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The next part going to be called, the next part of the plan that we were going to put is the appendix?

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: No, but the part that was -- no. There was like the action part of it.

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: There was another stage to this, yeah.

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah. And what Council decided was that they wanted to have the plan at a very high level and

take out those strategic targets and put them into more of an
implementation plan, which we have a placeholder for, as an
appendix or an attachment.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Okay.

CINDY ETKIN: So it's strategic targets you're
talking about.

SUZANNE SEARS: Okay. We have about two more
minutes, and I have a few announcements that Tim has handed
me. So are there any further comments from Council, from the
floor?

SARAH MICHALAK: Sarah Michalak, University of North
Carolina at Chapel Hill. I would love having some national
entity create a collaboration and coordinate for us a legacy
documents cataloging program, for instance. And I have the
wherewithal to accept a piece of the National Cataloging
Project. We belong to several of the national cataloging
standards organizations, and so we're good catalogers.

And I could also see that there could be a wonderful
role for OCLC if we just had a national coordinating body that
would help us get started and continue. And we could even
have some really serious time goal. Like what if our entire
community could get together with OCLC and with GPO and finish
up the legacy cataloging in two years? (Applause.) We could.
I mean, we put people on the moon, right? (Laughter.) So we
can do this. This is lower budget, but we can do it out of

our own resources if we're thoughtful and careful about how we do it.

And I think disposition and digitization and discoverability, that's -- that's really the hardest, I think, to make sure there's a nationwide, equal and fair level of discoverability, but digitization could be done in the same way, as a national cataloging project could be done. So if -- it would be so great if the Council and GPO would begin to talk about how we could all be -- how you would consider leading us in such an endeavor.

SUZANNE SEARS: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and close -- one more comment. Hurry, Nan.

NAN MYERS: I'm sorry. I wanted to talk yesterday, but I was afraid I would just go off and embarrass myself.

SUZANNE SEARS: So now you've had time to calm down.

NAN MYERS: Nan Myers, Wichita State University. This has been -- this a very fruitful conference to me, and the one thing I would like to say when I hear a comment like something about our graduate students in history not realizing that there's a depository collection or the value of it.

Really, now, do we not as -- I happen to be faculty -- but as professional librarians, you do have a lot of other tools at your fingertips. You have your liaison people that should be communicating that, if you don't have access to the history faculty. You have tools. You can embed

resources in the blackboard accounts, or whatever management system your institution has.

We're living in an era where it's embarrassing to hear our leadership from our directors only concentrating on space issues; whereas, are we not supposed to be educating people as well? And, yes, of course, some of the print is very valuable, and it is up to all of us to make those decisions. But I would like to just draw attention to the fact that there should be a balance here.

I realize GPO appears to have drug their feet for many years, but then, of course, they had a Public Printer, who was charged with and focussed entirely for his tenure on rectifying a number of other things. And he ignored the Federal depository library program, in my opinion, but did not make any attempt to destroy it. And now I see they're wanting to move forward, again, with emphasizing the value of the FDLP.

But I think that there's a lot of leadership that should come from deans and directors of libraries as well. They should agree to be trying to preserve the best of the old, along with the best of the new. And never overlook the fact, in my opinion, public libraries do know where it's at.

When I look at the exchange list, for example, Johnson County Library, which is a huge public library in Kansas, they don't have problems making decisions about what

they don't need. Academics, maybe they need to have a more clear philosophy, but I think each of us has spent way too much time obsessing about our space issues. They're real, but there are other ways to make decisions.

SUZANNE SEARS: Thank you. Okay. Just real quickly, a reminder that there is an error in the agenda. Lunch is two hours today. It's from 12 to 2:00. So you need to move all of your sessions. The next session will be from 2:00 to 3:30. There will be a break from 3:30 to 4:00. And then a session from 4:00 to 5:30.

Please, check the message board. Lunches are supposed to be by library type today, if possible, and I know the public libraries are going to try and meet right outside this conference hall here. And, also, tonight GODORT meeting is from 7:00 to 9:00 in Regency V, and Cass Hartnett is the speaker for that meeting.

If there are no further comments, I say we adjourn for lunch.

(Conclusion of session at 12 p.m.)

Transcribed by:
Sherry A. Belliveau
Liberty Court Reporting
112 N. Pine Avenue
Inverness, Florida 34450

COUNCIL SESSION: LIBRARY TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES
UPDATE
Tuesday, April 21, 2009, 2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: Welcome back from lunch. One
announcement to make. If you did request a certificate of
attendance or if you need any extra handouts, they've been put
out at a table in front of the message board.

I will turn it over to Laurie for the Library
Technical Information Services.

LAURIE HALL: Okay. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm
going to try to go through this fast, because I want to be the
first person at that lawn chair up on that deck where the
swimming pool is. I want to get there before you do.
(Laughter.)

So couple of -- just a couple of logistical things.
Originally, it was to be myself, Linda Resler, and Joe
McClane. Linda Resler couldn't come for this trip. So I'm
going to be doing the ILS stuff, and, believe me, Linda is not
here to give you all the really detailed information, but she
is available. I can give you her e-mail. So I'm probably not
going to be able to answer really technical questions on it.
But there is somebody back at GPO that can do that. So I'm
going to try my best.

Second, another issue is that Lance is really,
really strict about us getting all of these presentations and
everything by the beginning of April, so that they can come in

a packet and you have the presentations ahead of time. Well, the nature of my work, things change a lot. So even by the time some of these slides were put together a couple weeks ago, there's already something that's happened so some things have changed. So I'll highlight a few of those as we go through, so.

On all of these projects that we talk about, it's ongoing stuff, and things -- every week there's something new or maybe a step back or two steps forward. So I'll just highlight a few of those to let you know there has been some changes, even in these last couple weeks as we've been preparing.

I've got a little list here of all the projects that we're going to talk about. I'm going to go through four or five, and Joe is going to do his presentation on acquisitions. And then I'm going to come back in and do the integrated library section part and then talk about the ominous appropriation -- ominous? Did I say that? I did say ominous -- omnibus appropriations. (Laughter.) It is ominous sometimes. (Laughter.)

It's a lot of money in it, but we have to spend it quick and that means there's a lot of work to get it ready so that we can spend it. It's not as easy, as I'm sure many of you know.

I know this has come up all throughout the

conference and a couple of conferences ago, and I like to go over a few things because I never know who's been here before, who already knows what's going on, who are our new folks who don't know what's going on. We have started converting our pre-1976 shelflist, historic shelflist at GPO. There's about a million shelflist cards. It's a one-year contract with potential four option years. We're getting ready to finish out that first year of the contract.

And there are two parts to the contract. One is to digitize the shelflist cards, itself, because we want to box the collection up and send it to NARA. That's part of our records management responsibilities. And the other part is to take the metadata that's on the card and transcribe it into MARC21, so we can load it into our catalog of Government publications.

As to date we've digitized 100,000 of the cards. We're trying organize storage for those cards. And already the last two lines are incorrect. We are going to load 274 cataloging records from this project to the CGP, probably by the end of the week. They're going through some final quality control. There's some indicators that need to be globally fixed, things like that. But just about an hour ago, one of my staff said, we should have them ready and a Listserv announcement out by the end of the week. So that will be one of our first batches of 274 cards.

I took a quick capture of a few of the cards just to give you a little idea of the kind of metadata that we're getting from the cards; SuDoc number. This is a 1938 document, so there's no item number. Really simple, a SuDoc number, title, place of publication, publisher, one-subject heading, and one name authority, and then some other information. Right now this is still suppressed from our OPAC.

But that kind of gives you an idea of a little bit of the information. Here's another one from the Park Service. This is 1960 -- I'm looking for an item number. I don't see one. So there may not have been an item number on the card. We're pretty much transcribing every single thing that's on the card, even if -- if you look at that 500 note, its processed illustrations are colored.

You know, there's all kinds of information on these shelflist cards. Some times there's not a lot; sometimes it's more internal information. But we're transcribing it all. So that kind of gives you an idea of what will be on some of these cards. We can take questions after.

The other project that we've been working on, and some of you have been aware of, it's a two-year R&D project, with Old Dominion University, to develop some automated metadata extraction tools for us. We're in the second year now. We have received two batch of records from ODU, from

some records that we -- or documents that we got from the EPA Pilot Project, and my catalogers are taking a look at the results, as we speak, and quality controlling of the records, the metadata that we asked them to supply to us.

We sent them a second batch of material, mostly Congressional material off of GPO Access, and they're doing the same kind of automated metadata extraction practice -- process to develop some software tools to develop metadata from electronic documents. So it's been a real interesting exercise, because it's an academic -- really an academic institute -- exercise for them. It's more of a contractual obligation for us, but they have a lot of student workers working on it. It's the computer science department that's doing it for us, so it's really kind of a fascinating process. We should be probably putting up some records from that project in the next couple weeks, as well. The whole goal of both of these is to get metadata records for material that we don't -- that we've never cataloged before, new material and old material.

I saw -- I did see some of those comments that got sent to Tim, and somebody -- what did somebody say about WEBTech Notes? Where is it? What's going on? Well, even if you don't know, we are doing something about it. One of my strategies is, I don't like to announce stuff until I have something to deliver. I've done that quite a few times, and

sometimes the projects take longer. Or sometimes they get

derailed. So I only like to announce stuff when we actually

have something to show. We will have something to show on

WEBTech Notes very soon. If you actually want to see -- get

access to it, Karen Sieger in her session on the Desktop, will

have that available to show. Right, Karen? Yeah.

        KAREN SIEGER: Yes.

        LAURIE HALL: Yeah. So if you actually want to get

in and take a look at the test of WEBTech Notes, you can. I

just didn't do any live slides today. We expect or hope to

have the contract pretty much finished in mid-June. So we

will have a -- hopefully, have our deliverable not too much

after that. It's going to -- here's some things about it that

you need to know.

        It is going to replace Administrative Notes Text

Supplement the Paper. There will be no paper after -- in --

for the 2009. We still have November and December records, I

think, to -- or the edition, the paper edition to put out. So

once that is complete, we'll finish the year, and the online

database will take over.

        There's going -- there's a lot of functionality in

this application. You can -- you can search it, you can

browse it, you can view it, you can download records from the

database. There's RSS feeds that you can get. So if you want

to get all of the records that are added to the Tech Notes

Database, you can select all, or you can select just a category, if you only want to see the Update Miscellaneous, or the Update New, which is mostly new item numbers and new classes. You can get the feed to send you just one of those categories. So that's kind of the new -- I think a really good feature.

It's also going to be done in realtime. So instead of waiting for, let's see, six or eight months behind the schedule to get the printed, edited, we will do it in realtime. So once a record has passed through an editing process, it will be in the database and out on the RSS feed. So it has some of the same similar look and feel of what you -- if some of you remember what the old WEBTech Notes database looked like. So just the layouts and things with the data in the records.

But you have to remember, too, that once we go away from the paper, some of the data will look a little different. Right now, we've loaded the old records from the very beginning, and they have, you know, the volume number, and that kind of thing. Some of those things will not go forward in the new version. But we're looking forward to that. We're right on -- working on the administrative back end part of the module right now, so that my staff can go ahead and put new entries into WEBTech Notes.

And like I said, I did these slides a couple weeks

ago. This has already changed, so you'll see the closer
version with Karen this afternoon. And it is integrated into
the Joomla core, which is the software that Karen uses for the
Desktop. So it's an integrated part of the Desktop operation.
It's not part of the CGP. It's working with Karen's software.

So here's like a browse or the listing that you will
get, and then there's some features there, about what category
it's in, what issue, what's the item number, when the record
was last modified. Here's one of the older records that was
loaded. I know it's hard to see some of these. So it's
better if you really want to see, view them with Karen. But
it carries, you know, when it was entered, when it was
updated. That's -- that's -- I'm really happy and excited
about that, because I know that's a long time coming.

Another thing that happened just recently, as part
of the Desktop, the new Desktop, we put in a cataloging tab.
It's across the top, so we now have a separate location. We
migrated from the old Desktop. Most of the things that were
under the National Bibliography, we've moved them now to a tab
on the Desktop under cataloging. So -- and we've moved a lot
of that content. We also put some of that older content in
the repository.

And we, also, consolidated in one PDF version the
Cataloging Guidelines, plus all the updates to the Cataloging
Guidelines. And there's going to be some more work on that

done this year on the Guidelines this year. But just so you know that some of that material has moved around. I know some people had some trouble finding it, but it's kind of been migrated now under that tab. And Karen can show you that as well.

We have another project going on GPO-wide. A Deputy Public Printer mandate for us this year is to document a lot of our processes and procedures. So part of that process -- what comes out of that process is also policy that then goes out to you. So I wanted to highlight a few of those things that have come out in the past couple months, some of the things that we're working on now. We -- it was just not too long ago that we posted Cataloging Guidelines for cataloging digital reproductions. So that's been up, and, actually, I think there's been some changes, so we'll probably be sending out some other changes to that.

There was a separate record approach that went out, I think, in the fall, that has implications for all of you, where we cataloged each version on different -- and each format on different records, where we -- and we linked them together.

We also have one that's coming out shortly. The final edits from the GPO staff are due May 1st. And it's SuDoc Class and Depository Item Number Assignment for Digital Reproductions. There's a lot of -- while you're doing digital

reproductions, people will come to us and say, well, this really is a fugitive that needs to be cataloged.

So we will either check our shelflist, to see if it already went out in tangible format, or if it truly is a fugitive, we have to assign a new class for it. And I'm saying "new," because some of the things that we're seeing are old. You know, before we may not have had the class established, the agency may be dead, it may be before item numbers were created. So we have to do a little bit of research.

Sandy sent us a bunch of things recently that we never had. And depending on the age of those materials, we may never have set up the agency. We may never have set up the series or the class. So we have to do a little bit of research for some of those materials, so we get it classed and cataloged. So that policy or information about our assignment of -- for those historic fugitive things, that will be coming out shortly as well.

Another thing, that I know some of you participated in recently, was a census recall, where the Bureau of Census asked for recall of nine documents. We have gone through and looked at our recall policy and established a written procedure. It's a fairly elaborate, internal procedure on how to handle recalls from agencies, not only for documents like the census, but electronic recalls. We've had a couple

electronic recalls lately, so that's really an important thing. You may not think it has implications for you, but it does because it's all on how we work with the agency to recall. Let you know that the material needs to come back and the reasons for the recall.

And we've been working on a bunch of other internal SOPs, which are -- for our authority control processing, our -- some of our re-bib creation and some of the broken PURL issues that we're dealing with right now. So that's a little bit of -- kind of the day-to-day thing that we're doing.

I also know one of the things, and I've heard this -- and I've been with GPO for, gosh, 25 years now. (Sound effect.) The whole item selection process, for some of you -- obviously, some of you probably do not know, but the system that we have in place to handle your item selection profiles and run the Lighted Bin System, was built in 1982. It is a legacy application. We've been wanting to replace that application for years.

It's a complicated process because it has so many connections to so many of our processes. It's a backbone system, but we now have requirements for Phase 1 pretty much finished. We have a business case process that we have to go through GPO to get it through I.T. and I.T. security. We're working on that right now.

So the Phase -- we've already actually gone through

our Phase 1. The I.T. department migrated it from its old

hardware platform to a new hardware platform, which made it

very stable. We were always worried that one day it was just

going to crash and die and then we would be -- where would we

be? But luckily we've got it on a good platform right now, a

hardware platform. And our first phase is to migrate it to a

relational database platform. And immediately upon doing that

-- I think it's in COBAL or in Natural -- it's not even in

Natural. It's in COBAL. That's how old it is.

Moving it to a relational database will immediately

give us a lot of functionality. So we will be adding probably

fields to the data, some internal abilities, things that we

can't do. You know, creating item numbers that are in a

pending status until everything is finalized. We hope to

improve those output products. The item lister, the

amendments to item selections, and the list of classes

project -- process.

There will also be, obviously, room for notification

services for things coming that are in that system, and

there's a lot of internal interfaces that we need. Plus we

also send that information from that DDIS system to the

Lighted Bin and also to our Microfusion, another contractor.

So we're hoping to improve upon the interfaces in that system.

So that's moving fairly well.

So at this point, I'd like to have Joe McClane come

and do his little bit, and then we'll take questions at the
end. Do you want to do that, or do you want to do questions
for this part up to now? Okay. We'll let Joe go ahead.

JOE McCLANE: (Receiving technical assistance for
slide show.) We're getting there.

LAURIE HALL: Give us a minute and see if we can
pull it up.

(Brief pause.)

JOE McCLANE: Good afternoon. My name is Joe
McClane. I'm manager of Content Acquisitions. I'm going to
talk a little about the acquisitions process. Because we're
making a lot of innovations at the time, we thought you'd like
to know what we're doing and why we're doing it, and also how
acquisitions work. It's somewhat similar to library
acquisitions, but enough different that it's good to review
this.

So, hopefully -- we'll see. Oh, it works -- I think
it says somewhere in the Bible or the Constitution that if you
talk about a part of the Federal Government you always have to
have a slide for the mission statement, etc. The reason I put
this up is that, as you can see, content acquisitions plays a
prominent role. Not only do we acquire -- that's why I
underlined it -- but we also do a lot to identify, and we
actually do a little classification, because you have to
determine the class stem of something to figure out the item

number to figure out how many to order.

So we're really at the beginning. I always like to
say if library services and content management were a fish,
we'd be the mouth, because everything comes through us.
(Laughter.) Robin doesn't like that analogy because she's in
charge of distribution. (Laughter and applause.) I'm sorry.
I know. I know.

Anyway, we're the part -- we're in a typical -- in a
library we'd be in the tech service area and library services
and content management. As you can see, we're in library
technical services. And we're like a Mash Unit. One of the
things we try to do is to get the material in as quickly as
possible, and then on its way to classification, cataloging,
and to you.

There are four programs, and I think most of you
know this, but you have to remember that most of my speaking
is actually not to librarians but to agencies. And that's one
of the things I'm going to be talking about is a new emphasis
on outreach to agencies. We've always talked to agencies but
because -- for a variety of reasons, which I'll get into, we
really have to go out and try to form cooperative
relationships with the agencies.

So this is the slide I often use with the agencies.
As you know we have four programs we work with. Of course,
the Big Kahuna, Federal Depository Library Program; the

Cataloging and Indexing Program, the International Exchange
Service and the By-Law Program. And just for those few people
who don't know what all these are, the Cataloging and Indexing
Program is actually our biggest, in terms of number of titles,
because the Cataloging and Indexing Program gets every title,
of course, in the Federal Depository Program plus those things
that are not in the scope of Depository Library Program,
because of copyright issues or they're sensitive or etc.

We still try to collect the information, so that it
can be part of the Catalog of Government Publications, and
those of you who are familiar with the CGP know that there are
materials in there that aren't -- that even regionals don't
get. But there's not that many. The International Exchange
Service, as you know, is some people describe it like a
depository program with the libraries of the world. But it's
more like book-for-book exchange between the countries of the
world.

The way it works is, it's actually a Library of
Congress Program that we manage, because as you know we're
good -- or we try to be good at distributing Government
documents. So the way it works is that we partner with about
a hundred libraries worldwide, usually the largest library in
a country. So we will send a copy of some of our Government
documents to the British Library. In exchange, the GPO
counterpart in Britain, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, sends

a copy of British Government documents to the Library of Congress. So that's how it works.

This is a much smaller program than the Federal Depository Library Program because they don't get near the scale of what you could get or near the diversity in terms of formats. But, anyway, that's how that works.

And the By-Law Program is a program, we get a certain amount of money from Congress every year to distribute documents to people Congress wants the documents distributed to. I guess that's the best way to put it. For instance, we have, you know, over 70 new members of Congress. They get new documents through this program.

And the Federal Depository Library Program, hopefully, I don't have to explain this too much. I do want you to look at a couple things, though. As you saw, you know, we began in 1813 because, of course, that's when there were enough libraries to make a depository program a viable thing. But in the Printing Act of 1895, we were moved -- the Superintendent's of Documents Office and this program were moved from the Department of Interior to GPO.

Why? Think of acquisitions, because in those days almost everything was tangible, almost everything was printed at GPO, and it made sense to have the superintendent of documents at GPO. Think of a grizzly bear at the salmon stream just picking out things as they came up the stream.

That's what we were supposed to be doing, Superintendent of Documents at GPO. Now, think of how the world has changed since then, and you can understand why we want to change acquisitions.

I included this slide because this is a slide I give to the agencies all the time. Now, it's true that we can threaten the agencies with Title 44, but I'd much rather tell them all the positive things about cooperating with us. And, trust me, the Federal Depository Libraries are a very big positive thing we can talk about. So we do talk about the expertise you offer and the diversity you offer and the public access you offer, etc., etc.

But so these are the areas we are talking about, that we do have the equipment and technology, that you're value added, your diversity, and that you represent the major libraries in the country. All the things that, of course, you know.

This is how we find Government documents. Well, you know the part about this grizzly bear by the stream. I have an employee on the eighth floor that works with customer service, that sees the print orders coming through, the SF-1s and even the notification of intent to print, the 3868 forms. And they see these forms, and they determine from these forms whether this is worth having in our program in writing, the print orders.

Now, this is the traditional 1895 way things were collected, because, again, most things were collected this way. As you know a lot of the printing orders, the vast, vast majority of them are for printing jobs that GPO handles. GPO is not printing them in-house. We're actually handling them through -- and contracting them out to many printers around the country. So that's our second way.

And then there's something called "GPO Express." I don't know how many of you know about this program, but if somebody wants to get something printed in a hurry, but they want to follow the law, they sign up for this GPO Express Program. And they get like a little charge card, and they can go over to FedEx Kinko's and get the copies there. Now, once a week I get a report of everything that's copied, and we can actually get that information into our program, if it fits into the scope.

As then as you know we harvest documents from the websites, and thanks to you we identify fugitive documents through the LostDocs. Now, I underlined the last one Contact Government Agencies. We're more and more and more emphasizing that way to get the information. Think of it. If somebody asked you to go out and make a list of cars in America -- that are made in America or go out and buy every car in America, you could go out to North Tampa Street or North Capital Street with a pencil and paper and go, you know, Ford Focus, or you

could go to GM ask for a list. Well, we'd much rather go to the agencies and ask them to help us out finding this stuff. Lost Documents is great, but you know the Ford-Focus thing is not.

Let's talk about Government information and what that means. A lot of people say, "You know, Joe, I just went to the National Gallery of Art, and I saw the Caravaggio Exhibit, and at the end of the exhibit they always have that room where they're selling you all the catalogs and posters. How come you don't have all those beautiful coffee table books in your program? That's why. Government information is -- according to our interpretation of the law, is information produced with Congressionally appropriated funds. And those gift shop, coffee table books, they're usually created by this special trust fund that's like a revolving fund. They sell the books, they make money, they give money to the National Gallery or the Smithsonian or the Library of Congress, and then they use that, some of the money to create more catalogs. So that's one level.

Another one is that Government -- not all Government information falls into the scope of our Acquisitions Program. And let me talk a little about scope. We have a full training session for our employees just on the issue of scope, so this is a real breezy version of what we do. Scope is everything but documents containing personal, inaccurate, sensitive, or

restricted information, some times copyrighted.

What's personal information? If it's got your name and social security number, that's personal. There are documents with people's addresses, documents that we think somebody's privacy could be invaded. That's personal. Inaccurate, you can -- sensitive, restricted, you can pretty much guess what that is.

We say sometimes copyrighted because there are copyrighted materials that we can put in our program. The copyright holder has no problem with it, but there are copyrighting materials that we can't put in our program. They still get into the cataloging and indexing program, but not the depository program.

Documents with no educational value, the classic wet paint sign, and being a librarian, there are a lot of documents that, on the face of it, I think they have little educational value, but they -- somebody still thinks they have educational value.

And then there's documents strictly for administrative use. A lot of this stuff we get that people run off at the Kinko's is that kind of thing. I once saw something from Kinko's, and it was a memo. And it said, "Starting on Monday all staffers have to wear underwear under their clothes." (Laughter.) They obviously don't know we're reading their stuff. (Laughter.)

Now, we're going to talk about -- it's true. Now we're going to talk about traditional content acquisitions, and how we've had to change.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Unintelligible.)

JOE McCLANE: I'm not going to tell you.
(Laughter.)

Acquisitions was reactive. It was waiting to be informed of new publications. Think of that grizzly bear sitting on the side of the stream just, you know, chucking out the new publication. Acquisitions discovery was based on the printing of tangible information products. The cost, time, and expense -- remember, 1895 -- the cost time and expense of printing tangible documents was a vindication of the value of the documents.

Again, imagine you -- 1895, you write it out on long hand or you get one of those new inventions called a typewriter. You type it out, then you have to have it proofread, then you have to have the type set, and then you have to have the folios folded, and then you have to have them stitched, and then you have to have them bound, and then you have to apply the buckram. Anything you do -- all of that, too, must be valuable.

Today, that's not -- if you have a computer, you have a document. And then, of course, we have the mass printing runs, meant that many copies were available for a

long time. If you thought you needed a thousand copies, you
would go and get 1500 copies printed, because you didn't want
to go through the hassle of going back for print for ten
years.

So if we, quote, missed your document, we usually
can go back and get extra copies, because they would have them
stored some place.

So let's talk about now. First of all, most
documents -- most Government information is born digital. You
know that. There are many more avenues of producing,
reproducing Government information. Look at the Kinko's down
the street. Who would have thought 20 years ago that that
would be a source of government documents. And there's a lot
of Kinko's and there's a lot of little printing offices in the
regional offices of the various agencies.

Production is cheap. Every thought can be a
separate document, and there's an explosion of titles and
versions. And that's one of the things that is most
frustrating for us. Do you really want us to spend days and
days and days getting seven different versions of virtually
the same document?

Documents, as you know -- it's one thing for printed
documents. It's another thing for documents that are online,
and they -- they're living documents. They're constantly
changing. How far do we go? How much of a change is made

before we say, oh, this is a new version. They need to see
the new version, and, again, all this version control, all of
these titles.

Government publications, both tangible and
electronic, can be only briefly available because, again,
nobody is producing stuff for just-in-case. They're producing
things for just-in-time. You might think you need 700 copies,
so you just print 700 copies, thinking if you need more,
you'll just go back and produce more.

And that also leads to problems because there's
many, many, many, more reprints now. So constantly we're
finding documents, and we have to go through, at least all the
initial checking, to find out we've already got it.

So, again, here are the challenges we face. We face
it's -- first of all, it's harder to monitor new publications,
due to the ever-increasing number of titles. It's an
explosion; again, version control issues. There are more
sources of Government information. It's not just one stream
we can sit beside. It's thousands of streams.

And prioritizing resources and publications.
Whenever there are -- there are so many publications, so many
sources, so many places to look, we start having to
prioritize. And as I said, with all the different versions
and all the different reprints and all the different
information values of each version, we have to look at that

and say, we have to prioritize.

Our work now is more like a Mash Unit, you know, or an emergency room. There's all of this stuff coming in, and we have to have -- to do some triage at the very beginning to see what happens. For instance, people will say, "Joe, I sent you this stuff on this retrospective collection of Latrine Hygiene Pamphlets from the 1930s. Why don't you get it out?"

Well, that's the equivalent of somebody coming into the emergency room with a sprained pinky. You know, I'm going to say, "Here, have some Tylenol and sit in the corner." Because, basically, what we're looking at, what's the hot topic? What's the most information value? That's going to be our number one priority. And then our number two priority is going to be this and this and this.

And then the newsletters that are retrospective from decades ago, I'm not saying we're got going to get to it. We want to get to it, but in terms of priority, it has to be a little farther down the line.

So here's the initiatives we're doing right now. There's more emphasis on collection development. You know, before we would say, We just collect everything and a document was widgets and you just shoveled them in. And now we're looking at, wait a second, let's prioritize. Let's think about the future. Let's talk to the agencies. And that gets us to find content originators, not just content.

We have to talk more and develop more liaisons with the agencies, itself. We have always done it, and we've always done a good job with the bigger agencies like Census in Washington. But we have to go out more and more and be much more proactive.

And, again, that leads to our third point: Proactively working with content originators to identify and prioritize suitable content. And I'll tell you part of what this means is going out and meeting with groups of content originators and talking about our needs and talking about their needs and seeing if we can come up with a common strategy.

Last Friday I was on the phone with 64 editors and publishers at NOAA. This Friday I'm going to be at CUAC, the Cartographic Users Advisory Commission. Last month I was in San Antonio talking to all the DOD labs. There are 36 of them, and they produce a lot of great information for us. But they're -- a lot of it is lost. And so instead of just going to find the lost documents, I want to find -- I want to find the originators, so we have the whole collection. So instead of finding the one lost sheep, I want to talk to the shepherds, if you will.

And another thing we're doing and, again, we have -- I'll have a little commercial now. We go out all the time and talk to the agencies, and I would really like it if documents'

librarians came out and be -- or are a part of this. And our
great Louisiana Regional went out to a meeting we had at New
Orleans with FEMA and the Coast Guard about -- with the
Federal agencies down there and was a very good spokesperson
for the content consumers. We had the content originators, we
had content acquisition and we had content consumers.

And so as GPO's -- as the other parts of GPO, our
national account managers and our printing people have these
open houses, I've been invited to be part of that. So I'll be
in Cincinnati on May the 13th and Durham, North Carolina, on
the 14th. And if you'd like to see our outreach to these
agencies and the local level, just talk to me, and I'll tell
you all about it.

And, again, we want to expedite the acquisitions
process. Nothing's helpful to you if it's well late of when
the interest peaks in it. So we really want to get this
information out as quickly as possible, and we're
experimenting with something called "a brief bibliographic
record," so the minute it hits acquisitions, we can put a
brief record in the ILS. And you'll find out about, so, of
course, I don't get lots of CRMs about, where is that? We
spend about a quarter of our time handling where-is-that kind
of questions, and a lot of them would be answered if you could
see on the ILS that, uh, it's in acquisitions. It's on its
way to classification.

What can you do to help? Well, it's great that you
tell us about lost docs, but remember to give us as much
information as possible. We get a lot of lost docs that's
equivalent of your reference question "I'm looking for that
brown book with the dust on it," you know? Now, I know a lot
of times when you look for lost docs -- you find out about a
lost docs. You don't have a lot of information, but anything
you can give us helps us a lot.

The best thing to do is not just tell us about the
lost docs, but if you have the -- if you know the content
originator, if you have a contact, that really helps us,
because then we can go talk to them and find out, is this just
one document that just got lost, or is this part of a whole
series of things that we don't know about?

Ask GPO questions. Again, it's good to send us the
questions. We try to answer them as fast as possible. Again,
the more information you can give us, the better. And,
please, check the knowledge base before you send a question.
If we've already answered it, again, we'll direct you to the
knowledge base, but it's so much better if you look at it
yourself.

Again, we want to hear from you. My staff is very
dedicated. They really want to help and be useful. And
nobody got -- nobody is getting a lot of job satisfaction just
by collecting stuff. They want to make sure what they collect

is of useful -- useful to the users. So we want to hear from you, and we want your help.

As you can tell we're asking the agencies for their help in this acquisitions process. We need your help, too. You are the subject matter expert on so many of these documents. We need any help we can get from you.

And, now, I'm going to turn it back to Laurie, if we can figure out how this works.

(Brief pause.)

LAURIE HALL: Okay. Now, on to some of the stuff that's still going on with the ILS. 2008, we got the first phase of the directory up. I know you all have been working with that for six months now and submitting your changes. And we thank you for trying to help us keep that up to date.

We upgraded the Aleph software. We're on Version 18 right now. We've done some Web Interface enhancements. We've changed the look and feel a little bit. And we provided Z39.50 access to you as depositories.

Our 2009 plans, we have some enhancements. Now that Robin's folks have started using the directory more, for a wide variety of things in their area, they have some enhancements that they want us to make. So we're looking at software enhancements and some features.

The MetaLib, we've talked about MetaLib for a while, but we've finally gotten around to doing MetaLib. We finished

29

up some training of our automation staff just about a week or
two ago. We have the 35 site seedless that we finished. So I
would expect to start seeing some things from MetaLib probably
in the late summer.

One of our biggest challenges is serials management,
not only the checking in of the current stuff in all formats.
So that's probably 5,000 to 6,000 titles times three -- three,
if there's three formats of each. So that's 15,000. Plus
current titles, plus we have a big backlog of older materials
to check in, plus also historic and other -- even further, the
historic information in a bunch of our databases for serials
management. So that's one of our biggest challenges to kind
of get an overall serial strategy. And we've got some
training going on right now for our staff.

And then there's some other features that Linda has
been working on, on the Login page. She always provides us
with these nice statistics. This was by the end of March on
our successful hits. We're very happy with a lot of the
activity that goes on, on a regular business day. Lots of
people are using the CGP. We get a lot of inquiries from the
general public about stuff in the CGP, now, and not just you
guys.

We also now have a contract with Library
Technologies to do authority control in the database, the old
material, a gap load material, and ongoing authority control.

We're on like the second month of monthly authority control.
We're still working out some of the bugs with the Aleph
software and loading authority headings. But one thing I
think that is really going to be helpful is the authority
database that we're creating is only U.S. Government authors.
So I think it's a really unique opportunity for us. In the
whole name authority database, you have -- it's huge, but the
authority file we're creating is Government authors only. So
I think it's a real value; will be a real value. So that's a
major step forward to keeping that database clean.

And here's some examples of -- if you take a look
at -- you can click on authority headings now in the CGP -- I
can't even see this really well. These screens are very hard
to read -- but you can choose. You get the cross references,
the CNCs also. And you can also go to the authority records.
We had some indexing problems with that, but I think most of
those have been solved now. So you'll see all the CNCs, also
the references and the links to the actual heading in the
system.

The Login page we made some progress, and then we
got behind because we had some other issues going on with the
database. I think some people have been thinking that this
will be the record distribution mechanism, but Linda and I are
not quite sure this is how -- we're pretty sure this is not
where you can do record distribution, that we're going to do

that a different way. But this feature, it will be out in a couple of months. It allows you to set profiles. So if you want -- it's a little bit of enhancement, I guess, the best way to put it, an enhancement for new electronic titles, or something similar to that.

If you want to put a little profile in and say you want every document that comes out about frogs, you can have -- any time we add a record to the catalog that is -- has a subject heading frogs, you will get a feed of that cataloging record. So you create a bibliography or whatever.

You can do your item numbers in that, because that's an index field. We just don't think that this is the place where we're going to get custom profiles for record distribution, because it's just not as robust as we would need to develop, for 1250 libraries times 5,000 active item numbers, it's just not the place.

But you can do some small batches of records coming to you for a specific item number. We'll be talking a little bit more about that, but we just don't think that that's where custom library profiles or record distribution is going to reside. It's just not, kind of, the place. So we're looking at other options for doing that. I'll talk a little bit later about that.

Here are some of the enhancements that Linda's been working on now. There's some revised Help content for the

directory. Some of -- data entry guides that we've fixed up, as we've been working with the directory. So those are some of the enhancements that we're working on. There are also some other programming things that we're going to do for Robin's area.

And here's the information about MetaLib. There are three -- Linda e-mailed me this morning. I think there's three people that have been registered. They registered the CGP as -- for MetaLib exchange, one of the seed resources, but we should be having that shortly. So you can register and also make the CGP one of your targets through MetaLib. More information about that shortly. We just finished our training. That will give you federated search over those 35 databases.

So let's talk about money, now. Money, a million dollars, it sounds like a lot. And I know it really is a lot, but over three years it's only $300,000 a year, $300,000. But that, yeah, I feel like a Lottery winner. I really do. But what comes with the Lottery? When you win the Lottery, there's a lot of problems that come when you get the Lottery, right? A lot of work and trying to make sure you don't spend it on frivolous things.

So we have a plan in place. Some of Ted -- previous folks have helped me draft what we're doing to do with the program -- or the money. Ric has approved them, so here's

what we're doing to do. We're going to continue to go on to those next couple of years that we had on those contracts. We didn't originally have contract -- or money to go to the four-year contracts for the historic shelflist, but now we do. So we're going to go forward and try to get the projects done. Actually, we have to do it in three years, so. And we have to have all of the statements of work and all the money encumbered by September 30th. So that's a lot of work for us to do over the summer, to get all these things in place so that we can start delivering and driving results.

So we're going to continue on and use some of the money for the rest of the shelflist, and then we're also going to do some major authority control work on that shelflist. So we're going to control the headings and add some of those older headings to the authority control database in the CGP.

That serials control strategy is one of the things that keeps me up at night, so we're going to be looking for some planing process and strategies to get that serials control working. And also we've heard from you, and it's something that's been on our list for a long time, is that distribution of cataloging records.

Not only for you by your profile, but we also have a lot of other users. We have commercial users, we have sales customers who buy the records and then use value added products. MARCIVE is one of them, and ProQuest is another

one. So we have sales customers who buy our records.

I have had the requirements for that, a system like that for about three years now, but we didn't have the money to do that. So now we do. Our only stumbling block at this point is the licensing issue that's going on with OCLC, because our records now come through that venue.

And a lot of our records are created in the OCLC, you know, as part of CONSER. So that may -- we'll have to see what happens with that. We'll be talking to our general counsel, shortly, about the implications of licensing of our records. I don't particularly see that as a real problem for us, but it may potentially be a problem for the people who get records through our process.

When I talked a little bit about the legacy database, DDIS, the one that holds your item numbers and your profiles, that's where we see a development of that new database, at API between that new database structure and the integrated library system. So we're looking at working with those two systems and building that application from those two, merging of those two.

We also are going to use the money to do some API programming between some of our other internal GPO systems that have financial data on how much a document costs to print and how much it costs to send, you know, 800 copies to libraries. We don't have those kind of figures available to

us, but that -- that information is available in other GPO
systems. So we're going to build some interfaces with those
internal systems to get a better track of the depository site.
Also, that money is probably going to be used for some of the
integration between FedSys and the ILS.

So that's -- that's kind of what we're planning on
spending our money on. Like I said, it's going to be over
three years worth of time, so we're going to try to
prioritize. We will continue with the shelflist, since that's
already started, and get some of that. We already have the
authority control contract in place, so some of that stuff
will kind of flow in, as part of our other workflow. So it's
kind of a combination of projects that kind of benefits both
you, but also the public, because, you know, that money has to
be used to increase access to Government publications, and
we're doing that through the CGP. Okay.

So here's all of us, Jennifer and Linda who are not
here, but their e-mails as well. Most of you probably already
know our e-mails by heart. Okay. So thank you. Ready for
questions.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Laurie, I have a quick question.
This is Katrina Stierholz from the St. Louis Fed. When you
talk about the retrospective project, the historic shelflist,
that sounds like one of our Ds, descriptive work, cataloging
the pre-'76 material. Do you know how much -- will that

represent all of the pre-'76?

LAURIE HALL: No.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: What's the percent on that?

LAURIE HALL: No. We don't really -- we don't know what we don't know. That's what I've always said. All we know -- we know there are missing documents. We just know. When you go up to the shelflist, there are like guide cards for a series, and it says, you know, A1.25. There's nothing behind it. So we know that it was set up, and we know there's materials in there, but we don't have cards.

Suzanne Ubanusis (phonetic) has done an investigation of all those. And I haven't seen it yet, but she's compiled a list of all the things. So we know there are certain categories that we do not have. So I think we'll probably be going out looking for specific material in those areas, you know, in a particular series or --

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: And then those will be added to OCLC, as well as the CGP?

LAURIE HALL: Well, there is our big catch point right now. We have been -- and I shouldn't say anything, but I'm going to say it anyway --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait.

LAURIE HALL: -- those of you who know Laurie. We have been working with OCLC probably for the last year and a half to try to get them to work up a batch loading profile for

us. They're not very responsive. And I don't know if this whole licensing issue has kind of overtaken events, but since we're a national authority, an enhanced library -- there's only a few libraries that have enhanced capability. We're one of them. We worked with our Fed link office, which is for Federal libraries. We set up a profile. It's been a year now. We e-mail them almost every month. Where are we? What's happening? Are you going to do anything? We don't hear anything from them. So I guess I'm going to have to figure out some other ways to approach them to -- because we plan on loading these in the CGP and then batch loading them into the OCLC. So right now we haven't had much response on doing it, but that's what our plans are.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: That would be terrific. I think that would help a lot.

LAURIE HALL: Sort of let the deduping process and overlay process in their hands, rather than in ours.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. First of all, I'd like to thank whoever it is in the GPO matrix that allowed Joe McClane to be delivered back amongst us. (Laughter.)

I am a Jurassic doc, and Joe was part of the inspection program way back in the Neolithic period, and he can open up a can of whoopass and make you think you're sitting down to a four dinner -- a four-star dinner, and

you're enjoying it. (Laughter.)

So I'm glad to see -- I'm glad to see he's put back in a critical juncture in this process, and he still has the charm and the light that I remember.

LAURIE HALL: And just remember, just think what that does for technical services, you know, really.

JOHN SHULER: Exactly. You guys are cool, again.

LAURIE HALL: Right. (Laughter.)

JOHN SHULLER: The other thing that Joe's comments reminded me of, sitting next to Suzanne here with her Cyber Cemetery and I with my DOS Ban, which I call the Zombie Library. It's not quite dead, but the State Department came back to me about six months ago -- not THE State Department, but a segment of it, the Passport Office. And apparently a lot of citizens and other people use the Visa Bulletin, the old Visa Bulletins that are on that website DOS Ban. And they noticed that when we had our relationship with the Department of State, we didn't complete that part of the digitization. So what they've been sending us over the last six months, they've been digitizing it themselves and sending us back years of that publication.

So it strikes me, Joe, when I heard you. We should probably talk, because that sounds like this relationship between the library and the partnership is recovering content in a wonderful way that now has a way to connect back to the

Mothership -- oh, God. Did I say that? (Laughter.)

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Laurie, a question that came up yesterday, I think, from James Jacobs was the issue about Z39.50 and the 1,000 limit right now. Can you talk a little bit about plans for migration?

LAURIE HALL: Yeah. The only thing I have to do is check with Linda, because we've had some problems with our server loads. And so I think we've been monitoring our server. We had some issues with the server capacity at this point, but I will check back with Linda to see, you know, what the issue is about it, you know, to let more records through.

And, also, I think one of the issues, Ric, that you and I talked about, one of the things that would surely get anybody records as fast as they want is being a partner with us. So if you want, you know, you want to become a parter with us for some particular project, partnerships always take priority. And we'll get those records delivered to you, you know, or whatever you want. If it's things out of DDIS or you want stuff from the directory, it just makes it a little easier for us to customize things and get things to you. But I'll have to check with Linda on the server capacity issue.

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I have a question for Joe. You mentioned when you were talking about developing relationships with content originators. You specifically mentioned some of the DOD labs,

and it's been my experience -- and I don't know if it's the experience of others -- that DOD material is some of the most difficult to find, and it also seems like a lot of their publications are not included in the FDLP yet. That is what we often get questions about, and there's simply no way to get access to it. So I wonder if you could elaborate a little bit about what is possible to get from DOD? Thanks.

JOE McCLANE: Well, that's one of the reasons I went to this meeting of the DOD labs, is that very reason. I think part of it is, is they're not quite sure. They think if they get sucked into the Depository Program everything will get sucked in, and they won't -- they won't have a choice. So a lot of that was hand-holding with them and saying, Wait a second. If it's that sensitive, if it's that top secret, we'll let you make the choice on, the determination on that.

Also, it was good for me, because they have a booklet of the different levels of sensitivity, and we could talk about when they print something, how they can fill out the printing forms to let us know if something is, indeed, too sensitive to send out.

So I think just establishing the relationship with them and talking with them and saying, "If you have a question, let us know." But I think what happens is, DOD is so big -- think of it. It's about three dozen different labs, and there are hundreds and hundreds of people. And they tend

to be very spread out all over the world. They're -- if they know about the depository program, they have a very elementary view of it. They think it's just something that just spreads it out all over the world -- spreads out information all over the world without evaluating its content.

So it's going to take a little while to reel them all the way in, but already we're seeing some positive benefit from that -- from that. The fact that they can call me up directly and ask a question, "If we let you have this" -- or "How do we let you have it in a way that we have some control over how much of our material you get?" So I think they've been overly cautious, and, hopefully, that will end now.

GWEN SINCLAIR: Okay. So aside from the DOD labs, just DOD in general --

JOE McCLANE: In general.

GWEN SINCLAIR: -- is there something that the depository community can do to help this process?

JOE McCLANE: Our problem with DOD is it's so huge and so diverse, in terms of its printing, that there's no one point of contact. I think what the depository community can do, is if you find someone, a content originator or a publishing officer, let us know. Let us -- give us the information, and then we'll contact them.

The problem is it's, like most huge bureaucracies, is all of this turnover, and we lose track of all these

people. We're working with them, and as soon as we find a very good contact point, we go to that contact point.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I'd like to follow up on that, with a specific example of a problem publication, or at a publication that many depository librarians thought was a problem.

Was about nine months ago, I received an e-mail from one of my large selectives saying that he had been contacted by reporter in San Diego wanting a copy of a book, that was a text book for physicians in battle areas, that had very graphic descriptions of how physicians in battle areas treat battle wounds in the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters.

JOE McCLANE: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

DAVID CISMOWSKI: And he didn't even know this existed. He searched the GPO sales website and found that it was for sale. And he asked me if I could find out what was going on with this, and why it wasn't being distributed to depositories, especially, since he was getting calls from a reporter wanting to see this.

And I said that I would follow up on it, and I didn't, because I wanted to wait and see, because if this was being reported -- and there actually was an article in a nationwide newspaper about this. I forget the name of the newspaper. But then there was a posting on either DocTech-L or GovDoc-L about the same issue from another depository.

And later it was distributed, and I don't know who
at GPO made this comment, but there -- it was a response
either on Ask GPO or maybe it was an Ask GPO comment that was
later posted to GovDoc-L. The response was "Well, of course,
we were going to distribute it." There wasn't any question.

Now, I know from the news articles, if they were
inaccurate, that the Department of Defense did not want this
to be distributed to the general public, but yet it was for
sale on the sales unit. Now, I'm totally confused about what
kind of decision-making goes on, in cases like this, because
it seems like it's very unscientific.

JOE McCLANE: Let me -- this is a -- this is an
excellent example of what we have to deal with.

Before the book was published, we got a call from
the publisher, and it was true. The publisher, which is a
unit of the Defense Department, said, "We don't want this
distributed," and the reason was they said it's -- these -- as
you -- it was -- it's very graphic. The injured soldiers were
in states of undress, terrible war wounds, and they said we
don't want to distribute it and the reason is, a privacy
issue, which as we talked about our scope there are privacy
issues.

They said these are soldiers, and they were going to
get their picture taken for what they thought was an
educational book that only surgeons would see, and then the

Defense Department was worried it was going to be used
for -- by other people with other political views. And the
soldiers would end up being exploited, their pictures.

So this is a case where it was -- and then we asked
them. Okay. Is this -- first, they said, "Well, your
libraries won't want it because it's too graphic."

And we said, "We have a lot of stuff like this, and
we have medical school libraries that don't worry about that."

And then they wouldn't give us copies even for
cataloging. And we said, "Trust me. Our catalogers have seen
worse."

So we got the cataloging thing, but they -- they
persuaded us because they said it's a privacy issue. We
promised the soldiers we're not going to distribute it. And
we were, you know -- for the most part, if an agency comes to
us, and we don't have any proof, otherwise, we'll take their
word for it. But we argued with them back and forth, this
should be in the program.

Then we found out later that the doctors, whose
surgical techniques were demonstrated in this book, were so
proud of it, they went to the New York Times. And, meanwhile,
the printing contract had gone out. And, so, apparently our
sales people found out about it, and they jumped on the
printing contract. But we had to wait until it was reprinted,
and what we did was, the minute we found out it was in the New

York Times and it was going to be public, then we immediately said, "Well, we have to put it in the program. We understand your privacy issue, but it's now a public issue and everybody is asking for it, and it's in demand."

And so that was the reason, but it's a classic example of something that, you know, we try to be sensitive to the soldiers. And what we were told, initially, ended up not being how it ended up.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, again. The issue I have with this, Joe, and I know it's not -- I'm not directing this at you.

JOE McCLANE: No, I know.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: I'm just venting here. I believe that it wasn't a privacy issue at all. I believe that it was a political decision, because they didn't want these -- they didn't want the public to see how devastating these wounds are to people. And we have in our collection many illustrated medical volumes from World War II, some even from World War I. I mean, there's one volume of war wounds of World War I, gas injuries, that's horrible to me -- I mean, talk about disfigured faces -- and yet these were distributed through the program. Yet this one wasn't. And I, personally, don't think that something that is politically uncomfortable should be censored in that way in this program.

It's not -- the names of the soldiers were not

mentioned. Most -- in almost every illustration, except for a facial wound, it shows a torso or a leg. It doesn't show a face, so how can you identify an individual from those photos?

JOE McCLANE: Well, that's why we eventually -- that's why we -- we distributed it once we could get the reprint.

JUSTIN OTTO: Justin Otto, from Eastern Washington University. A quick question about MetaLib. The 35 databases that are going to be seed resources for it, I'm wondering, can you give me some examples of what those will be?

LAURIE HALL: I don't -- I can't give you an -- I can't give you the examples, because I haven't seen the list, but I have can find out from Linda what they are.

JUSTIN OTTO: Okay.

LAURIE HALL: And put them -- send them out on Listserv.

JUSTIN OTTO: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: I don't think we're that far down in the process. There was an original list that Cindy put together, what, two or three years ago, four years ago, maybe. So we just looked at that list, again, and updated it.

Cindy, do you -- I mean, do you remember some of the titles that would still -- the URLs that would still be --

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Yeah, we originally used as the seed list what was up

on GPO Access, as agency publication indexes. So we had
AGRICOLA, ERIC --

LAURIE HALL: And Ell -- Medline -- MedLib,
whatever.

CINDY ETKIN: Yeah, yeah. Medline Plus or -- the
DOE.

LAURIE HALL: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

CINDY ETKIN: There was a couple of EPA databases
and a couple USGS databases, I think.

LAURIE HALL: Yeah.

CINDY ETKIN: Just off the top of my head.

LAURIE HALL: Four years ago. So we've taken that
original list and just validated it, to make sure they're
still accurate, and there's maybe some additions. I'm not
sure what they were, but I'll get you the information.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, again.
Laurie, I have some questions about the shelflist conversion.

LAURIE HALL: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

DAVID CISMOWSKI: These records that you're going to
load by the end of the week, the 274 records, are those going
to be loaded consecutively into the CGP so that one would be
able to search by system number and just go from one to the
next to the next?

LAURIE HALL: Yes. Yes, they will be, but we'll
also send out a Listserv message. If you notice the records,

they also have a 955 field that says PTFS. That's the
contractor's name. So you can search by that and pull up the
batch. So part of that Listserv message will be how to do
that.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: Because I think --

LAURIE HALL: It should be consecutively loaded.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: -- given the hopes that the
community has for the ability to use these records, I would
think there would be a lot of -- a few people anyway --

LAURIE HALL: Everyone wants to take a look at that
big bat -- the batch first. Okay.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: -- who would want to look at how
much they contain. This is the first time I've seen, these
two slides, the metadata that's going to be extracted from
this project.

LAURIE HALL: Right.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: Looks pretty good.

LAURIE HALL: So it should -- they should be loaded
consecutively.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: And the second question is, you
talked about authority control through the CGP.

LAURIE HALL: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

DAVID CISMOWSKI: And was I correct in hearing you
say that you're only going to apply that to corporate headings
for Government agencies?

49

LAURIE HALL: No. It's for series. We don't do personal names. That's -- unless it's the name of a Post Office, or whatever. So it's subject, series, agency name, corporate names.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: So authority control is going to be applied to these shelflist conversion cards as well?

LAURIE HALL: As well. Not right now, though. That's what the million dollars is going to be used to do that as well.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: Thank you, Laurie.

LAURIE HALL: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, at Chicago. I was wondering if, Laurie, you could -- since a lot of the talk over the last two days has been thinking outside the box and trying to imagine what we're going to do in the future, without a depository concept, per se, do you imagine these changes in the acquisition and collection and cataloging processes, that you all have unleashed these last five years, is going to become very library friendly? In other words, you can acquire material without having a separate depository staff, and a regular acquisition staff will know what to do with this, as they do ordering and receiving any other material flowing into a library?

LAURIE HALL: So am -- are you interested in looking for other tools that we're going to develop that are not

always depository centric? Like an acquisitions list --

JOHN SHULER: Yeah. Uh-huh. (Indicates
affirmatively.) Right.

LAURIE HALL: -- of -- you know, by topic and those
kind of things?

JOHN SHULER: Speaking as a collection
development --

LAURIE HALL: Looking for, yeah, stuff --

JOHN SHULER: -- yeah, yeah. I'm thinking -- the
only model that I have in my head right now, and I know it's
not the only one, is, for instance, Yankee Book Peddler and
other vendors that deliver bibliographic records into the
acquisition systems of thousands of libraries. Yet, when we
show them our acquisition system, per se, their eyes kind of
go dead. And they go "Well, that's why we created you."

LAURIE HALL: So you're looking for like, you know,
preliminary loads of records?

JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

LAURIE HALL: You're looking for other kinds of
reference kind of tools --

JOHN SHULER: I -- yeah.

LAURIE HALL: Sort of like the NET --

JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: -- but you want them in categories and
things like that?

JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: I think the new DDIS, the new -- we call it the daughter of DDIS, internally. (Laughter.)

JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

LAURIE HALL: But that -- that database or that new platform will set up some of those -- the ability for us to do different kinds of --

JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.) or.

LAURIE HALL: -- distribution schemes or selection schemes.

JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: So, yes. But I'm not sure I'm answering that correctly.

JOHN SHULER: Okay. Well, I think you're getting -- I think we're both struggling to the answer, because my administration is very much interested in figuring out how to integrate what is a very singular operation more effectively into a reorganized technical service department that is merging acquisitions and cataloging together. And they're doing it around commercial models, as I just mentioned, but I'm just thinking out loud for the directors who aren't here, that after they're done thinking about space, I'm sure they're going to start thinking about technical processing.

LAURIE HALL: Hmm.

JOHN SHULER: Won't take them long to get there.

And they're going to come back, and they're going to ask us, well, you know, when you're not thinking about space, we want you to think about acquisitions, because it's very expensive to set up a separate department to process this stuff. And we don't have as many people as we used to. More people have got to do more things. They may not be a documents people. They may not be a specialist documents people. Can you make it easier for them to understand?

          LAURIE HALL: Yeah.

          JOHN SHULER: I think that's -- I think I see where that -- that is where this conversation is going, and I'm just trying to anticipate.

          LAURIE HALL: Well, you know, sometimes GPO is always behind everybody else on certain things, like getting an integrated library system, but, actually, Joe's folks in acquisitions do a lot of the preliminary --

          JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

          LAURIE HALL: -- cataloging already.

          JOHN SHULER: Okay.

          LAURIE HALL: We've already -- because of the size, we're pretty much the same size we always have been.

          JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

          LAURIE HALL: There's a lot -- a lot of -- it's always not that flow that Joe talks about. It's not always that way. A lot of the catalogers are doing acquisitions.

JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: Sometimes we're not. We share a lot of responsibilities across that small group.

JOHN SHULER: And then I'm going to go one step further, and this is something I mentioned last fall. I believe, if one imagines if we play this out to a -- one of the natural conclusions, that in the future, the library administrators are going to view the depository system as another vendor of this sort. But not -- you know, they're going to want to classify our depository obligations in the same way they organize now the space concerns, that you've got to pay for yourself, in other words, through use. So to now with our acquisitions process. You're going to have to demonstrate that your acquisitions process doesn't demand extra duty from us. So it's got to be normalized to the rest of our stuff. I see that as the next step.

So on a broad scale, we're moving from a special collection kind of environment and heritage, to something that is going to be usefully integrated, as we are now seeing along space lines, into the rest of the collections. And then some other day we'll talk about public service.

LAURIE HALL: Well, there are some other implications, potentially, for us, too, when we talk about -- you know, we've historically always done the SuDoc class.

JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

LAURIE HALL: So if you're talking about integration --

JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: -- you know, we do some classification in LC. We have talked about expanding, doing more LC classification, and, you know, slowly.

JOHN SHULER: So you can just hear the clocks ticking --

LAURIE HALL: Right.

JOHN SHULER: -- on all these other nonintegrated library procedures that have been, for a century, associated with the depository process, now coming up next on the block if you will.

LAURIE HALL: Okay.

JUSTIN OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. Laurie, a quick clarification on the DDIS. Are you guys just going to be -- is it just the software that's going to be replaced, or are you talking about replacing the whole -- that whole process, you know, from start to finish with --

LAURIE HALL: First step is just the software. Because it feeds in the Lighted Bin System, the most important thing for that first stage is to keep it going, so the distribution can still happen. So moving to the platform -- even moving to the platform will give us a lot

more options and opportunities to move that data around. But until -- we have to kind of work it with Robin's area, because that is the -- that is the backbone of that operation there.

So, you know, expanding item numbers or getting rid of item numbers, or all that kind of stuff, we're not looking at that right now. We're looking at just migrating it so it's on a more stable platform, and then working on that as our Phase 2: What are the other options out there?

JUSTIN OTTO: So Phase 2 would be reexamining the Lighted Bin System and that kind of stuff?

LAURIE HALL: Well, we're looking at the entire item scheme.

JUSTIN OTTO: Yeah, okay.

LAURIE HALL: Right.

JUSTIN OTTO: Thank you.

LAURIE HALL: Because that, obviously, has a direct impact on the mechanics of the Lighted Bin, so.

JUSTIN OTTO: Thanks.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I have two questions that I'm bringing to you for my selectives, none of whom were able to make it. One question was whether acquisitions is still trying to address the essential titles, stay -- any essential titles used to mean staying in paper. Well, another one bit the dust, the budget, and so they are asking is that going to continue?

LAURIE HALL: Actually, the budget is going to be in paper this year.

SANDY McANINCH: The whole thing?

LAURIE HALL: Does anybody know, the full thing? Lisa?

SANDY McANINCH: Because there was a big announcement, no more paper budget, so.

LAURIE HALL: Uh-uh. (Indicates negatively.) That's been -- that's been changed.

SANDY McANINCH: Okay.

LAURIE HALL: They probably didn't announce that, but Lisa can answer that.

LISA RUSSELL: We don't know anything definitive, but we believe it's still going to be in paper this year. I'm sorry. It's Lisa Russell, GPO. We believe it's still going to be in paper this year, and there's also talk that there may be an additional volume this year, but we don't know that for sure yet.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The latest information I have is, that it's very likely. If you remember last year, they decided to go all electronic, and because it was on the essential title list, I had it printed. And I think that they may be reconsidering what they did last year.

LAURIE HALL: And, remember, in print there was the Senate Document Edition, yeah, so.

SANDY McANINCH: So the answer is yes. Essential title still means you're going to try to keep acquiring them in paper. Okay.

LAURIE HALL: Unless it goes to totally a format that is not -- we cannot get it in a printable form, but that's always a lot of discussion back and forth with the agency. I don't think we've had too many of those, or any.

SANDY McANINCH: May I ask one more since I'm up here?

LAURIE HALL: Yeah.

SANDY McANINCH: Will WEBTech Notes be in the knowledge base? One of your advice items to us was to check knowledge base before we make an inquiry. So we had the question of whether all that WEBTech Notes information would be in that knowledge base in the --

LAURIE HALL: Initial plans are not -- we have not talked about moving all of that data into the knowledge base. I'll have to talk to Cindy about that, because based on the capacity of the current knowledge base, then it would be a mapping issue.

A lot of times the information is in the knowledge base, but the bulk of the historic data and the WEBTech Notes database, not yet.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Let me throw out something else there. Yeah. We do need to look at that and

capacity issues, but we also have the option of putting a
knowledge base widget onto the WEBTech Note page, so it will
be there to search. And maybe it might be able to search both
at the same time. I don't know. Possibility.

LAURIE HALL: Yeah, we haven't gotten that far yet.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: May I speak? Bernadine
Abbott Hoduski. There are some librarians throughout the
country who are willing to help upgrade records, the catalog
records, like adding the SuDoc number and other information to
it. And they're not all just considered like cataloging
partners with GPO, and yet the problem, of course, is you
can't go into OCLC and upgrade a record, because you're not a
master cataloger.

And I'm wondering is there going to be some process
set up that if, say, there's a library willing to go in, if
they're doing a special project of a whole series of
publications or a category, that they could upgrade records
that they find in OCLC, send them to GPO, and then GPO could
send those records to upgrade the OCLC record, or something
like that?

LAURIE HALL: Yeah. I'm not really sure what the
process would be. We've talked to Mark at the CIC libraries,
and we do know there are some libraries that are interested in
doing that. We just haven't worked out a flow of whether we
would give them, you know, batches of the brief shelflist

records, they would do something, and then they would send them back to us and we would update the CGP and then we would also send them on to OCLC. So we talked about that, but I don't think we know what the logistics are yet.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Okay. And I don't know if the librarian that, you know, looked at all the essential titles and was trying to find the master records, for example, for the U.S. Code or could find the parts cataloging but not the overall record.

And I know that some of these things that are so long traditional series in a program, maybe were cataloged so long ago that they really didn't get into the electronic catalog beginning in 1976, if you had something that was cataloged before that. And so they're not necessarily finding the overall record. They may find the record for the parts.

So are you making an effort like essential titles, if that is something that every library in the country should be accessing, the essentials titles list for their client base, are all of those catalogs upgraded in OCLC with the URLS and the PURLs, and all of that, so my public library can go in put that in their, in their database or in our statewide catalog in Montana?

LAURIE HALL: I'm trying to think of the answer to that question. All of the essential titles so far that are serials, there is a project underway now to clean up the CGP.

There's multiple records in -- there's lots of duplicate
records in the CGP of a wide magnitude, but all of the
essential titles that are serials have been cleaned up, moved
into a -- the single record approach links between all the
different versions. That just -- I'm not quite sure that's
just finished, but one of my catalogers has been working on
that for the last couple of months.

Because the essential titles are the first -- the
serial essential titles are the ones that are going to be the
first records that will be checked in, so we'll have holdings
for the individual issues. So did that answer your question,
besides the other major database cleanup that we're embarking
on now?

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Yes, that answers my
question.

LAURIE HALL: Okay.

ESTHER CRAWFORD: Hi. I'm Esther Crawford, Bryce
University. You touched on the separate records change that's
been made, and I wondered if you'd address the cataloging
policy now and in the future for Congressional microfiche
specifically.

LAURIE HALL: Everybody -- everybody -- every format
get its own record. So we had a backlog of Congressional
microfiche. They went over to the catalogers, probably about
2 or 300 of them, in the last two or three weeks. So in the

March -- they should now be in the CGP, and they would be in any record loads coming from archive, probably in this next April -- March-April batch. Yeah. Every single format of a document -- paper, microfiche, electronic, CD -- will all have a separate record, and they will have links to each of the records.

ESTHER CRAWFORD: Okay. Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, DOE. I think it was last fall we saw some list of the most commonly searched terms in the CGP, and when I went in and tried to replicate those searches, while it was obvious what the people were searching for, the searches didn't turn up what they wanted. And I'm wondering with this new money that we'll have for cataloging, will there be a way we can go back and enrich some of these terms so that they'll actually get the return that the people are looking for?

LAURIE HALL: Were those terms more general terms from the general public and not LCSH subject headings?

TIM BYRNE: Right.

LAURIE HALL: Is that part --

TIM BYRNE: Yeah.

LAURIE HALL: So Joe and I have talked about many times trying to do some of that -- what you and Linda were talking about -- starting to assign more general like BISAC headings, or something like that, to -- categories to our

publications, but that's kind of against MARC. So I'd have to --

TIM BYRNE: Well, some of the things were like searching "regulations" did not turn up the Code of Regulations.

LAURIE HALL: Right. Right. Plus part of that problem is, I think, there's a lot of duplicate records in the system that we're working on now. Our first group of catalogers is working on some de-duping process. Plus --

TIM BYRNE: Yeah. Well, Bernadine's comments reminded me of that, because there are, you know, 50 different records for the CFR --

LAURIE HALL: Right.

TIM BYRNE: -- for each part --

LAURIE HALL: Right.

TIM BYRNE: -- but there's not one record for the --

LAURIE HALL: For the whole --

TIM BYRNE: -- whole thing.

LAURIE HALL: Yeah. So and you have to also remember, too, some of those -- that -- building that database came from the printed monthly catalog, where there's individual issues -- records for multiparts. So all that stuff has to be merged together in holdings. So that's part of our process, but --

JIM VEATCH: Jim Veatch, Bartram Trail Regional

Library. That question about the CFR came from me, and others
like that, where the Federal Register and the PHC-1 and the
PHC-2, where you can get the parts, but you can't find a good
GPO record for the whole thing. And I was building a World
Cat, my own World Cat list of essential titles, and that's how
I discovered that I can't find the records for that.

But what I wanted to ask you was about -- I found a
number of records, especially for NIH publications where
there's a URL, but it goes to the most recent version of that,
like Double 0, 02 -- or whatever this year's is. But what is
described in the record was one that's maybe two or three
years old. And while I realize a lot of people would like
that new one, what's happened to the old ones? Are they just
gone forever now?

LAURIE HALL: No. That's sort of part of the
process of re-routing PURLs and matching the metadata with the
archive version. Most medical stuff, they usually only keep
that current version. They replace it, so that's one of our
challenges in Robin's archiving group and my group, to try to
keep track of all those things that change a version. So
every time a version changes, you've got to change and create
a new record. And also then reroute or add a new PURL to the
new version. So it's one of the biggest challenges, besides
serials, that we have in archiving. Robin, shaking her head,
would agree.

JIM VEATCH: Would you not just want to go back and re-catalog those as continuing resources, some of those that you know get changed like every year?

LAURIE HALL: Well, you could. So that is an option, if it meets CR-2.

TIM BYRNE: Well, I think we're into break time now, so I want to thank Laurie and Joe for their really informative session.

(Conclusion of session at 3:40 p.m.)

Transcribed by:
Sherry A. Belliveau
Liberty Court Reporting
112 N. Pine Avenue
Inverness, Florida 34450

COUNCIL SESSION: STRATEGIC ISSUES FORUM

Tuesday, April 21, 2009, 4 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: Welcome to the Strategic Issues Forum. The Depository Library Council is, of course, supposed to be advising GPO on the Depository Library Program, and one of the things I have discovered, since I no longer work in a depository, is that I don't hear much from the community about what they would -- their concerns are, and there are others in the -- on the Council who are in a similar situation. So I wanted to do something that would give us an opportunity to hear from the community.

We've been working on developing a Strategic Plan, and we had a session yesterday that was designed to elicit a lot of comments, but I also felt that there were issues that probably weren't going to come up in the discussion yesterday, that people might like to have Council aware of their thoughts on this. So I did send out an e-mail to GovDot-L and the GPO FDLP-L, who sent us some of the state list also.

And I was really pleased with the response that we got from a lot of the community. I think it's something we want to do, similar things more often in the future. What we tried to do with the comments that we received was to look at them and extract what strategic issues we wanted to bring up and discuss here. And I emphasize Strategic Issues, even though I said so in my message; we got a lot of people talking

about things that were really operational issues. So that's
not the point of this session.

It's really to talk about the things on a much
higher level, things that might be fed into the Strategic
Plan. And if people do have operational issues they want to
talk about, those should be done in the Update Issues --
Update Sessions.

Did you have anything you want to add?

JOHN SHULER: No.

TIM BYRNE: Good.

The first issue we want to just throw out is the
digitization of the legacy collection, and these are some of
the comments that we received.

Why is it taking so long to get older documents
online? Libraries are discarding documents that could be cut
apart and fed into scanners. I suggest dividing up the SuDocs
and assign batches to large willing depositories to get it
done. Others thought that this should not be a priority to
GPO, but the FDLP's. GPO's role should be one of facilitating
collaborations and developing a meta search, for searching all
the digitized collections from a central website at GPO. GPO
needs to have a searchable list of all digital projects
whether they're in -- whether at GPO -- whether they are a GPO
project or not. And others felt that it was probably best
left to the private sector.

So anyone have any thoughts they'd like to share with us on digitization?

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski. I'm on the Executive Board of the Freedom to Read Foundation, and we've set up a new committee to look at future issues that will affect intellectual freedom and our right to read, and so on. And we're very concerned about the digitization of all kinds of publications, and what's going on with Google and others.

And who is going to actually own this information? All of our publicly -- a lot of our publicly supported institutions over the years have shared their publications with private vendors of all kinds. And some have produced really wonderful products, and they've been made available. Others, nothing has happened with them, but the information still stayed in the public domain.

Now, with Google doing everything all over the world, some libraries, that are making arrangements with Google, will have control of their publications, but other libraries are going to end up paying for the information. So the policy issue is what's going to happen to Government information that's in the Google project.

Now, it may or may not be a quality product that Google is producing -- that's questionable -- but I think there's an urgency toward supporting GPO and the depository

library program, digitizing the publications and keeping them
in the public domain, so that they are free to every citizen
in this United States and not turn our information over to the
private sector. I think it's fine if they take it and do
something with it. I mean, I have no problem with that, but
the basic information, I think, needs to stay in a public
domain.

And that's why I think we need to ask for as much
money as it takes to digitize all of the -- not just the
documents out in the depository libraries, but I was at Jim
Veatch's library the other day in Washington, Georgia. And
they have a wonderful set of the War of the Rebellion Records
(Official Title: "Official Records of the Union and
Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion.") Now, I was
amazed in Georgia that they actually had the War of the
Rebellion Records in the South. I mean, I'm a Northerner so,
but, anyway, it was a wonderfully well kept set.

Now, my Library in Lewis Clark became a depository
in 1865. They have a lot of wonderful things from the early
days. They're no longer a depository, but they have a
wonderful Montana collection. So my concern is that we really
need to know what's out in all those former depository
libraries, or those libraries that had good relationship with
their member of Congress and have material that needs to be
there, before this all gets privatized and we're spending a

lot of tax dollars buying back access for the public.

MARIE CONCANNON: I'm Marie Concannon, University of Missouri, Columbia. At my library we have micro card that came from Readex, which is the depository and nondepository collection that goes back to 1956. And at a certain point, I think, it's 1980, it changed to microfiche. We have both of these collections.

Well, I figure if they have already put depository and nondepository Government documents -- they've photographed them, in order to create micro card and microfiche, that perhaps negatives are still available. And perhaps the depository community can talk to Readex and to ask whether there can be some kind of agreement made. I mean, it's a possibility.

I'd also like to second everything that Bernadine has said, both yesterday and today. I think that she just took the words right out of my mouth. I had been trying to get a collection of WPA Documents, Historical Records Survey digitized. I received a gift, 88 linear feet of the WPA Historical Records Survey, and I'm out there on my own trying to figure out whether this stuff is already digitized or not.

It has been very difficult to figure it out. I'm kind of like charting course myself, and I could really use some guidance. I searched the Internet to see if anybody had digitized it already. Couldn't find things, because it was

deep web stuff. And I put a message out on GovDoc-L and
didn't get any response except that, "Oh, yeah, do it." And
then I found out later that about ten percent of what I have
has already been digitized. It was findable through something
called "Oyster," which I hadn't heard of before.

So when I approached my own library's digital
initiatives committee, saying I'd like to have this digitized,
they said, "Well, this is already getting on Google Books, so
I don't see why we should invest the money to have this done."

My concern is, I have no guarantee that Google Books
is always going to be free. In the WPA the whole philosophy
behind it was to use Government money to create a good, that
would be usable by the population. I just can't stand the
idea of it ever having to become available only for a fee.
Ancestry.dot come wanted to pay for the digitization, but they
said, "Only you and us would be able to have it then."

And I said, "No way."

So if all you guys did was create a statement saying
FDLP -- I'm just making this up -- FDLP does not advocate the
use of Google Books, as an acceptable substitute for something
that's digitized by depository library community or GPO or
something like that. Then I could take that to my digital
initiatives committee and say "Just because it's on Google
Books, doesn't mean that we should not do it," if that's what
you think should happen. I'd just like to present that for

your consideration. Thank you.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library.
I guess my question is for GPO. What's keeping us from doing
all of this?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed -- sorry. I
didn't mean to blow you away -- GPO. As Ric said the other
day, there's been a decision to award, at no cost to
Government contract. The specifics of that I cannot release,
because it's still at an acquisitions process. More to come.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina from the
St. Louis Fed. Robin, can you give us a little bit, though?
I mean, are we talking about one agency in ten years? Ten
agencies in a hundred years? What's the scope here? Small,
medium, large would be plenty.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO. As my
colleague reminded me this is all subject to JCP approval.
The actual rate of digitization is part of the negotiation
process, which has not yet happened, because we can't award
until JCP approves that path forward. It also determines --
is determined in part by the type of digitization that is done
and the level of digitization specification. And then the
ingest into the FDsys system.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. This leads to
my frustration. I mean, we're advisory to the Public Printer.
We come here, find out there's -- I guess we've heard it other

means, but they've got this bid out. They're going to award a contract for digitization, and yet we're talking about how we can go about digitizing, and should there be a plan? I don't even know what the plan is. Where does this discussion fit in? I know you can't discuss the specifics, yet, but what was the proposal? I mean, can we see what the proposed scope of work was? I mean, that's public information I would think.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO. Yes, Ken. The request for proposal is on the Fed Bus Ops site, and the requirements for that are located there.

KEN WIGGIN: Well, could you tell me? I mean, I haven't got my computer right here. Is it to go retrospectively? Is it -- you know, what are the priorities of this?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: The priorities paper is also located off the Desktop. Briefly, the proposal -- the request for proposal was to digitize documents going back to the beginning of the Republic to do them to specifications that meet best practices digitization specs, as put forward by different groups, but about two-and-a-half years ago, three years ago, as part of the preparation for FDsys, there were specifications put out for TIFF images. The TIFF images would then be ingested into FDsys and access derivatives produced. The TIFF images would be part of a preservation master to be used only in case of absolute need corruption, need to

re-derive those materials for other reasons.

KEN WIGGIN: Thank you. That is helpful, but it almost makes this discussion mute.

TIM BYRNE: I did read the proposal, actually. I was looking at it in comparison to the proposal submitted by OSTI and NTIS. And both OSTI and NTIS were looking for an organization to come in and digitize their entire collections and sort of that's the way that they're written up; whereas, GPO's was a little bit different in that it looked like it was entertaining proposals that would be for digitization of parts of the collection. So had they gotten one for the whole collection, they would have loved that, but they also were looking at things that might have been just parts of the collection.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. The other thing we've got to remember is the community. GPO does not have its own collection, unlike other institutions. Therefore, if one were to play out this scenario, where do you think GPO is going to get its collections; a regional, a selective or some other institution that's already part of the program, if you will, who is willing to work with GPO.

Now, that is one possible scenario, and I think that scenario begins to address the questions that are expressed in this slide. Once that happens, I imagine a lot of these steps

are going to become much more clear; and, especially, with FDsys being on the ground now as a rubric, if you will, of how to organize this kind of digitization work. And I think it begins to address more steps and more concrete steps that GPO can take beyond just being an organizer, a partnership, or a suggestion of partnerships, they can actually begin to have a concrete role to formalize the digitization process.

So the third point is absolutely right, but it uses the wrong words. It is a priority of GPO working with the Federal Depository Libraries. It's not a zero sum game. The two of them have to work together for this to succeed. I think it's that simple.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, from NCO. I wanted to follow up with that, John. Could we get a sense from GPO's staff to clarify this discussion, is the business of issuing this RFP part of a larger strategy? Is the intention of GPO to contract, ultimately, for the digitization of -- significant fraction of the legacy collection? Is this a strategic decision that GPO has taken, or is this a pilot that GPO is undertaking? Can we get a sense of the strategic decision behind this?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. This is the implementation of a Strategic Plan issued in December of 2004, and I think, Ken, you brought up the maybe -- I think it was you that brought up that all material

was going to be digitized by December of 2007.

It is part of that strategy to ensure that there is a digital content management system to preserve the materials for long-term, permanent public access, and that's been rolled out as part of the Federal Digital System. And materials to include in that Federal Digital System, then, would be not just born digital documents coming through now, but the retrospective or legacy collection as those materials are digitized, going back to the earliest days of the republic.

The priorities, paper put forward, was to move back systematically through those materials that we have on GPO Access, and then other at-risk materials as identified.

CHRIS GREER: And a follow-up with that. So my interpretation of that answer, Robin, is yes, this is part of a broader strategic decision in keeping with an earlier plan for GPO to directly contract for the digitization of the legacy -- the entire legacy collection, so. And presumably that Strategic Plan was developed in an earlier -- in fact, was developed at an earlier time.

We've heard from the directors and others here in the audience that the depository libraries are, currently, undertaking significant amounts of digitization on their own. And so I guess the question is, in my mind, is it good use of public funds to duplicate that capacity, which is otherwise accessible to GPO?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO. Part of our effort has been the digitization registry, the registry of digital projects. And one of the things that we've heard from various folks on the Hill is "Don't duplicate what's already been done." Here's the quandary. What is a preservation master and if the materials are already available, does that move them to a different level on the digitization priority schedule? We do have partnerships already in place for digitization projects, and most of those are for PDFs or other formats that don't meet the TIFF requirements.

We do continue to work with the interagency group of digital specifications, best practices and recommendations. And we are one of about 16 or 17 folks at different agencies working on that. We believe that working together, Federal projects can move forward, but it takes the cooperative effort. As John said, "We don't have that collection."

One of the -- I don't want to say a threat. It wasn't a threat. But one of our most effective ways, of talking to some libraries of leaving the program, was to say, Okay. We'll bring that 18-wheeler, pull it up, and you guys go ahead and load it in, because there's my collection to digitize.

But, really, it's a cooperative agreement. Libraries are doing some of this already. We don't want to duplicate when we believe that it's a validated or

preservation master. Materials going into FDsys, at some point there's materials that won't be able to go to FDsys and we want to establish partnerships for those materials to ensure permanent public access.

So it's not an either-or situation. I believe it's both. There will be materials to digitize, and some of these materials are going to be relatively easy to do, that is, the new materials. The older materials that are brittle, mimeographed or even just faded -- paper is not bad, but the print has faded -- those are going to take other ways to digitize them than a high output format that is often used at this point.

CHRIS GREER: And one last question: Is GPO willing to act as coordinator for libraries that are willing to meet your preservation standards, to act as a coordinator for helping to organize a collaborative effort, in which libraries undertake some digitization, according to the standards that you're willing to accept yourself, and act as that coordinator?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Absolutely, we believe that is an important process that it will maximize the use of the resources. At no cost to Government means that the digitization is done at no charge, but as everyone who has worked on a digitization project knows, there's the front-end processing, and there's the

back-end processing. At no point is it really ever a no cost
to Government. I've got to get the materials from the library
to GPO, to bar code, to get to the vendor. I mean, this is
one scenario. It's not an established process. Ken, I can't
tell you that process right now. As soon as I can, believe
me, I will. I'll be glad to share it, but for those libraries
that are already digitizing, have the materials in their
collection, that's that much less dollars I have to spend to
get the materials in to digitize, and we want to establish
those partnerships. That's essential to make sure that it has
the permanent public access.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. Robin, is there any sense from you as to how many
universities or institutes are willing to step up and do the
digitization? I mean, I know there are a handful out there
that have already done some. University of North Texas, of
course, would love to work with other libraries to try and do
it, but we can't do everything ourselves. And I'm just -- I
heard a lot yesterday about "Let's digitize," but I didn't
hear a lot about "We're willing to spend the money to do
that," because it is a very expensive process.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO. As far as a
list of folks, I don't have that. I would be very interested
in having that, but, as I said, we have been trying to promote
the registry to have folks put in what they are already doing

and working on. And also that registry doesn't just say
"We're working on war department materials." It says, "At
what level are you digitizing these materials?" And it has
some other questions associated with it.

  We think that that is a really strong way of
obtaining that information, and we continue to try and promote
that. And then our interagency group. As far as the
libraries that, you know, said, you know "We're doing it.
We're doing some," there's kind of an interesting mix, because
some of them are doing under the Google Project. Some are
doing under the Open Content Alliance, and some are doing
their own digitization effort, not associated with one of the
other big projects. So finding that mix is our challenge.

  SUZANNE SEARS: So following up on that, Suzanne
Sears, University of North Texas. Would it be helpful for GPO
then if the FDLP community could be -- I hate to use the word
"survey," since was so poorly looked upon yesterday --
but could be asked to send you, yes, we would be willing to
partner with you on such a project.

  I mean, I'm just curious, by a show of hands are
there people here in the audience that you feel that their
university would be willing to work with GPO on digitization
projects? Or is that something you'd have to go back and ask
your dean? I mean, I know that -- I can say UNT, absolutely,
I know, and Gwen. So maybe if we could get a list together,

if that would be helpful, maybe that's something that we could
do for you?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. That
would be great, absolutely wonderful, and as I look at Ted
Priebe, I know his partnership person would do a little
"woo-hoo" to hear about this.

TIM BYRNE: I think we still have one dean here who
actually did give sort of an indication along these lines
earlier. I know you were standing. Do you want to say
anything?

SARAH MICHALAK: I still don't understand what it
means that this contractor would do this work at no cost to
the Government. Somebody's got to pay. So if -- does that
mean that GPO won't have to pay for the work?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO.
Sarah, that's correct. The GPO would not be paying the
per-page charge for the actual digitization.

SARAH MICHALAK: But who would pay?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: The contractor is allowed to
take those files and do "value added" to them. They cannot,
however, limit, put a proprietary stamp on it, and say "Nobody
else can get to it." So the other charges associated with --
as everybody knows, digitization itself is 20 percent-80
percent, as all the other pieces of the digitization puzzle.
And those are pieces that are going to have be paid for by

GPO. We did ask for funding to do that, and we were zeroed.

SARAH MICHALAK: So I didn't identify myself before.
Sarah Michalak, UNC, Chapel Hill. So one other question about
it. Will you be satisfied that the contractor won't be doing
the digitization and then charging, putting in some kind of
package of digitized documents and then charging for it?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. The
RFP reflects the ability of the party to do additional things
with this material. What GPO will be receiving are the
digital masters, and those we fully intend to make available
through the Federal Digital System to ensure long-term
permanent public access and so that the public can gain access
at no charge.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of
Kentucky. As you heard yesterday, we're also working on the
WPA, and Marie and I are going to talk. But one of our
concerns with our project and digitizing these materials is,
if there are really so few copies out there, do I dare really
let our digital unit tear them apart to create the digital
image? And it occurred to me that if we knew -- I know you
say GPO doesn't have a collection, but, actually, they do have
a collection. It's over at NARA.

And I just wondered if we know what the extent of
that collection is? What SuDoc ranges are covered? So if I
knew NARA had the FWs, I might not worry so much about my copy

being destroyed, or Marie's being destroyed, in order to create that digital copy. Do we -- it would be wonderful to know what's really at NARA.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Sandy, as you know, archives is able to keep the materials they consider essential, and do what they want with the rest. We believe that the material sent over to NARA's evidence of GPO's cataloging effort are there, and someone could get to them who are their NARA mission. Can GPO get to those? That's not clear yet.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I wasn't really insinuating that you would be able to get to them. I was really talking about it for the community. If we're going to be digitizing, I'd feel better about tearing my collection apart, if I knew that NARA had those WPA items. Does it go back that far, the collection, do we know?

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne, DOE. If my recollection, because this just happened just before I became a documents librarian, I thought that the shipment of the depository boxes to NARA started in late '70s.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Tim, I don't know that.

TIM BYRNE: I knew I'd get her up.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Maybe Bernadine does.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski, Montana, formerly with JCP. Everything that was ever collected at GPO, in the old documents catalog and all, that all went to NARA. So everything from the very beginning went. Now, I can't promise you that every single publication that ever went through GPO was in that, but every one that they had, and then they updated that each year, and then they sent the shelflist over there, also, which NARA destroyed, so that's part of the problem, the rich shelflist.

I don't know what the lawyers think, but I would think that GPO could borrow back their own collection. I would also think that GPO should be monitoring and JCP the intactness of that collection, because part of that original agreement was that that collection would remain intact and it would be the backup collection for the whole program.

And if that's not happening, then I think GPO, JCP and the library community should raise hell about it. Now, I don't know, because it's not my job, anymore, to monitor. I used to go over there twice a year to look at the collection and talk to them about what they were doing with it. And there were some wonderful people over there taking care of it.

So I'm assuming that the majority of it is still there, but I also think you could negotiate with them -- I mean, after all, GPO let Readex rip the things apart, on behalf of the Library of Congress, the Readex things. So a

lot of those things are already with no spines on them, and the new machinery doesn't really necessarily ruin the books.

Also, the Library of Congress, on some things, gets 25 copies of everything that goes through the system. And the Senate and House libraries get two to four copies of a lot of stuff. So there are institutions within D.C. that could help GPO out to digitize. What I see as the problem is there is no money. And if GPO has to go out hands and knees, begging some -- whoever, God knows who -- to come in and spend the money on it, that's not a solution. The solution is for us to go to Congress and say "Pony up the money, and let us do this one-time thing for the sake of the public, because we're running out of time in order to do it."

KEN WIGGIN: I agree with Bernadine. We need the money. Does anybody have any idea -- has GPO ever figured out an approximate cost?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Ken, cost for what?

KEN WIGGIN: Cost to digitize, not including the metadata creation of all of it, but just -- do you have a rough idea of how many pages are involved? I mean, when you went out for this proposal, did you have some sense of the scope of the collection, in terms of pages to be digitized or quantity? I mean, it would be great -- I agree. We should go find money, but I would have no idea what we're asking

Congress for at this point. I have no clue how much we're
talking.

　　　　ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. We
had some estimates of sizes, for 2.2 million documents. And
I'm sorry. The total page number escapes me right now. I'm
pretty nervous, but the actual cost, no, because there's so
much of it. There's the per page, there's the per record,
there's the storage. We did do a pilot project with some
materials, and I'm trying to remember.

　　　　Cindy, did we post that response? We will get you
the information on that.

　　　　KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin. Robin, thank you. I mean,
just having some rough idea of how many pages. I didn't mean
you had to put it all in dollars and cents yet, but just some
scope would be very helpful in trying to figure out a cost.

　　　　ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Yeah.

　　　　JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
would just like to register my concern about that last point
on the slide, about "probably best being left to the private
sector to do digitization." There have been issues, there
have been RFPs where private corporations have gotten those
digitization projects. For example, the GAO and Thompson
West, and Thompson West's deal is, let's just say, it's not
good for public access. And it's digitizing public domain
content, and then locking it up in a proprietary access

system.

So I would hope that any RFP that goes forward from
GPO would take that concern to heart and would ask nonprofit
organizations, libraries, other organizations, to do the
digitization.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas, just a point of clarification. These points that are
underneath these broad categories are just paraphrased direct
comments from the community. They're not DLC opinion. I just
want to --

REBECCA HYDE: Rebecca Hyde, University of
California, San Diego. I have a comment that's sort of about
the first bullet point, that I think is probably obvious to
everyone in the room. And there's been little mentions of it,
but I just want to flat out say it; that just cutting apart,
feeding the documents through a scanner, and just digitizing
it, is relatively cheap and easy, but practically useless
without the metadata, the ability to search it, the
preservation side of it.

It seems like that -- all of that is just as
important, and in looking at something like the documents that
have been digitized by Google Books, even if they were to give
access to those public domain documents, which they usually
don't, just looking -- just trying to search for something
that's maybe a serial, like an annual report, it's really

difficult to find a particular year, because they're not
gathered together in any way. They're just kind of put in as
they're digitized. All these separate things.

And even if those were all full of text in there,
it's really not the most useful way to do it. If it's going
to be done, it should be done in the best way possible, even
if that takes a bit longer.

TIM BYRNE: I think we're ready do go to the next
issue. Distribution of Digital Files:

You can also see some of the comments that were made
about digital deposit, distributed preservation and access
strategies.

Born digital Government publications are more
at-risk items. Find ways to capture, preserve, and provide
access.

Print-on-demand services for depository libraries to
get a good quality copy, printed copy, of born digital
publications.

Keep track of publications that are produced both
electronic and tangible. Continue to develop reliable,
searchable, archiving of these. Be sure to continue to try to
acquire fugitive documents.

Council have any comments?

I should point out that a couple years ago Ric Davis
actually asked Council to give him some priorities for a

variety of tasks GPO was taking on and had been trying to work on it. At that time Council said that they really felt that going after the born digital Government publications should be a higher priority than the digitization of the legacy collection.

PEGGY JOBE: Tim, I just feel that I need to comment on that last thing. This is Peggy Jobe, UC, Boulder. I think that maybe three or four years ago that priority that they should concentrate on the born digitals, as opposed to the legacy collection, made some sense, but I mean as I work with undergraduates and graduate students and even faculty members, the preference for digital material is so engrained now, after just a few short years, that if we don't have a digitized legacy collection, then I think we are truly in danger of forgetting about our history, because very few scholars are willing to work with the paper.

I'm not proposing we get rid of the paper. You know, I'd like to keep the paper, but I would also like to see a robust digital collection so that people do use it, because you know, I've seen people -- if you can't give it to them digitally, they don't want it. They don't care how important it is for their thesis. It just doesn't matter.

TIM BYRNE: I think the time that Council established those priorities, you know, was during a period of a number of years of flat budgets at GPO. Attempts to get

money for this had not been forthcoming from Congress, and the feeling was that I had to make a decision on the -- how GPO would use the budget it had. We certainly heard yesterday that there are a number of, certainly, library directors who were feeling there's a real need to get things digitized and digitized soon.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. To me, that third point, in many ways doesn't fit under the heading at the top "Distribution of Digital Files." Because if you're able to distribute a digital file, the presumption is that you have captured it already and that somebody is holding it somewhere.

And I think the urgency that was reflected by the prioritization two years ago, was an urgency of capturing, not distributing. And in my opinion if the choice came down to distributing or digitizing, which I think was Peggy's concern, I think, perhaps, the priority would be digitizing. If we had -- you know, to cut the baby in two, the priority might be digitization at this point, at least of some core materials, rather than distribution of digital files, even though I believe in distribution of digital files too. I mean, I believe in keeping the baby together and not cutting it in half, if at all possible. (Laughter.)

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I guess I would want the other half of the baby

(laughter) because, you know, I just -- I keep remembering in my mind the GovDoc-L message about the current industrial reports. You know, we no longer receive the tangible copy of that. It's born digital publication, and from, I believe, 2000 is when we stopped receiving tangible issues. And from then to now, those were PDF on the agency website and according to the GovDoc-L message, they're only allowing access to the last five years. So that means from 2000 to 2004 are now in their archive, which they charge $15 a PDF for. Those are gone.

If they had been captured, that would be great, but then, you know, lots of copies keep stuff safe. James Jacobs can tell you. You know, allowing -- it's not just capturing it. It's also if we had a digital file system in place, a distribution of digital files where once -- you know, GPO could have captured that into FDsys and sent it out to 12 or 15 libraries that were willing to hold those digital files, then we would have those archived PDFs that we could have access to.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, again. Suzanne, I think we're in agreement, but we just don't realize it yet. I go back again to distribution of files. I'm assuming that GPO would be the distributor of these files, either through the CGP or the FDsys, or whatever mechanism. So the publications that you're talking about, are

publications that were not captured by GPO, correct? So that is a high priority, a very, high priority to capture those things.

But what I'm talking about, when I talk about cutting the baby in two is a choice between distributing files that GPO already has on its servers, or digitizing the legacy collection, which I think is a much harder choice. And I'm not totally comfortable with what I'm saying. (Laughter.) But having heard what I heard yesterday, you know, when you consider the total help for the FDLP, maybe some hard choices do have to be made if -- I hope they don't have to, and I'm totally confusing myself.

DAN O'MANAHY: Dan O'Manahy, Brown University. I think maybe we need to cut the baby in three, because the distribution, as the both of you are seeming to agree, the distribution of known materials that we have some custody of, that's one thing. The digitization of known items that we have in tangible format is another, but there's the whole stuff out there that isn't being captured and that we're losing day in and day out.

And while the folks today -- with the history that we're not interested in today, is the history at least we know of. The history that we're losing today is the stuff we're not capturing. So that there's really three very difficult aspects of this.

Ideally, we would be doing all of them all the time, but there are three aspects of a difficult choice, rather than just two.

TIM BYRNE: So baby makes three?

DAN O'MANAHY: Beg pardon?

TIM BYRNE: Baby makes three?

DAN O'MANAHY: Baby makes three.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. That second bullet, maybe somebody could help me with contacts for this comment. "Distributed preservation and access strategies. The -- GPO is putting up their failover for continuity of operations." Is that what's meant -- what was meant in this comment, or is this, you know, community preservation and access strategies? Does anyone have a sense of what direction the comment was going?

JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I believe that may have been my comment.

TIM BYRNE: I believe it was.

JAMES JACOBS: What I was trying to get at, if it was indeed my comment, was the distributed preservation and access strategies are thinking along the lines of not one central database of all content of all documents. I'm amazed at what FDsys has been doing so far, but I would like to build in a collaborative preservation and access strategy. That includes things like peer to peer, things that are already

happening, BitTorrent. These are already technologies that
are being used to share files. I won't get into the
legalities of all of that, but there are technologies and
standards already being used in the public to access and
distribute content. And we should be exploring those.

CHRIS GREER: Quick follow-up.

JAMES JACOBS: Yeah.

CHRIS GREER: And can you imagine, for example,
libraries providing some of that preservation and access
capability to a peer-to-peer file network or something like
that?

JAMES JACOBS: I would love if that happened. You
know, a library wouldn't necessarily need to collect all
digital files, because if you had 50 regionals, perhaps -- not
that that's a perfect number or anything. But if you had 50
regionals, and they all had different parts of that, they
could, in a sense, all be seen as one preservation network, in
a peer-to-peer network.

LOCKSS is another concept that lots of people here
are familiar with, Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe. So these
preservation concepts, we can no longer think in terms of one
library, one preservation point, but we can think of it in
terms of networks of preservation points. Does that make
sense?

CHRIS GREER: Yeah. Chris Greer, NCO. So I'm a big

fan of cloud storage concepts.

JAMES JACOBS: Yeah.

CHRIS GREER: And you've talked about a variety of them.

JAMES JACOBS: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

CHRIS GREER: But a question for GPO, I suppose, is are there legal or policy issues in whether GPO preserves the digital content or GPO partners with nonGovernment sector entities for preservation? I don't know whether you discuss that with your General Council or with your policy office. Do you have a sense of whether there are policy issues there?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. As I said that we do have some partnerships already in place for digital files. Preservation level was a down-the-road piece of the Federal Digital System, and the discussion of pushing files out to libraries and access derivatives versus preservation level files. But it's -- we don't have that firmed up yet. Maybe -- I think Lisa LaPlant is sitting down there.

Lisa, do you want to jump in there?

LISA LaPLANT: Sure.

CHRIS GREER: And Chris Greer, NCO. While Lisa is standing up, the current design of FDsys is a centralized model. It doesn't seem to implement it and distribute it in a push mode for the most part. So it was clearly some design

considerations there.

LISA LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant from GPO. So
from -- I can answer it from a technology perspective, not
necessarily from the policy side. So one of the key aspects
of the system is that it's a packaged-based approach, and it
kind of gets back to some of our earlier discussions and
presentations on it, so. In the way that we're storing the
content, we're making sure that all the content -- all the
information that you need to describe the content, plus the
representation information to render it and make it useful, is
stored as a package. So that we will have the capability to
take that information and give it to another institution.

So the policy side of the question really comes in,
as we touched on earlier, with the what do we make available,
what formats, and then also on the -- back on the technology
side, going through a technology selection process and saying
what's the best way, from the technology side, to distribute
that out and to make it available.

And that's what one of the things where we hope to
really get into the Legislative Task Force and some of the
other initiatives that we're working on, to take a look at
some of those technology issues.

JUSTIN OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington
University. Quick follow-up, just to make sure I understand.
As FDsys is designed now, there's the live version that people

can access, and you've also got your offsite backup copy,
which is basically identical to what people can access, in
terms of what information is being saved and stuff, right?

Now, after that, is there any technology limitations
to having an arrangement to where there's your live site,
there's your backup site, and then there's also a distributed
copy floating around out there, or stored -- shared between
regional libraries or other libraries who are willing to give
up some, you know, server space or just, you know, have the
hard drive space available to hold part of it. Please.

LISA LaPLANT: Lisa LaPlant, GPO. From the
technology standpoint, it's -- I really see it as more of an
issue with transferring and how you're going to get the
information that you have in one place and make it available
in the other places and how you keep those synchronized. You
know, what files do you synchronize, how often? How do you
check it? What technology is behind that?

So from the conceptual and the model standpoint,
that was taken into account when we built the system, but the
actual putting it into place and putting that digital
distribution system, or something similar, in place is not
something that we've built as of today's date.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Katrina Stierholz from the
St. Louis Fed. Robin, can you -- I wasn't clear. Was the
short answer, yes, it's okay, as a matter of policy, for

digital distribution?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Sure.
Now, let me qualify that, as any good Government employee
would. (Laughter.) The plans are to -- to share the
preservation files with partners to ensure redundancy. Those
are the plans. The processes are not yet in place to do that,
but the original requirements have that capability built in,
knowing that some times things go wrong.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Thank you.

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. So we did this
exercise a minute ago, with respect to digitization, but I
wonder if -- a quick show of hands, those of you who think
your institutions would be interested in discussing the
potential of being a preservation partner with GPO. (Audience
members raise hands.) A significant number of hands there,
too. Good. Thank you.

TIM BYRNE: Fifteen hands? That's impressive.

CHRIS GREER: Yeah.

TIM BYRNE: Why don't we move on to the next issue:
Transparency of Government information through social
software.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago. I think this simple statement opens up another front
that we really haven't discussed as a community, and that's
the intersection of e-Gov, with what we do as librarians. And

the fact that the services that were once one or two removed by our publications, are now full-fledged engaged in the electronic services that Governments deliver. So the expectation is that public libraries, academic libraries, other libraries, that have a relationship with the Government, such as a depository library, patent library, whatever, now become service points for those Government institutions, beyond just simply giving information.

And we've seen this happen over the last several years. After hurricanes, after fires, after disasters, people -- or even economic disasters, like we're having now, where we heard that people are coming in to use the computers, that in previous generations they may have gone to Government offices to access those services.

And I think the burden it puts on us as librarians is that we are now asked to serve beyond just, where is the information, how can I get it, to help me fill out my tax forms. It's not that they haven't asked that before, but now there is a another level of -- because there is no other Government agent there for them to engage, the librarians, in a sense, become de facto Government agents, for the agencies using e-Government services. Whoa.

TIM BYRNE: Let's try another one then. I'll give this one to John, too.

JOHN SHULER: Double whoa. I think with this one,

if there is we could talk about our collections until the cows come home, and probably not really achieve a solution very quickly, that would satisfy all our institutions. But there is one thing I hope we can all agree on, we are a community of experts. And that we do now have the electronic tools to share that expertise in an effective way.

And as some kind people have said earlier there are models, there are techniques that are in play that are moving beyond the test-bed phase and have been incorporated within the depository library program and show great promise in sharing our expertise across geography and institutions. And I think, might open the door on some interesting aspects of managing electronic collections as well.

Because if all we do is talk about moving the physical items to another great place, sharing the possession of digital objects in a great place, it still presumes no relationship with our public services. That conversation hasn't happened yet, and what I said about acquisitions about two hours ago, we can have the same conversation about public services.

What do you do with the documents librarian once the collection is gone? Once the acquisition process is gone, where does his or her expertise reside within the library organization? Some say reference desk. Eh, I don't know. I've seen it done both ways. I've had it many ways done to me

over the last nine years. I can't say yet I've found a happy relationship, so. I know. I know. It's just me. Okay? I'm going to shut up.

PAT RAGAINS: Pat Ragains, University of Nevada, Reno. And I think I'd like to comment a bit about the previous point about the social networking software, first. I think it's something that has a lot of potential, just as an online national reference service has a lot of potential, but is beginning to be realized. One thing that I think is important to recognize about social software is that it's largely supporting what I would call informal communication at this point.

And, yes, we can repurpose it to some extent, and I think we probably will see that over the coming years, as people, who essentially are native to Facebook and MySpace, things like that, begin to enter the work force in greater numbers. I know we've heard that Facebook has been taken over by 50-somethings and older, but in terms of its actual diffusion through -- throughout society and being used in business, I sort of expect to see, if that happens at all, that that will happen in the next perhaps 15 to 30 years. And it will be recognized as just as useful in its own way as the telephone, e-mail, etc.

But those are mediums essentially for more informal communications, as opposed to formalized channels of

communication, that still require things like written documents and signatures, and things like that. Although, we are making progress towards using digital signatures in society as well.

So those things are going to change over time. To what degree they will be merged with social software, I don't know, but I think to bring this home to be relevant in our context, I think social software can be useful for public service, but realize it's ephemeral at this point. Because something is posted on a Facebook site or MySpace site is no -- or a blog, is no guarantee that it's going to be there tomorrow.

Things that -- questions that are answered in a national reference service, they get stored in a knowledge base that's accessible. They have more permanence, and those are the extent of my reflections about those two points.

I think I've tried to figure out in my mind where we are with these tools. How can we exploit them? How are they being used at this point? What's their significance? And how is that likely to change in the future? So I think not only in the library world, but throughout society, we need to think that way as well, in terms of seeing a greater diffusion of social software and its use throughout society, not just for social relationships. But that's going to take some time, I think.

TIM BYRNE: I would just point out that thanks to
Cindy Etkin's status updates on Facebook, I knew about the GPO
videos before coming to this conference and actually had seen
them.

JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
think this is a national service, a national reference service
is an awesome idea. I think GIO is doing a great service
already. I've talked with John about that before.

I'd just like to reiterate a point that I've made on
lots of other occasions that services needs collections, and
whether that's physical or digital collections, but they do
need each other. Because if you have a reference service, but
you don't have a collection, then you don't have the skills
and the expertise to answer those questions.

And so if we have services without collections, we
end up being like travel agents, and the travel agent concept
is, you know, when they were the only ones who had access to
computers to buy and sell tickets, they were the ones people
went through. As soon as it went online, and they went on
web, travel agents disappeared. If we don't have our own
access -- if we don't have control over our own collections,
then we won't have the service to do that any more.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State
Library. James, I find that a very interesting comment. Our
library is participating in Government information online, and

I find that for probably at least 80 percent of the questions I deal with, I'm able to come up with what I think is a reasonably good answer, just by using remotely accessed online resources that are available on the web.

I do agree with you that collections are important for the other 20 percent, of course, but I don't think that it's essential to have a collection for every question, at least in the current environment.

JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford. Very true. It's not -- you don't have to answer every single question with your own local collection, but it is important to -- that we continue to have those two concepts bound together.

JOHN SHULER: To give you -- John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. To give you one recent example of this effective Google on printed word, I was working with a Sister from the Dominican University about a memorial service I'm planning. And I ask her for a particular piece of scripture that reflected the qualities of this particular person. I totally expected her to jump up, move to her bookshelf, pull off the missals. She turned in her seat, and she Googled and came up with the scriptures. So I think that to me was a Divine intervention. I don't know.

It just sort of reminded me, again, of what -- it just reminded me, again, that the concepts and the stereotypes that we hold in our own heads are at play and endangering all

the other ancient institutions of our society, and that Google is pretty much becoming the, THE de facto first step.

And I've accepted that as reality, and I'm trying to deal with it, accordingly, but it strikes me that we can take advantage of that, as engaged deliberative professionals, and we could use this software, both the Question Point Software that GIO uses and social software, to organize what I think is the heart of our reference service, which is an expert deliberative discussion with our customers, our clients, our communities. And everything that I see about the software, indicate it can only make us better experts, not diffuse our expertise.

TIM BYRNE: I think we're actually leading into the next one, too.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: Tim before you get -- excuse me. Before you get rid of that slide, could you back it up? David Cismowski, again. Right now, the National Online Reference Service is probably a good way to describe this, but if we're thinking strategically, I would like to suggest phrasing that first bullet point to reference service without boundaries or nongeographically-based reference service.

JOHN SHULER: In my wildest -- excuse me. John Shuler, University of Illinois. In my Grateful Dead Moments, that's exactly what I imagined, that kind of world, but, hey, that was a Grateful Dead moment.

41

CHRIS GREER: Chris Greer, NCO. David, I agree. This bullet beneath -- the comment beneath it is not a prediction. It's a description of a current landscape. And James's point is well taken. To what degree will expert software systems replace some of the capabilities analogous to what happened to travel agents? So what will -- what capabilities will the library systems bring to the table?

And that's the key to the models for the new FDLP that we're talking about. What is that value-added capability we're trying to achieve?

JOHN SHULER: And just one more footnote -- john Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago -- since I seem to be tripping on a number of things. That last book that Marshall McLuhan never wrote -- nice conundrum, right? -- is called Library Without Walls. And I think he anticipated in much of his writings the very puzzle that we are faced with here, with a distributed mechanism that is both the message and the medium. And I think that's, as a profession, what we are wrestling with right at the moment.

TIM BYRNE: Cindy?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just have a question, John, and I probably should know the answer to this. With all the questions that GIO is answering, are you all creating a knowledge base?

JOHN SHULER: Hmm, yes.

CINDY ETKIN: Somewhat hesitant. Okay. And is Google allowed to search that knowledge base?

JOHN SHULER: No.

CINDY ETKIN: Okay. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: Are you going to finish? You going to follow up? There's one more question -- future, future.

CINDY ETKIN: Are they going to?

JOHN SHULER: Yes. Thank you.

CINDY ETKIN: I was going to say, because our knowledge base does.

JOHN SHULER: Because James and I talk sometimes and often, and he's indicated to me that these tools exist, that in my own limitation, I wasn't aware of. And I think we could liberate nearly the 10,000 questions and turn them over to the blog -- the Cloud world, OCLC willing, of course.

TIM BYRNE: I think this is yours, too.

JOHN SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. To think about our reference life before the digital world, it was primarily tacit and individual. The only two people who knew how badly a -- when there were two people in a reference interview, or perhaps only one of them knew how badly it was going, right? My favorite joke.

In a digital world, what we have is now 10,000 questions and the good, bad, indifferent answers that those questions got. So for the first time in a hundred years,

since librarians invented the idea of reference, we now have
the ability to go back and find out how badly we did. In
other words, we get to do what catalogers have been suffering
under for at least 50 years. (Laughter.) People get to go
back and look at our work and comment on it, and I'm not too
sure the reference culture is quite ready for that
cooperation.

So to put it on a positive spin, we have an
opportunity in both in terms of training, best practices, to
dig into this database, this knowledge base, and improve upon
subsequent generations of reference librarians in a very
deliberative and organized way. That's a good story.

KEN WIGGIN: I'm not exactly sure what this comment
is, but in one way you can interpret it to say that a lot of
libraries that previously couldn't provide good public service
in the area of Government information now can, because there's
so much available, digitally, it's helping them get trained
and learn to use these online resources more effectively. But
I think in some ways public service can be enhanced in
libraries that previously couldn't do it.

KATHY LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco. I mean,
we had good, bad, and ugly reference questions in person, that
we couldn't always track, but to me the GIO and Question Point
and texting -- a lot of us are doing texting now and e-mail.
All of those are different forms of people getting their

questions answered, and that's what we really have to really look at, is how people -- the different kinds we have. There's a lot of language issues that people aren't comfortable coming up to a desk, but they would text something or they would, you know, ask anonymously.

JOHN SHULER: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

KATHY LAWHUN: That's why I think these digital formats of all kinds are things that -- it's not just Government --

JOHN SHULER: Yeah.

KATHY LAWHUN: -- but it's the whole reference world, but the Government -- because we have so many experts, it's really great that we started the GIO, because there's been some really specific questions, even from people who wouldn't even step into a public library, have asked in the same -- you know, like they live a block away, but they'll ask it digitally of some sort, and they get the actual, still-good answer. So I think, you know, we have to expand how all of us experts are getting the information out.

JOHN SHULER: I think it allows us to -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. It allows us to share our expertise in a very sustainable way. Instead of having conversations, instead of writing articles, we actually preserve the conversation in a way that's never been possible before, across the mediums.

TIM BYRNE: Of course, the quality of reference service in a digital world was -- or what we tried to deal with, in the Government Information 21st Century Grant that trained depository libraries to train nondepository librarians to use Government information online. And I think that it was very successful in reaching out and getting those primarily public librarians, who probably did not use a lot of Government information. But it also made even greater experts out of the depository librarians that we worked with.

All right. New models of cataloging metadata acquisition. How do people feel about getting less than perfect cataloging records? Harvested records with some enrichments, but not full cataloging, not the full cataloging we get now?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I've been a cataloger for many, many years, and I still do dabble in it every once in a while. And at one point I had this purest attitude, and I no longer have that. And I think what really finally dispelled that attitude was the results of the EPA crawl that GPO did, when it proved to me, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that it is impossible to fully catalog to marked standards, documents that are captured from the web during crawls. Some other way has to be done -- has to be found to provide metadata for those captured documents. Once you tease them out and find out which ones are in scope

and which ones are memos, even the subset cannot be fully cataloged.

And so I don't think we have a choice, really, realistically. It's either a matter of having imperfect metadata and the documents, or just not capturing the documents and throwing up our hands and saying, "Well, since we can't do it perfectly, we're not going to do it at all."

REBECCA HYDE: Rebecca Hyde, University of California, San Diego. I'd say one thing that would be very important would be that it would be an OCLC. There's a lot of campuses that are going to WorldCat Local, and I know we're going to it. University of California Shared Catalog is going to become WorldCat Local, and there's a lot of clean up that we're having to do in our local catalog, so that everything that we have is apparent in that shared catalog.

So, personally, I'm not a cataloger. And I don't care very much about perfect cataloging records, but that would be important to me. Would be that it was obvious that we have it, that it could talk to that system.

BETH ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. We have a mantra now at our institution: Good Enough. And part of that is public service driven, obviously, but part of it is catalogers like David, who were purest at heart, but in their own searching, for their own personal reasons, are finding that they would discover what any of us

who moved to MARCIVE did, that once you put it into the catalog, once you make it accessible in some form, some fashion, the use goes up, and the use is what's important.

The only thing to be aware -- perhaps this follows with the previous speaker, is there are some good enough, that are much better than other good enough. (Laughter.)

As we seek the -- you know, as we purchase a lot of the commercial products, and we get the marked records from them, some of them have been in an abysmal shape, for one reason or another. And it has taken so much time of our catalogers to put it in that good enough shape, that it really wasn't worth getting these free records, or not, has been a question.

I had a -- our systems -- one of our authority control librarians, who is a goddess in my opinion, she almost broke down in tears when I said, "It's okay not to do some quality control work on these records, but to do it this way, because it meant so much less work for her. So that would be the only caveat to the "good enough" mantra.

TIM BYRNE: Communication between depository library directors and depository library coordinators. It's pretty bad. I really saw this as a regional depository librarian, in actually talking with both groups. There really wasn't a lot of communication between them, and I think we certainly have been trying to reach out more to depository library directors.

Certainly, inviting them to this meeting was one way, but what can we do to get our depository librarians to be more assertive about communicating with their directors?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, again, California State Library. It's very difficult in -- I've talked to scores and scores of depository librarians and talked to them about this very issue. It's very difficult to communicate directly with your director and to promote what you're doing and what the program is all about, in a direct way.

What I advised them to do is do it indirectly. Do it in a way that doesn't come across as blatant advocacy. Share statistics. Do something like, if you continue to select tangible documents, total up the value of those documents by going to GPO Sales and just give reports to your director of a positive nature. And try as much as possible to integrate your depository activities into the general mission of your institution, because if you don't do that, then you're not going to -- you're going to wither on the vine, because you'll stand out from your mission. And so use subtle ways of communicating, instead of just charging in and saying, "I think this program is important, and this is why."

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I really feel that this is one of the things that we lost, when we lost the inspections. When the GPO inspector

came to the library, even if it was just once every six years,
it was a chance for the depository coordinator to sit
down -- it was one of the positive things about the inspector
coming. You know, you were worried to death; oh, my gosh,
they're coming. But one of the positive things were, was
that, you know, it was a chance to highlight your collection
and to show your director what you're doing right. And the
GPO inspectors were always really good about, you know, going
to the director and talking to them -- at least the ones that
came to the library I worked at -- talking to the director
about the importance of the program and keeping that
communication line open, even if it was just once every six
years.

NAN MYERS: Nan Myers, Wichita State University.
One of the interesting things I did in my career, was to get
out of librarianship when I was fairly young and spend 12
years in sales and marketing. And I have to tell you that
that enhanced, greatly, my relationships with administration,
whether it's in the library or on campus.

And what I would really like to see, and no one has
mentioned, is that in library schools or library training or
from bodies of training, such as the GPO, we're never given
strategies for sales or marketing, or that kind of training.

I have always regarded my library as a business.
Now, it's not that I don't enjoy being an academic, because I

felt that I was born to be an academic and ate up grad school, and things like that, but the fact is, if you regarded this as a business, you can begin to accept the fact that you need to be assertive. Subtlety is also good. I appreciate that comment, but I want to tell you something that I tell myself all the time, and it's something I learned when I was being trained by the national organization that had me as a regional sales manager.

One of those things was that -- well, it two things. First of all, most sales require ten or more touches before you get a positive response from a client, so you cannot fear going forward. Sure, it's discouraging, but you can't just say "They don't want me," or "Oh, he closed the door, and when can I get back in to visit with him," that type of thing. So you have to have a certain amount of nerve to be in a depository adventure.

The other thing is, just remind yourself that, no never means "no." It means "not right now." And then you can feel free to bring the topic up again and again and again. Thank you.

CASS HARTNETT: Hi. Cass Hartnett, University of Washington Libraries. I was thinking about the question of how to approach one's director or dean, and I thought, boy, I don't even talk to my dean often enough and my dean, you can talk to her about anything. She's wonderfully open and

receptive. I think part of what we come to loathe in the
interaction is just the history of the collection and the
decisions that have been made about the collection. I'm even
afraid that I might say the wrong thing.

So I would just -- I just had a flash as I went out
to lunch yesterday, with three deans from other institutions.
And I thought, oh, that's an interesting thought. Maybe at an
upcoming workshop of some kind -- and maybe not even by DLC.
It could be ARL or ALA or another group -- you could pair
deans with line librarians from other institutions and have
open dialogue that's not loaded about that particular
collection, or the year we threw out the hearings or, you
know, what we did, right or wrong. It would just be an
interesting thing to explore.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. So Cass, that's an ALA go-to program, Communicating
with Your Dean. But I just want to say, you know, we have to
remember that different deans have different personalities.
Different directors have different personalities, and some of
them have open-door policies and some of them have closed-door
policies. And so it's not -- just like the program, it's not
one size fits all.

Communicating with the deans is not going to be one
size fits all. We all have different personalities and
different ways we can approach things. And the key is to find

the best way, but to make sure there is some communication, because, you know, that is -- you can't, as Ann so eloquently put yesterday, you can't say, you know, that poor planning on your part is an emergency on mine.

I mean, all of a sudden, you know, you haven't been talking to your director or dean for years, and then all of a sudden they come to you and say, you know, "We're getting rid of this collection." Well, it's because they have no idea of what's going on with that collection.

GEORGE CARTER: George Carter, San Bernardino County Law Library and part of the library that's the Reigning Law Library, Depository Library of the Year. (Applause.) This just goes to show you how greater law libraries are than the rest of you peons, because, first of all, depository collection is just vital to what law libraries do, so we don't have to make the case. And our directors, and my director, personally, we both work on these programs together.

So I think the solution here is just to turn over everything to the law libraries. (Laughter.) I'm sure you can set that up with Mary Alice.

TIM BYRNE: We should all be law librarians. All right. Okay. I think we have really exhausted our time here.

ANDREA SEVETSON: I don't think so, Tim. (Laughter.)

TIM BYRNE: Can we shut off the mic? (Laughter.)

ANDREA SEVETSON: I wanted to share something about this. I'm Andrea Sevetson. I currently work with LexisNexis, so I used to be at Berkley. And when I was at Berkley, we went through five ULs in my time. I don't believe that any of that had to do with me, (laughter) but, I now -- I live in Oregon now. My boss is in New York. So how does he know what I do, right? Good or bad or indifferent. He only knows, because I tell them. He knows if I get a kudo because I send it to him, because, otherwise, he wouldn't know. He gets my monthly report, because occasionally he remembers to ask me for it, and occasionally, like on other months, I'll remember to send it to him.

And I think one of the biggest deals with depository libraries is, they hear about all the problems. Access is an issue, this is an issue, that's an issue. But if you don't share the kudos that you get, the -- Doreen's lovely letter that she got from a faculty member. They actually -- her policy class actually signed a whole card for her. Well, how many times do people send that forward and just sort of show people. Look, people are using this. People are appreciative of the service.

If they only hear about the problem, then you are a problem. And so you need to remember to tell them the good stuff, too, and not just tell them that. And you don't have to call them, you don't have to e-mail them, you can just

photocopy and send it in and say, "I thought you'd want to see this, because the collection is getting used. There's this great policy class, whatever it is, but tell them the good news, too. Don't just tell them the bad news.

TIM BYRNE: Okay. I want to thank everyone for their comments. And just encourage anyone who didn't get a chance to make a comment or thinks of something else that they'd like to, please, share it with us. I'm still getting e-mails from the post I made a couple weeks ago. (Applause.)

(Conclusion of session at 5:30 p.m.)

Transcribed by:
Sherry A. Belliveau
Liberty Court Reporting
112 N. Pine Avenue
Inverness, Florida 34450

COUNCIL SESSION: LIBRARY TECHNICAL

INFORMATION SERVICES UPDATE

Wednesday April 22, 2009, 8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m., Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: Good morning. Welcome to the last day of the conference. I do have some attendance figures I'd like to share. We had 40 first-time attendees, 46 Regionals, 102 Academic, 18 Law, 12 Special and other, 12 Public, 13 members of Council and 18 from GPO. So I will go ahead and turn it over to Ted.

TED PRIEBE: Good morning, everyone. I'm Ted Priebe, Director of Library Planning and Development, and my objective really today is just to go over some of the high-level things that we're doing in my division, talk a little bit about each of the three units within the division, and what our main mission is, in support of the FDLP Program.

So from a high level, I would really describe it along two lines. We are the primary project management unit with direct overall support for all the operational areas throughout LSCM. So when you think about project management, you know, it's more than just coordinating activities. It's doing some of those fun things, like creating Ghant Charts, getting the SOPs together.

When you look at the current case, and how to, you know, migrate to the future state with legacy applications, it's all those kind of things. And if any of you have ever

had experiences in project management, trying to come forward with a plan and then keeping everybody to that plan, and trying to identify the primary missions and avoid the scope creep, it's really a unique juggling act. And, although, I've never been able to juggle four balls, I've learned how to do three well, and it's kind of a fun activity.

So the other primary thing, beyond the planning role, that we do is our web contact unit. And Karen Sieger had a couple sessions yesterday. I'm not sure how many of you were able to attend those. But between the community site and the FDLP Desktop, which are two primary responsibilities she has, we also have, you know, the additional roles of GPO Access, Ben's Guide, which Ric spoke about. And our planning unit is doing some of the preliminary work, in regards to that survey, and how we might upgrade and improve that site, as well.

So I wanted to talk a little bit about who does what, and just starting off with the three main units within planning, we've got Library Services. And Janet Scheitle is the manager of that unit, and some times we lose context of how many people, or who does what. And in Janet's area we have a total of three staff and her, a total of four people in that unit.

Web Content, which is managed by Karen Sieger, who is here at the conference today, is a total six. And Lisa

Russell, who is in a session right now, an educational session

going over authentication, has a whopping three, and that

includes herself so from that high level, I just wanted to

drill down a little bit into each of the units. And since

it's the last day of the conference, you can feel free to get

up and come to that microphone whenever you want, because I

was just going to go from a high level on our projects, but if

you had any kind of questions, whatsoever, stop me at any

time. And I'd love to take a shot at answering for you.

So let me go into library services a bit. One of

the themes that I've heard from many of you, during the

conference and from Council, as well is, you know,

collaboration. I want to have opportunities to work with GPO,

and I have resources, and how do I do that?

Well, library services is the place to make all

those things happen. We have an absolutely fantastic person

in that unit, named Suzanne Ebanues, and I don't know how many

of you have met Suzanne, but very dedicated to GPO and this

program. And she's our partnerships lead. So off of the FDLP

Desktop, there's a whole section on partnerships. There's a

very simple form. If you have interest in whatever. It

doesn't matter if it's content you want to digitize, if it's a

unique service that you have, that you think can benefit the

overall community, we would love to engage with you on that.

So all I'm going to say about partnerships is, if you'd like

to step forward, that's the place to go to, and Suzanne
Ebanues and someone within that library services group will be
reaching out to you.

The next part I was going to touch on was the FDLP
Handbook, which was something that many of you and Council
were involved with from a few years ago, when that first
started. We are currently at a place where we're getting
ready to do some final updates from the Handbook and have that
integrated off the Desktop. So it's going to be a totally
dynamic document, and by dynamic, I mean, that it's going to
have the ability for you to much easier -- have a much easier
way to drill down into various sections of that document, a
more robust search capability. So when you need to find a
quick reference point and how to get to it, we're going to
have a much easier way for you to do that.

Policies and procedures, another key area that I'll
probably mention, again, in our content management group.
Again, when you think of project management, in order for you
to really start moving forward on any new initiative, you have
to be able to document what it is, and that's where the
procedures, and these as-is, and to-be processes will come
into play.

Special Projects, just to give you a couple
examples. Janet Scheitle, one of our -- the manager of that
unit has been doing some of the project planning with Laurie

Hall on the Omnibus Cataloging and Indexing Funding, as well
as working with Robin and some of her staff on education and
outreach. So we've really been able to, from the couple years
that -- since I started in library services, take this
planning unit, and instead of having it be a -- kind of a
floating unit that helps on special things, here and there,
we've really integrated the folks, both managers and stuff,
into our operational areas.

So we feel like we've really got some good synergy,
as we move forward on some of these projects, and we look
forward to hearing, of course, from Council on recommendations
on where they'd like to see us go. And we think we'll be
involved very much with our operational team on that.

So, maybe, the last couple adds, on this unit, they
formerly were involved with the adds-and-drops process, also,
in support of the biennial survey. So many of the functions
that you all are involved with, in terms of when you begin in
the program or when you're doing the surveys, this team is
also a part of that.

I just have a brief screen shot here of the Desktop
and the Handbook for those of you. I wanted to stop and just
take a moment, because it's an opportunity for me to hear
directly from any of you who use the Handbook, day in and day
out, or if you're not using it, if there's things we can do in
planning to make it easier for you to use that.

So any recommendations or suggestions at all, we've got the opportunity here to put forward. I would love to here them, and if nothing else, take the note and bring it back and follow up on offline as well.

I see a few people getting ready to jump up. Okay. Well, please, take that as an open offer, when the session is done. If you have been using it and there's a few things that you'd like to see different, I would love to hear about those.

Second area in planning is content management. Content management, which I mentioned with Lisa Russell in that authentication session right now, handles a lot of CRM increase from our Ask GPO. For those of you that have access on a regular basis to our GPO Access system and can't find something or maybe you found there's a link that needs to be updated or there's, potentially, in those rare instances where we have an error on GPO Access, these are the folks that you'll be talking to.

So for a group of three people, they really are our technical folks, in relation to how to find information, search, and access on the current system. They're also working hand in hand with our project management team on FDsys. So when the PMO, Lisa and Selene and Carrie were talking about those applications that are being migrated from GPO Access, in addition to looking at you and focus groups in the community, this content management group is who they go to

say, "Okay. What kind of interface do we need? What's the
functionality?" So they are really providing a lot of those
initial feedback loops to them on how that system gets out, so
very important.

Primary liaisons, as well, when it comes to
authentication, which is why, of course, Lisa is in that
session, right now, going over the different pieces that we
play. And when -- we mentioned about DDIS and the migration
of that, Lisa Russell is also one of the players working
operationally with Laurie Hall. So from a high level, those
are some of the pieces and the components of what content
management does, within our area. Any questions on those
folks? No? Okay.

Well, she's got a whole session on authentication,
so I didn't want to go into too much granular detail, but I
will just make a few comments. In terms of some of the
documents we have worked on and are in process of working on
and, certainly, the budget with all the visibility of the
current economic state, that is something that we'll be
posting, and it's projected that the 2010 budget will be
posted, I believe, some time next month. So we'll be working
on the authentication on that and coordinating with our
production folks.

Web content management is the third unit in
planning, and it is probably one of the busiest and most

challenging of all the areas within -- within planning and in
many ways, I feel like within library services, content
management, overall. When you think of that first bullet here
in the list of activities that we have, and in many cases you
think of a web unit, especially when you think about the
billions -- or the millions of hits that happen off of GPO
Access every day, you'd think that there may be 20 people that
are running all these legacy systems and updating pages and
Ben's Guide and the content on the Desktop.

So I think it's really a tribute to all of them when
six people are able to make this kind of thing happen. And
it's certainly not just the six of them. There's
collaboration with our content management team and others in
the area, but, you know, primarily is that as the name would
indicate, web content, they do the web design pages, they
integrate the applications. And anything that's technical or
a legacy system, basically, they're involved with it.

So when you're telling GPO, you know, I don't like
the functionality and this or that in the legacy system, we're
the ones that are going to be working with you, hopefully, on
defining those requirements. So when those surveys come out,
many times those originate off of our unit and/or get posted,
it's your requirements and feedback that really give us the
requirements on how we develop those systems. So thank you
for those of you that take the time when we do post those

surveys to give responses. I think that covers our friends on the Desktop.

Current activities, for those of you who were not at Karen's overview, I was just going to mention a couple brief things. From our original or old Desktop, we are continuing legacy migration, and any time those of you in the community that had content from that old site, that you're trying to find, and you're not sure where it is, you know, we've got the CRM system, but we also have that contacts page for Karen or myself. Please, feel free to send us a note.

If it's not readily accessible or findable, and it's something that's in a transition or migration, we want to hear from you, and we can get you that content very quickly. We're also working on making more dynamic access to that content in some of the search functionality. And one of the things I heard from a few folks is, you know, we'd like to see a more robust search and an easier way to access some of that material. So that feedback is critical to us, and we continue to work on the promotional items and that ability to make those orders as transparent and seamless as possible.

The community site, which is in its beta form -- you now, we develop this as a beta, really, based on a lot of feedback that we had heard from everyone last year, in terms of wanting to have a social networking environment that was just for depositories. So what we've now been able to do is

launch this, and we need to continue to hear the kind of feedback that we've heard at this conference, which was excellent, in terms of how we can make it easier for you to use, because our goal is to provide this for you, and for you to be able to communicate and have that open dialog and be able to post and interact among yourselves. I call it a closed loop, because it is set up strictly for those of you in the depository community.

So we encourage you to use that, and if there are suggestions or ways that we can improve it to make it more intuitive or friendly, we would love to hear from you on that as well.

The last bit I had was, really, the projects of special interests. And I kind of overviewed, in a high level, some of them related to integrating applications. When you think of WEBTech Notes, that's an application in collaboration with Library Technical Information Services. We'll be getting ready to release in the next few months, and that will be off the Desktop.

Other applications that we have, we want to hear from you on them. Needs and offers, different things that we currently have posted off of the Desktop or off legacy systems, if there's specific functionality that you need, or search capability that isn't there that's a value to you, you know, reach out to us and let us know.

So the content migration that I mentioned, that's something that by the end of this fiscal year, the end of September, our goal is to have any and all content, off of that legacy Desktop, migrated. And you might think that's kind of a snap the fingers and do it, but as technologies evolved, you wouldn't believe the thousands of HTML pages and some of the innovative ways that some of our designers had put content on there. So it's a continuing evolution.

And the last note I'll add is, with authentication, we are continuing with that, and the mutual goal is when FDsys has subsumed all of the content that's now on GPO Access, we want to have all that content authenticated. So we've got to start with a handful of applications. When we come back from conference, working with our team in the project management office, we want to reach out to those Federal agencies and continue and complete that process of content migration.

That was my last slide. While I'm up, any quick questions for me? Or, if not, I will turn in over to Robin and, perhaps, after she's done, if there's some questions at the end, we can also take them then, as well as offline. Okay. Well, with that, let me see if I can pull up her slide. Thanks so much. (Applause.) Oh, I'm sorry. Please, go ahead. Yes.

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: You said that the Handbook was going to become more dynamic. Is it possible to have an RSS

feed just on the Handbook?

TED PRIEBE: That's an excellent suggestion. Okay.

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Thank you.

TED PRIEBE: Let me take that. Thank you.

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Oh, I'm sorry. Carmen
Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas.

TED PRIEBE: Can I ask one follow up on to that for
the RSS feed? Are you looking for any time there's changes,
so that you can be notified?

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Yes.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. Like our change control, make it
an automated mechanism. Got it. Excellent. Janet?

JANET FISHER: Janet Fisher, Arizona State Library
and Archives. Is there any way that you could do a one- or
two-, or so, page executive summary at the front of that?

TED PRIEBE: For the Handbook?

JANET FISHER: For the handbook.

TED PRIEBE: Sure --

JANET FISHER: Okay. When I'm trying to explain to
the Legislature, because we are a Legislative agency.

TED PRIEBE: Uh-huh. (Indicates affirmatively.)

JANET FISHER: -- I have to do this because. I'm
not going to say "Turn to Page 86 and Page 102." It's too
much for them. Everything we give them is a one-page
executive summary. That would be the kind of tool that would

be most useful for me.

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I'm hearing you. At first I thought you were looking for more of an overview, and I was going to point you and the community to some of the OPAL overview sessions, but I understand what you're looking for, more of a high level. This is the must that we need to do in relation to the program. Did I understand you right?

JANET FISHER: That's correct. That's what I would be looking for.

TED PRIEBE: Okay. Excellent. Let me take that as well. Great feedback. Thank you.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Good morning, everyone. And, thank you, Ted. That was the technological part that I tend to stumble over.

I'm Robin Haun-Mohamed. I'm director of Collection Management and Preservation, and this is the last day, the last update of the meeting. (Laughter.) In a meeting that in many ways has not been easy, but it has definitely been interesting. (Laughter.) We've had an engaged Council, an engaged audience, and low and behold, GPO staff are fully engaged, also.

I want to say thanks to all; Council, for your participation; audience, for your questions and your concerns and your passion. And then also to Lance's team -- Nick, Yvonne, Bridget, Debbie, Lance and Kathy -- for doing the

things they do to make it work. (Applause.)

There's three units in collection management and preservation, and by this time of the Council meeting, you've probably heard a lot about some of the big things we're doing, but briefly I wanted to go over what depository distribution, education, outreach, and office of archives management do, if you look at an organization chart.

Depository distribution has about 18 people. I say about, because we've got a couple open positions and some other things that are going on. This is -- excuse me -- take a step back. My Power Points are always off, one slide forward, one slide backwards.

Overall collection management and preservation is responsible for distribution of those tangible products to your libraries. We coordinate the conferences and learning events between the libraries, GPO, agency representatives and Council.

We're responsible for the organization management of material in all formats, to get the material ready for our narrower requirements per record keeping. And we are also responsible for coordination and processes associated with the biennial survey, request for GPO participation, promotional materials, and public access assessments. Very often the folks in collection management and preservation are a public face of library services and content management.

Now, I can go to distribution. Again, we're the
folks responsible for getting those publications. We receive
them. And I don't think Joe McClane is in here, but he got me
good yesterday. He's the mouth of the fish. I don't want to
think of where he thinks we are. But, anyway, I kind of like
to think we're the lifeline.

We are responsible for getting those materials in,
for maintaining the systems for the Lighted Bin and library
addresses. And you've already heard that those systems date
back to 1982. And it's not just the tape on the case sealer,
but it's the hard wiring through the walls, in a factory that
would like to make everything invisible. So we're in constant
communication with I.T. about possibilities and changes and
costs associated with those systems. So I'm really excited
that some of the funding from the Bill is going to be used, in
part, to upgrade some of these systems, so we can get the
material out faster.

We're also responsible for coordinating the shipping
list development with library technical information service,
so that, hopefully, what goes out in the box matches what's on
the shipping list. And that can sometimes can be a challenge,
as if you've ever taken the tour, you're going to come in and
you'll see all these boxes and they all look the same. And
then you open the inside and they all look the same, except
for one number right at the top. It says No. 14 instead of

No. 15. So that's our responsibility, to try and make that
mesh.

We're responsible for item fulfillment for your
libraries' profiles. We make sure that the materials you are
supposed to receive get into your box. For those of you that
have never been to GPO, what we're talking about is an area
where we've got four deep, I think, and like 30 down. And the
operator will put in an Item No. 0556C, and the lights come on
above the box. And then you can pick up a stack of
publications, you walk down, you throw them in the box.
Sounds pretty easy, but nothing automated other than that
light going on. (Laughter.)

Having a volunteer to do that for a couple of
hours -- you don't wear watches, because watches get caught on
the top. And your arms get real tired after a while. And
then you think, oh, my God, did I drop it in that box, or did
I miss that box? So concerns about the boxes and the box
process, please, come directly to us. We need to hear about
it when it's a problem.

The delivery of the publications to the depository
libraries, we have contracts that are let for distribution of
materials to your libraries, except for, I think, Alaska is
still First Class mail. So UPS has the most recent contract.
And one of the things that you can help us with is, if there's
a ZIP code change or address change, physical location change,

if you will let us know that, that will save us an extra $7 a box on top of regular shipping charges, because they will charge us every time for that. So it's really important, if there's a change, let us know, and that notice needs to come through the CRM or Ask GPO service.

The Federal Depository Library Directory is a great tool, but that doesn't interface with our DDIS system at this point, nor does it go to the right person for physical distribution of boxes. So, please, you can use -- it's under FDLP and then I think there's address change for libraries in that pulldown box. Please, let us know when that happens.

Then we're responsible for claims fulfillment.

Laurie, are we ordering ten extra and like three are processing copies? Two or three are processing copies. So for most materials you might have eight extra copies for claims. So when we screw up, I need to know, especially, if it's a big thick volume. If it's something real small, go ahead and do the posting on the discussion list, which often happens, but if you see multiple problems, that means there's a problem either with the person in the unit doing the distribution or something else is going on. And I need to know about that, so that's really helpful when you guys are able to report that to us.

Current activities in depository distribution, we're reviewing the claims processing for paper, electronic, and

separate publications and trying to make that more efficient.
And, again, that's why I need to know when you're not getting
what you're supposed to get. We're updating the shipping list
that are sent out each week. That page has been updated in
conjunction with the web team, and it seems to be a pretty
popular spot.

And then we're working on the requirements for our
changes or modernization of the distribution of changeable
publications. In other words, identifying pieces of equipment
that can replace the ones that are now Bandaid-ed, and the GPO
is actually milling pieces for our conveyor line, because you
can't find replacement parts anywhere. So it's definitely a
fun area to work.

If you ever come to GPO or into D.C., give us a
little advanced notice, and if we can give you a tour, we
will. It's one of the things that interagency folks do like
to go see the boxes and drop something in there box. You
know, "Hey, I was here." And they get back to their library
and seven to ten days later, that note comes to you. It's a
little thing, but it's fun. It's fun.

Okay. Collection management preservation also has
the education and outreach unit. And the conference and event
planning coordination with the OPAL presentations, library
designations and change of status came from Ted's area over to
our folks in Lance's unit. We respond to request for GPO

participation. The re-establishment of public access
assessments, the biennial survey questions, and assistance, of
course, from throughout LSCM for those questions and
participation, promotional material requests and fulfillment.
Those are all the things that we do.

There's also the things that aren't written
anywhere, but a library calls and says "I need this," or "I
have questions about this." "I don't understand the
substitution policy." "I'm having problems with my director.
They want me to deselect everything in a week."

Those are real questions. And the folks that often
take those -- you met Kathy Brazee, over there on the side.
And, actually, Ashley Dahlen had joined us this last year, and
then we have a new public access assessments in training.
Ashley had a baby in February, so we're pretty excited. We're
growing our own. (Laughter.) So, anyway, public access
assessments is a big part of what we do without calling them
public access assessments.

A lot of times we'll say, "Kirstin, the Public
Printer would like to come visit you." She got about a week's
notice, and bless her heart, she pulled together a good group
to meet and talk with Mr. Tapella, so we play that role, also.

It's because our coordinators, our outreach
librarians, really are former depository librarians. I did
come out of a depository library, but that was, oh, so long

ago. Kathy is much more recent, and then Ashley came out of the University of Maryland. So these are folks that you can call on for assistance. We are glad to take those calls, e-mails. Oftentimes, it comes through the CRM, just as a vague query, kind of that reference interview. And you're trying to get down to it. And we call back and we try and resolve it and work with you on what your questions might be.

Current activities, we're working with web team to migrate the material from the old Desktop to the new Desktop. And as Ted said, it's not as easy as it sounds, because the old Desktop, of course, had writing that was like this long (demonstrates) and read like a 1994 web page. Karen is very insistent that we be modern and update and rewrite this material. So that is some of what the folks in education outreach are working with.

We are revising the self-study models, beginning with the Introduction to Basics, so it should be posted pretty soon. The self-study in the past was a requirement for libraries that would allow us to identify whether we need to actually come visit you or not. The new self-study modules are voluntary, completely voluntary, but they will give you an indication of how your library is looking, in case you want to know what a public access assessment situation would look like.

We did put up, week before last, the website for new

depository coordinators, and we had over a thousand, I'll say hits, going to the articles and opening the articles and looking at them and seeing what's involved. If you have not seen it, please, do go take a look. I think they're very timely, and we're pretty excited, because what it does is it allows us to do our welcome letters to the new coordinators, which we want to do, whenever we get that notification, and we're not having to update the pieces and attachments. We're sending them to the site and saying, "Here's a good place to start, and then come back to us with any questions. And, of course, you contact your regional."

We're finalizing the conference locations for the Fall. It's going to be at the DoubleTree, and then for the Council Meeting in Spring in 2010. And there's still some discussion on that location at this point.

And then with the Omnibus Bill there was about $100,000 for education training outreach, online training. So we're pretty excited, because we're going to be working to develop an online training module for depository coordinators.

And as Ric said, it could take a number of different directions. A lot of times people say "Give us training." Training is not enough. Tell me what kind of training you need. Is it subject based? Is it for coordinators? Is it for those that are going to be training others in the libraries? What -- online is pretty much the way we're going

to have to go. Tell me how long a training session, and can
we use OPAL for some of it? Can we use other resources?
We're looking at other options, too, so I'll give my e-mail
addresses at the end of this. But we really need your
feedback so we do that in the best way possible.

There's some areas of concern that I'd like to bring
up, briefly, too. And I just broke my pen. We're good.

Public access assessments, it's not that they're not
being done, but to actually say to a library, "I'm coming to
visit you," or "I'm looking in depth at your institution," in
these economic times, I think is an intimidating factor. And
I was down a couple staff members. So we will, of course,
visit libraries that have a need. You need us to come,
there's issues, and we will be supportive of you.

We also will continue to do assessments based on the
resources that we have, the web pages, the results of the
biennial survey. We have some key things that we look at to
see if maybe there's a need for further investigation. We
call; we talk with you. But for me to actually start saying
we're going to go out and do this and this and this and this,
right now, I'm not sure that's the best use of the program or
the money, especially since we're still figuring out what it
means to stay in the program and the benefits of the program.

So that has moved on a little bit more slowly than
we had anticipated a year ago, and because of that, that's why

some of the web work has gone up. The new welcome to new

coordinators and the revision of the self-study modules. It's

not that we haven't been doing anything. We're putting our

emphasis in a slightly different area, to ensure that when we

do start moving it forward at a faster pace, those resources

are in place for people to be well educated and ready for us

to come visit.

Education modules, I covered. I'm sorry. The

revision, the self-study modules begin with the introduction

of the basics. We will need feedback.

Those are going up as drafts, aren't they, Kathy?

And we know you've been surveyed to death. We've

heard it, and some times comment -- ask to comment, but these

are resources that you are going to be using, so we really

need your feedback when those go up. And there's usually a

link right there on the Desktop. Please, take the time, if

you can, to give us feedback on those.

The last thing I'd like to bring up is an area of

concern for education outreach is the Urban Myth. We've been

working on this five years. You need to select 25 percent of

all materials available through the Federal Depository Library

Program. Can you tell I've written that a lot?

That died years ago. You need to be selecting

materials to meet the needs of your primary users and the

folks in your Congressional districts. Those are the folks

that you serve under the Federal Depository Library Program.
And it doesn't mean that you need to select this much or this
much. It means you need to take a look. You should have a
collection development policy, either part of your overall
library policy is fine, or a separate one for Gov docs.

You need to have service level decisions. What
kinds of services are you going to be supporting? And that
will help you make then the decisions, with regard to what
you're collecting.

And if you find yourself in the situation where, all
of a sudden you've lost two staff members, and you're the only
one there, and you think the only thing you can do is leave
the program, please, talk to us. We'd love to talk to you.
Talk to your regional. A lot of times, there's other things
that can be done, other approaches. We've had a lot of that,
recently, where people are feeling that that's the only
solution. No. There are other things that can be done, and
we want to work with you to identify what those possible
solutions are. So that's education outreach unit.

Office of archives management, this is a small group
of people, about five people, and they are the folks
responsible for coordination and collection of tangible
materials cataloged for the FDLP and the C&I cataloging and
indexing program. They get the materials ready and boxed up
and sent to NARA to meet our records requirement.

They're also the group responsible for working with the cross agency efforts, both within GPO and with other agencies to develop those specifications for digitization, for preservation level and for access derivatives. And then we are working with our library partners and others, who have put in digitization efforts into our U.S. Government publication digitization process, the Registry. And we have been trying to promote that, including when we go to the Federal and other meetings, dealing with digitization specifications.

This is a group also responsible for working with CENDI digitization and harvesting, FLICC preservation, Digitization Working Group, and the Society for Imaging and Science Technology. As you can tell, this is a special group of people. These are people with technical skills dealing with online files with digitization and Federal bureaucracy.

Our current activities, we continue to work with the folks on the Federal Still Image Digitization Group, and also the digitization guidelines and those guidelines are available at that URL. They're also working on metadata guidelines at this point. So it's a good place to be, and we play a role consistently in that group.

We continue to work and acquire publications for our digitization effort, in response to our request for proposal, to try and fill in and have material if the RFP decision to award goes through the JCP, and then we begin that process.

We have to have materials to start with. So we do have some in-house, and we're working on that inventory and continue promotion of the Registry.

This is the area, also, that received -- will receive about $500,000 for storage, associated with our digitization efforts, and our cataloging and indexing, specifically, dealing with our permanent server. Raw materials are stored at this point, that we identify and PURL to it, and link through the CGP.

Okay. To summarize, I would say to Joe, we're not the back end of the fish. We really are the lifeline and the bloodline from the receipt through the end. We've got our narrow storage requirements, we've got out permanent public access commitments for the material in FDsys, and we are often the public face of who to go to if you have a problem dealing with your libraries.

The goals and objectives of my unit, collection management and preservation, are to improve our service. And, believe me, I did hear what you were saying, and we don't take it personally. What we try to do is take it in, take it back, and make it better.

We want to be more timely in our response, and we want to work to identify the libraries' needs. So I will be working with Cindy, with the Outsell Project for customer relations. I look forward to hearing from you, if you have

any questions or concerns, either offline -- or I'm here till we're through. Come see me, if you have any concerns. And I'm going to open up to questions, because I think we have the time.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. First, I just want to congratulate Kathy and Ashley on the new depository coordinators Toolbox. I think it's been needed for a long time, and it's an excellent tool. And I was really glad to see it go up.

Second, I'm not sure if this is under your purview or not, Robin, but at the last Council meeting, we discussed a possible promotional tool of fact sheets, and that sounded like what Janet was asking for, as far as the executive summary she could take to her legislature.

We discussed those fact sheets that we would be able to have to promote our depository, not only to the legislature, but also to our director and increase the communication with our director. Do you know, is that going forward, or did we focus just on the PSAs this time?

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Suzanne, I -- I'm not sure I, totally, am recalling the discussion on this. Now, we have a value at the FDLP page where that's where I was involved, along with several other LSCM folks, where we're trying to reaffirm some of the value statements. But I don't know if that's exactly what you're asking? It's not? No.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. No. It was a discussion about how best to market the
program. It was on marketing and promoting. So it was just
on overview of the program, a one-page fact sheet that we
would be able to take to a legislature or to show to our
director, if we had a new director, or something like that.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO.
Somehow there was a gap there. It sounds like an excellent
idea, and we'll carry it back to the folks that are working on
the marketing pieces. And then we'll update you on what it
looks like.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think that's
something that's very easy to do, considering where we are now
in the marketing campaign. We've launched the overall
marketing campaign and all the pieces and parts with it. I
think that's something that can be done in a week or less.

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of
Hawaii. I'm concerned about the public access assessments
being held off on. You know, I think I agree with Ann Marie
and some other people, who have expressed the opinion that the
inspection program, even though it struck fear in the hearts
of many, actually had a lot of good effects on depositories.

And, of course, we're not doing inspections any
longer, but we are doing the -- or we're supposed to be doing
the public access assessments, and I think those would have

the same beneficial effects. So I wonder if you could talk a
little bit more about the rationale behind holding off on
public access assessments.

And I'd also like to hear if there are any others,
either on Council or in the audience, who are also concerned
about the holding off on public access assessments.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. It's
not so much a holding off, as during the interim period, when
I only had one person, that was the time we were to launch the
systematic beginning of the public access assessments. It's
more of, we used the time differently because I had someone
out for a bit.

Also, during that time, funding has been limited for
travel. So our focus, of course, now on public access
assessments, is not simply to go to the library, but to take a
look at the libraries web presence, at their biennial survey
responses, talk with the regional about how the library is
doing, and then, if warranted, go and schedule an on-site
visit.

We are in coordination with depository coordinators
that we are doing the public access assessments with. And
these were shown through the summer, this last summer, on how
that that process would go. It is a concern in the fact that
some people are confused about what needs to be done, to be in
the program. What does that mean? And we answer questions on

that every day, but it's not so much a -- it's more like it's been postponed a bit, because mainly staffing and funding; but it's not stopped. And we, of course, do any investigations that we need to in response to people.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. That clarifies it a little bit, Robin. And I do appreciate your sensitivity to budget issues, but I think it's also important that directors have the material to work with. In planning, sometimes it's good to be able to justify some of what we're doing, and it may also be an opportunity to reconnect with some of the directors. I mean, we've certainly heard some disconnects here at this conference, and maybe it's an opportunity that we don't want to squander or miss. But I understand, I mean, if you've got restrictions on how you can get out there and do some of this, that's understandable, but I wouldn't put it off, just because we're all in some budget crisis, although, I appreciate that.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Yes, Gwen, I am also concerned about Public Access Assessments. And I agree with what Ken said that I do feel when the inspections stopped -- I certainly understand the budget shortfalls and the staff numbers and that it was difficult, but when the inspections stopped it was -- when I got an inspector to come to my library, it was a wonderful opportunity to communicate with the director.

When I was in Oklahoma, luckily, the regional came every year. So when GPO stopped inspecting, I still had somebody coming representing the FDLP, saying this was important. And, you know, that was Steve Beleu, from the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, would come, and he wasn't even my regional. He was the regional for the other half of the state, but he would come every year and talk to my director and explain the importance. And I do think that's missing from the public access assessments. I don't know if the answer would be to have somebody locally that could do that. I'm not -- we're all facing budget shortfalls, so. But I do think that was an important part of the access assessments.

And when Tim had asked for comments from the community, one of the comments did bring up the inspections, and that they had not been inspected since 1999, and that was a big concern. So I do think it is a community concern, as well as Council.

KATHY BRAZEE: Hi. Kathy Brazee, GPO. I just wanted to mention that we updated the text, the narrative, on the public access assessments page. Regionals are welcome to -- please, if you are a regional, please, suggest your selectives take a look at it. Through that page, there's a little bit of information about going to the request for GPO participation form. We have one pending request in Ohio. The regional was

aware of this, and we called the individual who made the request and sent quite a bit of documentation.

So we welcome the requests, and then depending upon funding for travel, we'll certainly accommodate them. But the first thing we do is set up a long conference call, and we do an immediate phone assessment and review the latest finance survey data, and look at the library web pages, kind of do a prelim check. So at least that's there, just as a start, but thank you very much for the concern.

ANN SANDERS: Ann Sanders, from the Library of Michigan. Since I kind of, in some ways, opened that can of worms with my comment the other day, I kind of feel compelled to say something. It is a bit of a mixed message. With the content of the Handbook so very flexible, in replacing all the "musts" and the "shalls" with the "recommended" and the "highly recommended," I have found myself in the position of talking with library directors who say, "But you told me, when you were here before, that we had to do X. And now this thing says, we should but we don't have to."

And it's rather an awkward place to be. I also find myself spending most of my time talking to libraries who are in crisis mode, mostly, in my opinion, because they haven't seen this coming; but, nonetheless, they're in crisis mode, and it's gotten to the point where my state librarian refers to it as "My going out to talk another one in off the ledge."

(Laughter.)

But, basically, I feel like I'm doing a lot of trying to resuscitate the dead instead of triaging the living. And so I really welcome the flexibility and the new approaches. Don't -- please don't misunderstand that. But at the same time, we have a very mixed message going on right now, and a lot of smaller libraries that are very confused by it.

So perhaps the idea of the executive summary kind of a document, and some of those other kinds of documents, would give us some place to stand and some place to refer to.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. The first thing I'd like to say is that I deeply appreciate the responsiveness that I have received from both Ted and Robin's teams, whenever I contact GPO. The response sometimes comes within five minutes of my question, and that is truly extraordinary.

One concern that I have came from the posting that Tim made to GovDoc-L, and that was transmitted through FDLP-L. Tim was asking for inquiry from the community on strategic issues. What he got, in many cases -- and I would say it was at least 50 percent of the responses -- were comments about operational problems that, in some of the postings said, These are going to drive us out of the program. We are considering relinquishing depository status, because of probably two

areas; quality control on the part of GPO and problems with
the item selection system.

And I'm sure you've saw those postings, because I
know you monitor GovDoc-L, but I know that the improvement to
the technological system that drives, to a certain extent,
quality control, and item selection is probably going to
improve that. But if there's anything that you can do in the
interim to improve those areas, you would be greatly
appreciated by me, and I'm sure by Council and by, most
importantly, the people in the field who are not here,
especially public libraries, for whom this is really a
difficult issue.

And I think it's a difficult issue, and I know I'm
dealing with the technicalities of processing tangible
documents, but in larger academic libraries, I think in most
cases the depository coordinator has a team of student workers
or lower level people, who recognize the problems and they
handle the problems.

In public libraries, maybe there's a part-time
worker who does the initial processing, but the problem ends
up falling on the depository coordinator, who is a librarian.
And that is the kind of concern that public libraries face, is
that too much professional librarian time is being taken up
writing GPO about classification mistakes, item distribution
mistakes, the fact that if you deselect that there's no

granularity in many of these item numbers, so you can only
select electronic. If you select an item number to get
electronic library items, you also receive a lot of tangible
items associated with that item number.

You know, those are the problems that those guys
deal with on a daily basis and hourly basis, and it's
making -- it's making some depositories in California
reconsider what they're doing, and I'm sure that California is
not alone. Thank you for listening.

I don't mean that as a -- this is such an ongoing
problem. Every conference this problem is mentioned, and it
doesn't ever seem to get solved. And that's frustrating to a
lot of people, but it's not -- I'm not aiming this at you two,
because I know that you and your teams are really wonderful.

TED PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Thank you, David.
And I appreciate your kind words in regards to the responses.
And it really is a priority for everybody at LSCM, when you
send a submission in to Ask GPO, for a timely response. We've
got senior managers that monitor that for every inquiry and
the routing.

Specific to the qualify control and the issues --
and I've certainly heard that loud and clear as well. We are
making positive change. And we're making that positive
change, and we've prioritized it in many ways, with what I was
describing earlier in my presentation, in terms of documenting

work processes. And I don't know how it is your library or
for those of you that are in Federal agencies, but documenting
that process and having the ability to cross train and bring
in additional people -- because there's gaps in every
workflow.

I don't care how efficient we are, there are areas
we need to improve. And some of those quality problems or
areas where we need to improve things are we're starting to
get that documentation. So we went all the way across to
LSCM, prioritized areas that were related to feedback that
we've had about quality control and timeliness issues, and we
feel like we have made a lot of progress in getting that as
is.

And then the next step, of course, is the "to be."
How do we make it better? How do we cross train and bring
people in where there's a shortage of staff? We all deal with
hiring freezes. That's not the issue. How we can improve the
process? So that's heard loud and clear.

Item selection is another piece that we are working
on for our next budget submission. It is a big legacy system.
That's not an excuse. It's just -- I'm saying we are working
on that, and that's something that we're going to be looking
for funding and the support from those of you in the
community, when we make that request to our oversight, that
that is a legacy system that will take some funds, frankly, to

migrate off of the current legacy mainframes and environments.

So thanks for sharing those things, and we are moving forward on both fronts.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Thank you, David, for that. And that's also what I was hoping would come out of some of those comments that Tim requested. I have not read Council recommendations yet. I know that's for the next session, but I'd like to encourage Council to consider looking back at some of those themes that came forward. We heard about assessments this morning. We heard about item selection. We heard about quality control. And I'd encourage you to consider those as recommendations.

I mentioned the other day that having that helps us, also, in terms of funding priorities when we're able to submit budget requests. Having that behind us to say that these are priorities for Council, also helps us get the dollars.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I have a -- and this is probably just an ignorance question, but we heard a lot about digitization at this meeting. And we've heard a lot about projects that are going on, some in collaboration with GPO; some, I think, on their own.

I just feel I don't understand how -- how is GPO archiving or going to archive things that are being digitized, maybe outside of a formal collaborative or even with a collaboration with you, so that they are somewhere more

centrally available. And how is my depository going to be able to access a copy of something that's been digitized by another depository or some other group?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you, Ted. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. The Federal digital system was set up with requirements for archiving the scanned materials. For those institutions where we do not have a partnership, we are going to try and acquire a copy of that for ingesting into -- into the Federal digital system for the permanent public archive.

The how to do it, is still in the requirements developing phase. As Lisa LaPlant indicated, we have submission packages set up, where we can take the document, the metadata associated with -- an any renditions, and ingest those into the Federal digital system, so that they can be shared out again in the future. But what will be served up for the public are the access derivatives.

We are looking to develop partnership for permanent public access; that is, some of this material, either the library digitize the material, and they have it on their servers, and we a signed agreement; or that we distribute some of the files, the preservation level files to partners, to also have in their repositories. Does that help?

KEN WIGGIN: Thank you. That's helpful.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I want to emphasize that last point that Robin mentioned, because I know there's

been quite a bit of discussion about that. Through GPO's
Federal digital system, we will hold the preservation level
master copy and make the access level derivative available,
but, also, what I want to do is, in keeping with the history,
the traditions of the program, and, also, what it says in the
law about permanency, we will have the capability to offer a
distributed model for both access and preservation level
files.

What I've heard in past conferences, particularly
from some of the regionals, is that they don't want that to be
punitive or a requirement, per se. And I think at a policy
level, that's where we need some discussion, but I think that
it's important that GPO not be the only keeper of all of this
digital content. I think we need to look at models for
distribution in the Electronic Age that has served us well in
the Tangible Age.

CASS HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of
Washington Libraries. I had one factual question to clear up
and, really forgive me if it's already been addressed. It's a
distribution question. True or false, the National Archives
and the Library of Congress receive tangible copies of
materials from GPO? Because there was a statement made about
how LC and Library of Congress have to go around and harvest
tangible docs from agencies, implying that they didn't used to
have to do that. So that was a confusing statement from the

peanut gallery.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you, Cass. This is Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Written into the law is the authority for LC to receive 25 copies of every publication. There's also requirements for NARA. Those agreement -- there were agreements made 20 --

Richard, are you here? He's hiding.

There were agreements made about 20 years ago, where LC cut back to 15 copies of a lot of things. They still receive 25 of the big things, the Statutes at Large, etc.

NARA actually has three, what we call, selectives. And they've gone through and identified those materials that they want to receive, and it comes out to be three copies of selected publications. So the full set goes to NARA, as part of GPO's record process. The materials that we digitize -- excuse me. I have digitization on the brain.

The materials that we distribute in a tangible format are the things that go to NARA with -- in a specific packed way and boxes marked in a specific way and, actually, go to a kind of holding area, where they stand about ten years, and then they're accessioned into the archives, directly. But NARA no longer receives a copy of everything. I think that did come out yesterday.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, again. I'm sorry, Robin. I'm a little confused by that answer. I

thought that you said -- okay. The final sentence was NARA doesn't receive a complete set of everything. Is that what you said? But yet you said, you send them a complete --

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: I didn't mean to confuse you, David. NARA receives only a complete set via GPO's records requirements. They do not receive them under the authority of bylaw at this point. They have cut back their selections to the point that they're actually acting as a selective library, and they're getting three copies of some publications.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: And this is David Cismowski, again. So somewhere in the bowels of NARA resides a complete set of -- or should reside a complete set of everything?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: The public documents library that we had at GPO was transferred to NARA, and I think Bernadine was referring to the materials, all the materials from the past, so those materials are over there. And then on a regular basis, we transfer the materials that are cataloged over the NARA. So there should be a complete set, but whether they're all in one spot, that I can't tell you.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. Bottom line, what I hear is, they're not accessible to our purposes. They exist. They exist in a way that they give us comfort in our time of doubt (laughter), but in terms of dealing with these very real issues of digitization, disposition, and discovery, they are -- they are like not

there.

So what we have are our collections, our legacy collections, your good resources, and whatever we can make from that collaboration. That's essentially what we have to work with.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: This is Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. John, you're pretty well on target. We do believe that if we needed to borrow something, and it could be identified, the location identified in (laughter) -- I shouldn't have said that out loud. Yeah.

JOHN SHULER: That's where the faith comes in. I understand.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: For non-destructive digitization effort, we believe we could fill in gaps. And we had some discussions a couple of years ago about that with them.

JOHN SHULER: Okay. John Shuler from the University of Illinois, Chicago. So I will say it out loud to make it clear for everybody. What we have amongst our collections, all 1,200 odd of them, is what we have to work with. We should not look for a Calvary to come from NARA, right, or to come from a Fortress of Solitude. What we have is what we have, and that is what we must work with. And I don't think we should plan or build or expect anything else; is that about right? Is everybody -- okay. I just think somebody should

say it once and get it into the transcript. So when we go back we can review.

CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas. That is something I'd like to have clarified in one of those fact sheets, because I have had my administration say, Well, doesn't NARA have it? Can't we get it from them? Why are we needing to keep this?

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski. I'm sorry, Robin. Did you want to respond to that?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Just briefly. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. NARA really was not set up for less than long-term access. And really that is their response often. "We have the materials, we make them, we archive them, we put them in a safe spot." And to think of them as a lending library, would be a mistake.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Going back two to three years, there was a plan that was very widely touted, about GPO establishing, I believe, two dark archives, geographically dispersed in this country, where, it was my understanding, GPO would try to round up a physical -- two physical copies of every legacy publication that had ever been published in print.

And for born digital documents, it was my understanding, that GPO was actually going to print out or produce in tangible format, two copies of every digital

document that was in scope and store these in these dark archives against the time when the digital versions were corrupted or unavailable. And then, presumably, the retrieval mechanism in these dark archives would be robust enough to allow GPO to go in and get a physical copy and make another digital copy.

Now, my memory is a little hazy on this. And the documentation I've got stored away somewhere at the State library. I don't think it's online, anymore, or if it is, I can't find it, but have these plans for these dark archives just disappeared, or is that still in the long-range planning of GPO, somewhere, on the horizon far distant?

JOHN SHULER: Ric knew this was coming, so he left.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: I mean, this is a concern, because I'm assuming that two or three years ago, GPO felt that it was necessary to have tangible backups to these digital files, because preservation and storage mechanisms for digital files are not perfect. And you wanted to be able to go back and get the physical thing, just in case there was a catastrophe.

Now, maybe that's no longer a concern. I don't know.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: David -- Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. That was actually -- you've got to go back another year, at least. It was actually about 2004, I think, that the last substantive discussion of the dark archive happened. We have

to get JCP approval for that concept, and that has not been obtained. Also, in between there, there was change in the head of GPO, a change in the vision.

I won't say that it isn't still a concern, but I'm not sure how doable it is. And it's one of the questions that -- I was looking around the room for Ric. Yes, I was, because it is a -- it is a concern that if we digitize these materials, what will we do with them? We're not going to toss them. Are we going to -- we need to save them for quality control, first of all. And then we have opened some discussions with NARA to place these materials in NARA, but not the regular site, but in the alternate -- what do they call it -- alternate Congressional Facility. It's where other materials are stored to insure just what you're saying, that if something happens to the file, that we still have the original object from which the file was done. But I don't -- I don't have the status on a dark archive. It actually kind of migrated from two to one and working with NARA for that one at this alternate facility. I will ask.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I notice you don't have your fly swatter, Robin. And this is not meant to you directly, but I often hear at these meetings, "Well, it's up to the JCP. It's up to the JCP."

Has the JCP been asked about creating these dark archives, or was it just assumed you were going to have to

asked them, and they would say no, so it wasn't?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Yes, there have been discussions with the JCP on this. A formal letter requesting this has not yet gone forward.

KEN WIGGIN: Would that kind of thing benefit -- Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Would that benefit from an endorsement from Council, I mean?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Sure.

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. A couple of people, in response to Tim's posting about Strategic Issues mentioned microfiche, and when's it going to die? And I know we ask this every time, but I thought I would just ask it.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO, and I'm noting which GPO folks have fled already. (Laughter.)

We are taking a look at microfiche. We actually have that as a project that is ongoing right now, to identify what materials -- and there's just very, very little that only goes on microfiche. There's one Congressional publication I believe, Defense Appro Pub, or something. It's a big thick book. Identifying how many libraries across the board, a spectrum of materials that are going out in microfiche, which, essentially, is only Congressionals at this point.

And trying to find a way of identifying who's actually still using microfiche. We know the diazos are not

archival quality, that has never been the case, for microfiche materials that GPO did the conversion. The first generation or preservation level microfiche, the silvers, go to NARA as part of our record keeping process. The second generation silvers, those are the ones that people replicate from, go to the Library of Congress about every four years. And then the diazos go out to all of you. So we're looking at how much is going out, who is using it, and what are the costs of the microfiche conversion?

You can't look at it as simply as a request on -- on income, because you really can't beat the cost of microfiche, 96 frames per page, 10 cents a page. That's an awful lot of information that can go to libraries in a tangible format.

There's another part of the microfiche challenge. A lot of our international exchange service libraries still receive fiche, and while there's many that are saying, "Stop, desist. I don't want it, anymore," there are still libraries in underdeveloped areas that this is the best way for that information to come to them.

So those are the things, Gwen -- I can't really see you, but -- those are the things that we are looking at. And, coming back, analysis -- I think it's somewhere around the end of June, June or July, that that summary will be presented to Laurie Hall, and then we will share out what we've learned.

KATHY AMEN: Kathy Amen, St. Mary's University,

Blume Library. This -- I wasn't going to ask this, because I thought it was too stupid a question, but it kind of follows that. I'm doing a big weed and shift, right now, and trying to plan for space. As far as you know, are the Congressional things going to continue to be printed for the foreseeable future? I mean, I rather assume that they are, but I just --

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Kathy, yes. This is Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Right now, the Jud Committee on Printing directed us a couple years ago to continue tangible distribution of Congressional materials in paper and microfiche. So if we were to make a change to the microfiche, we would be -- of, course, be checking with JCP. I do not see the paper option changing at this point.

Cindy, do you have any further information on that?

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. No. (Laughter.) What you said is right, correct, and all I know.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Thanks, Cindy.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky. I'd like to jump back to the dark archive question issue. My only concern, about this being tabled anyway, is that as weeding accelerates, which it is doing in all of the selective depositories, you are fast losing segments of the collection that you might be able to harvest at least one complete collection to put somewhere, where you could get it to it, and NARA wasn't an issue.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Thank you, Sandy. This is Robin Haun-Mohamed, Government Printing Office. I have stacks of materials just for that reason, located at GPO, and I was told at one point if I brought another piece in, it was going in my office. And if any of you have seen my office know, it's a disaster, so.

But we do monitor what the postings are and things that we perceive to be at risk, because of age or because they're more rare, we are reaching out and having some of that material brought to GPO. That would be a really strong thing for Council to do, a recommendation on, because I'm fighting for space. And we can't get that material unless we have a spot to put it, and I'm with you, I don't want to lose that material.

KEN WIGGIN: This is Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I certainly can't speak for NARA, but I also run the archives for my state. And there is a distinction between an archive and a record or a publication, and I think we shouldn't necessarily blame NARA. Once I take in something as an archive, it's treated very differently. And I think we should be looking for something outside of NARA, in terms of accessible -- well, the dark archive doesn't need to be totally accessible, but it shouldn't be viewed as an archive, per se. It should be, you know, a dark archive in the sense of, you know, a repository for the older documents, which are

still under GPO's, let's say, control and not NARA.

JO ANN BEEZLEY: Jo Ann Beezley, Pittsburg State University. And this really has nothing to do with this, but one of the things in Robin's presentation was, that she's responsible for conferences. And I just want to say this is one of the nicest hotels that I have stayed in, at a Depository Library Conference or Council Meeting. In all the times I've come, this was that nicest staff and everything they did was wonderful. And I think that GPO deserves some thanks for picking this particular place, because this is wonderful. (Applause.)

TIM BYRNE: I think we've reached the end of our time for this sessions, so thank you all. We'll see you in a little bit.

(Conclusion of session at 10 a.m.)

Transcribed by:
Sherry A. Belliveau
Liberty Court Reporting
112 N. Pine Avenue
Inverness, Florida 34450

SESSION:

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS

Wednesday, April 22, 2009, 10:30 a.m.-12 p.m., Tampa, Florida

TIM BYRNE: (Gavel.) All right. Okay. This is Tim Byrne from Department of Energy, Office of Scientific and Technical Information, sharing his last session. (Applause and laughter.)

What we're going to be going over now is some of our draft recommendations that we've come up with. And one of the things I'd like to sort of point out that Council, in the way that Council is used by various Superintendent of Documents and Public Printers can change at times. And I think in the last few years, Council was not always called on to make recommendations, so we've been trying to, you know, change our culture here.

I really had hoped to have recommendations at the Fall meeting, and we got really tied up in the Strategic Plan and getting input for that, so that actually we used our Council working sessions to get more input on the Strategic Plan. So we did not have recommendations last Fall.

This year we did a good deal of discussion of recommendations at our two working sessions from 5:30 to 7:00, something like that. And that was quite a challenge to try to get recommendations and discuss this at the end of a long day already. And so we came up with some recommendations

yesterday, and then the group just sort of said, "Okay. This is enough. We're leaving." And -- well?

So I guess what I'm trying to say is, I don't think we really finished working on the recommendations, so what we are presenting here is really a draft of our recommendations. And I think we have four recommendations that we'll be presenting now. There's, I think, another four that I think we definitely want to work on, and there may be a couple others that we'll bring up in our discussions, too.

So, Ric, you can, you know, expect to hear from us more on the recommendations here. (Technical adjustments.) They can't read it anyway. I'm going to try to make it larger. Well, let me read it.

Our first recommendation: To meet the goals of providing no fee, permanent, public access to Government information. Council recommends that GPO hire an outside consultant to deliver a range of models on how libraries can better provide Government information to the public in the 21st Century, for consideration by Council. This consultant report would reconsider the operations of the FDLP in the context of the Electronic Age and possible future technologies. This reconsideration will address how best to maintain and utilize tangible legacy collections and U.S. Governmental -- U.S. Government digital assets to best meet the needs of the American public.

And the rationale that we put in this, is that it's based on the feedback we have received from the community. Council feels that it's crucial to have a neutral outside party to -- wait a second -- a neutral outside party to develop the possible new scenario for the 21st Century FDLP.

(Technical adjustments.)

JOHN SHULER: "Trust us." That's really what it said.

TIM BYRNE: Okay. The second recommendation: Council further recommends that GPO request funding for grants to states for collaborative digitization projects.

The rationale: As information users rely more and more heavily on electronic resources, it is crucial that the legacy Government documents collection be digitized.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Are you going do go through all of them, and then we'll come back to these or?

TIM BYRNE: Let's go back to the first one, then. Okay. No, I can't go back. I'm sorry.

DENISE DAVIS: Can I suggest we go through all of them, and then start from the beginning?

TIM BYRNE: Okay. All right. Good.

Three, Council further recommends that GPO create a list of libraries willing to participate in collaborative digitization projects and take the lead in coordinating these

projects.

The rationale: GPO needs to take a more active role in the coordination of the digitization of the legacy collection. Council further feels that commercial sector digitization projects, with access restrictions, do not diminish GPO and FDLP responsibilities to provide no fee, permanent, public access of digital versions of Government publications.

Four, Council further recommends that GPO report at the Fall 2009 Meeting on efforts to simply the discard process.

Rationale: The depository discard process is extremely time consuming and burdensome for both selectives and regionals. As pressure grows in both large and small selectives to reduce collection size, the process needs to be speedier and less staff intensive. Any comments from Council on number one?

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: We had a -- our side of the table -- oh, Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso Law. We had a comment about the word "operations" in there that we had a suggestion that another word like possibly "strategies," "operational and organizational strategies," or some other similar word be used, because operations sounds kind of lower level.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz from

the St. Louis Fed. And I just want to emphasize, in our discussion of this hiring an outside consultant, that we really wanted someone who had a neutral viewpoint. Somebody who could bring a fresh eye to this and comes open to all sorts of scenarios and possibilities.

TIM BYRNE: Are you standing, Ric?

RIC DAVIS: I'm ready. Ric Davis, GPO. I'm seeking some clarification on the words "GPO hire an outside consultant." We've mentioned a few times throughout the presentations that the dollars that we've received for this fiscal year are earmarked for certain items, so I want to ask for clarification.

Are you asking for GPO to seek additional funding to hire an outside consultant, or are you asking us to determine if we can use funds that are already appropriated this year, that have been earmarked for purposes of hiring a consultant?

And the other question on that is, if that is not approved, what other flexible options might we have, in order to look at the program?

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I think our feeling is both; that you should look at what funds you have in your current budget, and owing to the fact that the new budget starts in October, that you make this a priority in deciding how you are going to spend funds.

We think that this is a real major thing that needs

to be done, and the resources should be directed to this, as soon and as best as possible.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I agree. It's a very important priority. What I'm concerned about is time delays as well, though, because requesting dollars for the F.Y. '10 Budget also doesn't mean that you can start spending them on October 1st. So I want to be able to take actions from the Strategic Plan, while we're looking at this as well.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I just -- Ric, when you're trying to find a flexible way to do this, something we were very clear on, in Council, is that we want it to be an non-biased, non-interested outside party, and, you know, sometimes when we're trying to make money stretch and somebody volunteers to do it for free, we say, yes. But we certainly feel that, in order to reach a consensus, we need somebody from outside to look in.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. And Ric, we didn't mean that everything is going to be dropped to focus on this. As you will see in our further recommendations, we indicated, as has been said in other meetings constantly, there is some other low-hanging fruit that we can act upon from the Strategic Plan, in addition to this.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, American Library Association. Ric, I guess a couple of questions, would words

like "expedite" or "immediately" be useful to GPO?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think the only word that gives me heartache is the indication that it says, "GPO hire an outside consultant," because I think it could imply, maybe to some people not attending the conference and hearing this conversation, that GPO can go back and cut a purchase request next week.

And what we have to do is, actually, request funding, which I can do in the F.Y. '10 Budget, but I think a word like "expedite" or "take the necessary actions to pursue," that still indicates that this is a critical priority. But I also want to give a dose of reality that this is something that we're going to have to request funding to do.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. Would it help if it said "the GPO seek funding for an outside consultant," or "take the necessary actions"?

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Yes. That would help a a lot.

DAN BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico, the sleeping midget awakes. I share Ric's concerns about the expediency of this. I would suggest that in wordsmithing you look at operations and say "structure." I think the operations is fine. I think it's the structure that needs to be investigated. That's what I've been hearing over the last

several conferences, the last 12 -- all right, 20 conferences, actually.

The other thing is that while GPO can seek funding, and do this and that, and I appreciate, you know, I understand the rationale of wanting to have a fresh pair of eyes. I think that's always a good thing. The problem is is that the future is here, and we're losing it as we stand here and ask GPO to seek funding, and to do this and do that.

We need to make some decisions and we need to start working on this tomorrow, not wait until October of this year or perhaps October of next year, while GPO is continuing to seek funds. And I'm not discouraging them from doing so. I just think we have an opportunity right now.

Things are changing more rapidly than at any other point in the history of the FDLP, and if we continue to sit around and debate what this thing should look like, we're all going to be sitting there with these collections, that at some point, aren't going to be useful to anyone. And we're going to have a structure that's archaic and skeletal. And so I think we need to start doing something tomorrow, and not wait until October.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Dan, I think if you look at our subsequent recommendations you'll see us as doing exactly that. Beginning to look at things that we can begin to address, as a

9

system, without asking for somebody's permission or insight. Stuff that has come up clearly in this conference and others, that we have the ability to pull off, if we can get our act together.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Dan, your comments bring out a very -- a very difficult conundrum, I think, at least in my mind. What we have heard here is we need to do something now, not tomorrow. We can't delay. However, we have heard this from one segment of the depository library community, a very important, a very valuable segment, but it's one segment.

We've also heard from Ric that doing a measured, neutral study is going to take some time. And I think Council's problem, right now, is how to reconcile the need for some kind of an approach that's going to address everybody's concerns and not just academic libraries' concerns.

And at the same time doing something now that will at least indicate that GPO is making progress towards solving the concerns that we have heard so much about. And, quite frankly, I don't know how to deal with that, how to reconcile those two things, but we need to try to do it somehow.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski from Montana. I think the virtue of having the Government Accountability Office do it, it comes out of their budget, not out of GPO's budget. So you're not going to have to worry

about the money, and if the Joint Committee on Printing would ask for it, it would be expedited, just as the Senate Environmental Committee asked for the EPA audit. It doesn't have -- I mean, and GAO does lots of things. They look at the future, also. They did a lot of studies for the Joint Committee on Printing when I was there, and they were very, very helpful in us making policy decisions and looking toward the future.

So I would -- if you don't do it in this one, I would suggest that you have it in something else, to encourage GPO to work with the JCP to have GAO do some of this work for them.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. With all due respect, I mean, the evidence that we have is that the Joint Committee on Printing is unwilling to listen to the Federal Depository community. And I would be reluctant as a Councilor to encourage GPO to work -- to continue to work within the bowels of Government when they have an opportunity to get somebody from the outside to look at this.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: I respectfully disagree with you. As a member of the Committee on Legislation of ALA, and as a retired JCP staffer, I meet with the JCP staff every year. I'm in constant contact with them. They're enthusiastic about the idea of the Government Accountability Office looking into this; especially, Congressman Brady.

So I would say that the JCP could be -- this is and has always been this program's greatest ally. This is their oversight responsibility. It's their program. And they really respect and support this program, but they also, as has been pointed out by other of your members, have to look at all the members of the program and all the users, which means everyone in this United States, when they make their decisions. So I think that the JCP is very willing to support us in making this a better program.

JOHN SHULER: I think -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I think the point should be, amongst all these divergent views, is that we need to do something with deliberation and clear eyes, as well as do something now. And I think what David was expressing, that this may seem in conflict, which means we may have to make choices that some of us are not comfortable with, but let us make choices as a matter of deliberation, not just because we're falling through space, and we don't know what else to do.

TIM BYRNE: Any more comments on the first one?

Council further recommends GPO request funding for grants to states for collaborative digitization projects.

Council?

JOHN SHULER: I think this is, again, is a clear example for GPO, and will and has demonstrated leadership in trying to organize what sometimes seems like a herd of cats.

They have the ability, and they have the relationship with the depository libraries to do this. And I think the depository libraries have the will to work with GPO, if they both can just simply agree, yeah, let's do it. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. This side of the table would recommend a little change, that it say "funding for grants for regional collaboration" -- "or collaborative digitization project." Take the "states" out of there. We think it's a little confusing, but if we use the word "regional," it might expand the concept a little.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Is there another word we can use for regional? Can anybody, because I just -- I don't want it to be confused with it being thought that we're saying the "regional libraries."

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz from the St. Louis Fed. The goal was to make it -- what we wanted was GPO to request funding for digitization projects that would be widely distributed across the United States. Would involve -- they need to be some coordinating agency -- or somebody who coordinates it at some level, State or regional level. So I don't know exactly what the words -- I guess we can wordsmith this, but that was the goal.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Yeah. And I understand that, and I agree with that.

I just am concerned because there are many selectives in
states where their regional, if you're giving them the money
to do the collaboration, they would never go anywhere else.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso Law.
I think that we were using regional in the more generalized
sense, but I see your point that that has a specific meaning
here, too. So if we can think of a word that means that, that
isn't a word that is regional or selective, that would be
good.

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: Kind of like Catholic with a
small c.

ANDREA SEVETSON: Andrea Sevetson, LexisNexis. I
would say just take out the word "to states," because
collaborative means among partners or multiple places. I
think if you leave out any reference to geography, you still
get that there.

My own feeling would be that it just not be -- and
the other word is, I like grants. That implies, at least,
that there was some process involved there; that GPO isn't
just going to go around, willy-nilly, handing out funds, which
I really didn't think Ric was going to do, anyway. Open your
checkbook, please.

So I mean "grant" implies a -- some sort of
competitive process, to me at least, and if you take out the
word "states" and leave collaborative, you've still got the

idea of multiple partners working together.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I think part of our thinking was sort of a new approach to Congress by making it -- the more Congressmen could buy into it, if they saw the money being distributed nationally and not just ending up at GPO. And I think we were trying to figure out a way to say to Congress "These grants are going to go out across the country to deal with this project and not just stay at GPO." So that's why we're trying to put something in there that implied that it really was a national endeavor.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO.

Andrea, I brought my checkbook today. (Laughter and applause.) You wouldn't want to see my checkbook.

I applaud Council for thinking outside the box and making this recommendation. I do want to mention, as Andrea alluded to, that right now legislatively, we do not have grant authority, but I know this is something that's been discussed for years. And I think in terms of our new modeling and the types of things we need to look at, I think this is real outside-the-box thinking, and I thank you for this.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, American Library Association. Yes, but there are agencies in the Federal Government that do have granting authority, and you could have an interagency agreement, that would allow them to administer the grants on your behalf. Once such agency is the Institute

for Museum and Library Services.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I think it would be fair to say that Council, over the last few weeks, has been discussing grants in possible areas, even beyond digitization projects. I do think that it's an idea that should be investigated, because partnerships can work, if there's no financial support, but maybe they can work better, not just in digitization areas, but in other areas as well, if there's some funding that will increase quality, speed, and provide an incentive for even applying to form a partnership with GPO.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library. I'm sure Ric knows this, but there's also ways to do this through the appropriating language, even if it were initial -- IMLS has one large grant program that only exists in appropriating language and not by statute. So we could encourage -- I think what we're saying is we would encourage GPO to explore all options, both in getting the funding, having Congress understand that the money is to do a very national approach to this problem, and that they be able to give out -- award grants.

TIM BYRNE: Council further recommends that GPO create a list of libraries willing to participate in collaborative digitization projects and take the lead in coordinating these projects.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: Tim? Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso Law. I can't -- all right. Second sentence of the rationale: "Council further feels," I think we should change that to "believes." I mean, our feelings probably aren't as important as our thoughts on this.

DENISE DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA. Or read "In Council's opinion -- "it's Council's opinion that," dah, dah, dah, dah, dah.

JOHN SHULER: It's the first step to the dark archives. (Laughter.)

TIM BYRNE: Robin?

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: I'm not that tall. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Council recommends, create a list of libraries willing to participate in collaborative digitization projects. We do have that in the Digital Registry. I think our discussion yesterday indicated that there were folks in the audience that were doing digitization projects, and we were hoping that they would either come to GPO or come to Council and you guys forward us that list, so we could do additional outreach.

The "more active role in coordination of the digitization of the legacy collection," can you give me another word besides "active" because we've done the RFI. We've done the RFP. And now it's the -- RFP has been decided to send forward to JCP to move forward with digitization

project if they approve it.

Is there something further, Council can share with me, that GPO can be going with regard to this?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz from St. Louis Fed. Robin, I think when we were listening to people talk, they were using words like "knit" and "quilt," and I think, at least from my perspective, what we were looking for was a coordination piece of the digitization, in laying out exactly what all needs to be digitized.

I mean, you guys have a registry, and it's really a self-selected kind of model, right now, where you put your information in the registry. And you indicate what kind of level you are doing this, and GPO says thank you.

And I think what I was thinking is more that GPO would lay out the SuDoc, or something, or items or agencies and ask, in priority order, we need people to do blank. Is somebody out there willing to do census, or whatever, and really actively coordinate the digitization, because it feels ad hoc.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. The other way to look at this is that, that registry, Robin, represents tactical decisions by individual libraries to digitize certain parts of their collections or other material, that may benefit the program.

What the Council got the sense from, from listening

to people over the last few months, is to knit those tactical decisions into a broader strategy. So as we move from talking about a legacy collection, in a theoretical way, we have a definite road map of how these different bits and pieces of collections will one day create that digital legacy. That's one other way to think about what this statement means.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: I would -- Bernadine Abbott Hoduski from Montana. I would like to see this broadened to include Government agencies that are digitizing their older publications, because there are some of them that are doing it, and some of the Federal libraries that are depository libraries, or others, are doing this. So I think they -- if there was an effort made to identify those agencies that are digitizing, particularly the field operations.

And, also, as far as whether you're going to do a grant or whatever, I would suggest it be broadened to say that you could be doing a contract, just like GPO does millions of contracts right now, and they provide services to the agencies. If this were a joint thing, like John Shuler said in the past with the State Department, if you had a depository library who was a partner with the publishing agency with GPO, then it could be done under a contractual basis as a -- as really just a printing job, an electronic printing job.

So I think that I'd like to encourage you to be more creative in thinking about how to approach this. And you have

all these creative partnerships already, but we need more of
them when it comes to digitization. And then the Library of
Congress and National Archives are all doing a lot of
digitization, but I don't know how much cooperation is going
on, between the major agencies that are doing this.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO.
Bernadine, thank you. That does give us the opportunity to
share that we do work with LC and NARA. The groups that I
mentioned, at least two of them, have standing working groups.
And, in fact, James Mauldin, who is head of office of archives
and management, is at LC today working with one of those
groups.

We, also, reach out to agencies, for example, USGS,
and invite them to participate. And they are now
participating in Still Images Digital Working Group. I love
the idea of getting agencies involved and not replicating
effort. The challenge to the Registry is, you can lead them
to it, but you can't make them use it. But I like the ideas
that you put forward on other recommendations of things to do,
other ways of looking at it. And so thank you for providing
additional information on that.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: And if that was
publicized in all the depository libraries and others knew who
you were partnering with and working with, that would help, I
think, in their thinking, about who they could work with.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Thank you, Bernadine. I would like to point out that I think an advantage, if we could get the agencies to contract, would be that some of the fugitive documents might also be digitized, that were never put into the program.

JUSTIN OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. When I think of, you know, GPO coordinating a list of, you know, priorities for digitization and what needs to be digitized, I think, you know, a lot of hands went up yesterday when the question was asked, well, who would be willing to participate, or who thinks their library would be willing to participate, and just getting out there and working on digitizing the legacy collection? A lot of hands went up, and mine did, too.

My library is a smaller library. We don't have a lot of staffing or time or -- you know, to commit to some kind of a big project, but with a list like this, depending upon how you do it, list of what needs to be digitized, letting people say I will do this and this, I would -- you know, I want this to happen, too, so I want to do whatever I can to help make it happen. So, I mean, a smaller library like me where -- like mine where it's -- I work with documents, and there's a couple of other people who also work to make our depository happen -- would be willing when we can -- and I know this may sound a little oversimplified -- but I would be

more than happy to, you know, look at this list and say, okay, well, I see a few little gaps in there, and I know we have this one or two things in our collection.

And I would be happy, on a Friday afternoon, when I'm not on the reference desk, or anything like that, to go and pull it out of my collection. And as long as I have the equipment and the ability to, you know, make a TIFF to the correct standards, and whatever else needs to be done, to just do that and just help pick away at this project. Because it doesn't -- you know, you don't have to sit there and wait for people to say, "I'm going to take this huge chunk." And just try to -- you know, because that can seem kind of daunting to just have -- and, yes, chunk is a technical term, by the way.

You know, I see people doing that, and I think it's great, but also you really can make a dent in something like this if you have the coordination to allow people who just want to put the time into it when they can, to just kind of help with it. And having a list like this, if that was the way it was treated, would allow people, at libraries like mine, to just help as we can.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I think a list would also help for those of us who don't do our own digitization, but have to send it out to the digital lab, if we say, you know, GPO would like for us to do this SuDoc number set, right here, because some times they

look at you and say, "Oh, well, that's not exciting. That's not fun. We don't want to digitize that."

So you know they want to do what is the biggest bang for their buck, and it would be really nice if we could say, you know, "This is seen by GPO as being important, and we would like to do this set."

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. The thing that all of these recommendations are, again, knitted together is a sense to give to the library directors, that were voicing their concern, that GPO can do something, depository libraries can do something, in a coordinating fashion, to address their immediate and near immediate needs.

So we want this to be a call to go forward to those that said, basically, we need help now. Yeah, we heard you. Here's what we're going to do in the near-term, mid-term and long-term. Just so that, again, this idea -- we're all going to die, end of story -- is not really the dominant narrative any more in this discussion. That's what we're hoping for, anyway.

SALLY HOLTERHOFF: And I think that might help to explain this to higher ups and your University. We're participating in this Government project. They need us to do this. Rather than we just thought up this idea in the library, and lets do it. But it's more like, you know, that

just sounds better. It sounds like you're doing something
that you've been asked to do, and it's a big project and you
can publicize it somehow, get credit.

JESSE SILVA: Jesse Silva, University of California,
Berkley. I'm looking at this list and wondering what's going
to happen down the road? Is each library going to have their
own digitization projects housed at their own libraries, and
so we're going to end up with a bunch of silos of the
different pieces of the collection scattered around the
country? Or are they going to be included in something like
FDsys, so that they're all in one central location, or both?

KATRINA STIERHOLZ: This is Katrina Stierholz, from
the St. Louis Fed. I would hope both. I mean, I think that's
part of the coordination piece that GPO could provide
leadership on is, here are the standards. Here's what we
like. We want the TIFFS. And they could do it all. And if
perhaps coordination means having six different databases that
they search for this information, if might be -- you know,
that works, whatever. But I think GPO would be the ones who
provide the leadership and the coordination.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. I would certainly hope that it be in more than one
place, you know. Yes, that's part of the collaboration and
the coordinating, is that there be at least ten library
servers that have all of the TIFFs.

JOHN SHULER: And -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. And I think I've heard the Superintendent of Documents say several times that he's extremely interested in involving a distributed mechanism of preservation and digitization in the system. And I don't think -- unless you're going to stand up now and say so -- I don't think he's going to back off from that. So we have to take him at his word somehow.

RIC DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. John, I was going to disagree with you completely -- just kidding. (Laughter.)

Justin, I want to thank you for your comments a second ago as well. I think going back and re-examining this from a list perspective will also do something else. It will enable us to all go back and look at the priorities for digitization that GPO currently has up on the digitization web page. Look at areas to see where various digitization efforts also may be overlapping; are we duplicating effort. And also look at, again, the standards that are being used by the community, in relation to the standards that GPO looks at.

For the gentleman from California, who just mentioned that, I agree with what Council said. I think we need redundancy. I think that we need to look at the standards, for both preservation and access, to see what we certainly want to ingest into FDsys and not duplicate effort, but I think it's very critical to have multiple copies.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Just as depository libraries are expecting GPO to share preservation masters and access derivatives with them, I would hope that libraries that do these digitization projects would go the other way and share their preservation masters and access derivatives with GPO, so that these can be stored in FDsys, so that we have the best of both worlds, and there's cross pollination in both directions.

JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I'm really excited about this recommendation, and I thank Council for doing this and thank GPO for supporting this. I just want to let people know -- mostly, the audience -- that there's a project called "Book Ripper." And it's, if you Google it, it's "bkrpr" without the vowels, but it's a very cheap way to quickly scan books with off-the-shelf technology. And it's a pretty neat project, so check it out. Thanks.

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia. I'd like to echo James' compliments. This is a very exciting recommendation. And a suggestion I have is to use the survey that was done several years ago, asking the library community what the priorities for titles to be digitized, to somehow connect this with this coordinating effort through GPO. As I imagine, making the arguments to my administration for why certain things should be digitized over something else, I think the backing of the library community

to state what these priorities are is great leverage. To be
able to say it needs to be the monthly catalog or the serial
set, or whatever, instead of something else, because there is
that duplication argument. Why should we do this, if someone
else is doing that; so I think if there's some way to couple
those two things together.

Also for directors that were feeling surveyed out,
actually doing something with one of our previous surveys
could have some good P.R. to it, I suppose, too. Thank you.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois,
Chicago. Allow me one more step out onto the metaphor ice
here -- and Katrina will love this. I think what we have in
the system is a liquidity problem. (Laughter) It's for you.

What our collections are, basically -- our legacy
collection is frozen liquidity, and that we are now living in
an economy where the information is quite freely exchanged.
And what we haven't come to terms with yet is, how to release
this material and these traditional collections in such a way
that protects the investment of the local institutions, but,
allows the institutions to share it readily. (Laughter.) You
want to stop me?

(To Council Member) So exactly where I'm going,
Sister.

What we're talking about here -- what we're talking
about here is a bailout tarp approach to our liquidity

problem, in our very librarian-like fashion. Thank you very
much. I'll be in Vegas next week.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch. I can't even speak
after that. University of Kentucky Libraries. Back to the
Registry. Since GPO is heavily involved with these groups of
agencies or talking about these projects, could you -- I don't
know how to say this. Could you encourage them, help them,
actually type in their information on the Registry, so that we
would know what they're doing, (laughter) because it becomes
very labor intensive for us to go out to all the websites and
see what -- you know, check all the agencies, who is doing
what. It would be great if that Registry reflected all that
activity.

ROBIN HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Yeah.
We have encouraged, led them right up to the river, and said
"Please" -- John can fill in the rest -- "please, drink from
this." The problem with us actually inputting them is, when
they need to be updated, then that's -- that is a problem.

But there's no reason I can't have James go back and
say, "Hey, there's this group of librarians who really want
you to participate." Folks from NAL already do and various
other institutions.

We're also trying to lead the FLICC group into going
along with the Registry approach versus the digital master
piece-by-piece approach. But it's moving a little bit slower

than you would like. So I can -- we can, of course, renew efforts. We think that we've gotten several new agencies participating by just doing the outreach that we do, through the various digitization groups, but we can put more emphasis on that, definitely.

TIM BYRNE: Tim Byrne. I would like to mention when the GWLA Federal Technical Report Digitization Project got started, we really wanted to make sure that we were not taking on something that the agency was planning themselves. And that really meant going to each agency and tracking down, you know, who was responsible, what they were planning, because I think a lot of people think that the digital registry is for things that you're actually starting and working on. And it doesn't always have what the agencies are really planning in the future.

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond. Just a suggestion, and it seems that to have a registry of people of interest in projects, or actually occurring projects, and binding that in some fashion with the grants process, seems to be -- the way to, you know -- not, you know, force the water down the throat, but come about as close as you can get. That if you're going to take this grant on, this is your obligation. Make us -- make it clear what it is you're doing, and I have a sense that might be the way to pull those two things together.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to respond to that, because a couple years ago we were in discussions with IMLS about doing just that, as one of the grant requirements and part of their reporting out, that they would have to put an entry into the registry, and that sort of fizzled, but that might be something for us to review again.

MARY MARTIN: Mary Martin, Libraries of Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California. I wanted to say that, you know, I really like the ideas being expressed in these first three recommendations. As a private institution, we have a concern about funding for digitization projects, and while we're -- we're willing to do it, but the chances of us getting an LSCA grant, or any other kind of Federal grant are very low. We're not even allowed to apply for them. I'll tell you the truth, we're not even allowed to apply for them.

But there are funding agencies out there, foundations that issue grants, and there's quite a huge community of those types of funders. And it would be nice to have a little bit more of a connection here. It seems like we're asking of GPO, in terms of creating a list of libraries that want to digitize, and to be frank, you know, it's not GPO that's using these documents. It's the library community. So I think it would be more up to us to determine what the priorities are and then create opportunities and exchange information on what would be the priorities for digitization

projects.

And one last thing, I just -- I can't let number one go. I've been trying to, but I really think that the library communities -- I realize we've been arguing and squabbling over this for 15 years, or however -- I've been here 20, so I guess 20 years. And we haven't come to any conclusions, and I'm assuming that is why you are suggesting that we hire an outside consultant or that GPO hire an outside consultant, but I'm asking myself, okay. if that's going to take six months, a year, 18 months, what's going to happen in the meantime?

There are a lot of recommendations on the table from library organizations, and we had a group called -- of all things -- COMA at one time -- how appropriate. (Laughter.) And maybe we need to go back -- maybe the organizations need to go back to the drawing board and start figuring out how to cooperate and agree on this.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Again, these recommendations are just the beginning, and if you look at them, and especially the last one, we are strongly encouraging GPO to take concrete steps in the next few months to begin to address some of the basic issues raised by the different people over the last three days, from the last few weeks. So, again, as David pointed out, we're trying to do two very difficult things; deal with the problems immediately and deal with the problems in a deliberative

long-term fashion. And sometimes it's not going to be enough
for everybody, but we hope we can come to a compromise in a
collaborative way.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. I would say that the reason that you mentioned, is the
reason why we have to have a non-biased outside consultant.
It's been 20 years, and we don't have a consensus. I really
don't think we're going to get one in a month.

So I think we need an outside consultant who is
going to give us three or four choices, and this was mentioned
in one of the Council meetings. You know, at least then you
have, well, this is the better than that one. So, you know,
maybe then we can get a little more of a community consensus.

And I believe that Council feels very strongly that
this meeting, while it has been extremely important and very
productive, is only a small representation of the depository
community and the stakeholders in the depository program.

The public libraries that were here were maybe four
or five. The State libraries, again, four or five, because of
budget cuts in funding. Yet, the public is a major
stakeholder in the Federal Depository Program and the public
and the State libraries are the people who serve them the
most. The archiving of the academic libraries is certainly
very important and a very valuable part of the FDLP, but so is
the service part that the public libraries do. And we need to

know what they need, as well as what the academic libraries need.

TIM BYRNE: Council further recommends that GPO report at the Fall 2009 meeting on efforts to simplify the discard process. The depository discard process is extremely time consuming and burdensome for both selectives and regionals, as pressure grows on both large and small selectives to reduce collection size. The process needs to be speedier and less intensive.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I'd like to flush out our thinking on this a little bit, and I don't know if we were all in agreement.

JOHN SHULER: No, David, you're kidding. He's showing us weakness. Don't do that. (Laughter.)

DAVID CISMOWSKI: You mean we're not humble?

JOHN SHULER: Oh, yes, I forgot that part.

DAVID CISMOWSKI: The one sentence is very vague, and I think purposely so. One of the difficulties with the discard process -- and I struggle with the discard process every day as a regional -- is that right now the rules for discard are determined by each individual regional. GPO, except for a few, very, very, broad dictates that are in the Handbook, assigns to regionals the responsibility to develop discard procedures that suit that region or their state.

And what I was sensing from a lot of the comments here is that, first of all, there is a misperception in the community that GPO dictates discard procedures. And second of all, there seemed to be a call for some kind of national uniform standard for discard procedures. Now, I personally do not agree with that second -- I don't agree with either of those points. First of all, the first point is absolutely not true. Second of all, I think that it should be a State or a regional decision as to how stringently to require selectives to list things, because each regional is different.

Some regionals only came into the system in the 1980s, and they do not have a very deep tangible collection. Maybe they don't want a deep tangible collection, but maybe they do. That should be their decision, a region's decision.

And so what we're trying to get at here in the vagueness is, yes, it should be simplified, but we don't -- at least I don't have any magic answer to how it should be simplified. Maybe there are technologies out there that could automate these processes somehow, but whether the simplification can be mandated by GPO, or by a consensus of the community, is a real dangerous approach, I think.

MARY MARTIN: Mary Martin, Claremont Colleges. Thank you, David. He's my regional librarian, and I really appreciate that we can have conversations about discard processes. One of the last things you mentioned, about a

technology that would make it a speedier process, reminded me.
Yesterday, I went to the -- I went to the section on the
deselection process.

And, you know, there is an automated system out
there that allows you to deselect and select, that is really
slick and really smooth. It's one of the things we're
thinking of using, because my predecessor had someone box up
boxes and boxes and boxes of documents with just the SuDoc.
She said that's all we needed was the SuDoc.

So I'm looking at, you know, if I have a conscience
about discarding this stuff, having to open up the boxes to
find out what the titles are, because the needs and offers
list requires SuDoc and title.

So it seems like there might be some technology out
there. I'm not sure who could do it, but the technology
almost lends itself to a type of union catalog, for who holds
particular items in areas, so that we wouldn't have to go
through this process.

So I really appreciate this. I don't know that GPO
could actually do that, but, you know, there is technology
that I think could speed this process up.

LAURA HORNE: Laura Horne, University of Richmond.
I'm going to echo a comment I made, I think two days ago,
State plans. What are we going to do about them? I would
like to know what Council -- have you had conversations about

them? Do they need to be revised? Should this be strategy
for how to simply for Fall? I'd just like to hear some
feedback on what these are doing for us. And if this truly is
the mechanism for making those regional decisions, how are we
acknowledging them and how are we modifying them if they do
need modification?

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago. I echo Robin's earlier statement that you can do
every bloody thing possible, in regards to leading people to a
State plan, but if the culture does not have any energy in it,
any tugs and pulls to honor the State plan, then it becomes a
dusty document. And we're really left with the same situation
we have now, so I think some other kind of energy needs to
flood the system, if you will, to reanimate the corpse. And I
thought of a term, Robin, a moment ago: Library Whisperer.
(Laughter.) Thank you.

CLIF BROADWORTH: Clif Broadworth, Oklahoma State
Department of Libraries. The one thing that I am a little bit
afraid about on this one here, is that in Oklahoma we do have
a needs and offers process that works very well for our state.
We query all of our selectives all the time to make sure they
know how to do it, and that they feel it's an easy process.
So I would be a little bit leary about going in and changing
something for everybody, that have some states that work fine.
thank you.

TIM BYRNE: Clif, if I could ask you quickly, if with your current process, if you had a library that was deciding that they were going to discard a large part of their collection, would you still think it's a simplified -- or a simple process?

CLIF BROADWORTH: We've had that, actually. We've had two libraries within the state that are university libraries that their directors felt they didn't need to be part of the system. So Steve and I talked to their directors. We talked to the librarians. And we were able to come to a compromise with them that they still put the stuff on the needs and offers list. They send us the list. We go over it. Give them the minimum number of days that are required, and they discard it, if we don't want it. So, I mean, we've had two libraries that have discarded -- I don't know. I'm guessing -- 70 percent of their tangible collection.

SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. As a former selective in Oklahoma, I would like to second Clif's comments. When I was doing discards in Oklahoma, it was very simple. It was very well explained. It was -- there was no question how to do it. I received a response to my discard list in a very timely manner -- you know, usually 30 days -- that said, yes, you're allowed to discard, or, no, these are the things we want. And the other thing is, that all of the selectives in Oklahoma look at those

discard lists. It's not just the regionals, and we're given
opportunities to add to our collection, as well as the
regional was given an opportunity to add to their collections.
It worked very effectively.

JOHN SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago. I think this is a perfect example, demonstration,
indication of what the issue is. Parts of the body are alive
and well and thriving. I don't think those are the parts that
we want to shock back into the system. However, if there's a
way through this recommendation and a way that Council can
work with GPO and the community to create 52 Oklahomas or 52
Michigans, then I think that is what the community is asking.
Am I wrong about that? I mean, we go back to a marriage
counseling kind of mode. There are some broken relationships
out there, and we're not out to fix the relationships that
work. We're out to make the relationships that work grow in
number.

KATHY LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco. We
heard a lot about best practices, when -- including the person
that's standing up right there in Michigan and Oklahoma. So
couldn't we use this as a recommendation and collect best
practices and then get those distributed for people who are
having trouble with the current structure.

KEN WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin, Connecticut State Library.
I think we also have to recognize that for many of the

regional depositories, it's also a manpower issue. And I
would certainly -- it would benefit us if GPO, when approached
by some of the selectives, would help make it clear to some of
them that we're not trying to stand in their way, and there
are different methods of dealing with the discards, but some
of it is truly logistical.

One of the directors of my -- well, the director of
my university library came back from a meeting with the Public
Printer, called me down and said, "I was told you could make
this process faster." Well, you know, I'm dealing with a
major public library going out of being a selective. I'm
going with a university who wants to cut their collection by
at least half.

It's a manpower issue for us. It wasn't a process.
We have a very good process, but when you're trying to make
sure that at an item level -- and we don't have all the item
level information in our collection, right now -- that it
takes time.

And I think we've got to be able to communicate back
to some of these directors that we're doing our best, but we
don't get the manpower we need for some of this. And that's
what some of us, particularly in public institutions or
nonacademic institutions, where we don't have students to draw
on for labor, we have really tight budgets right now. It's
just going to be a process. So I would appreciate even some

support from GPO in spelling that out to folks.

ANN SANDERS: Ann Sanders from the Library of
Michigan. This -- as this is written, this looks to me like
this is a sop to the academic deans and directors who are
here. We're going to, you know, make you all feel better that
you spent money to come to Tampa for a good reason. That's
really what this looks like to me.

I don't think that's what you intend. It's obvious
that's not what you intend, from what you've already said.
You know, as a State who does the best we can with what we
have and has had some very nice things said about it, I
appreciate that.

And I'm kind of tired of being penalized for doing
the best I can. And I would -- we also have a saying in
Michigan that "Wherever two or more are gathered, you will
discuss disposal." (Laughter.)

I've spent a lot of time at this meeting thinking of
more ways to make that more flexible, and I think that
elephant in the room is still that there are regionals that
don't do that. And we have gathered some -- I don't know if
they're best practices or not, but there's some regional web
pages.

I know they're kind of out of date right at the
moment, because they're about to move to the FDLP community
site. There's some broken links there, but there's a

gathering of all the State's disposal plans that are available, or were available. So some of that stuff is already out there.

It's just I think you need to rethink what you want to get out of this, and say that, rather than say something that's so vague it can be used to placate some people and beat others above the head and shoulders, I think, because I don't think either one of those things is what you want to do.

SANDY McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, University of Kentucky Libraries. I wonder, if following on what Ann said, if some rewording that gets more at making the process more effective and brings to bear some technological support, maybe at GPO, maybe somewhere else. Helping regionals maybe make the process more effective. I don't know that "simplify" is anything one would ever say about a SuDoc collection and collection managing that, but I think "effective" might be a better word.

CINDY ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. As I mentioned the other day, this is one of the areas that the law gives us a lot of flexibility. And I don't think, David, it would be our intent to take that away and suggest that everybody do it the same way.

I also mentioned that this was one of the findings of the regional report, and we were going to take a look at this very closely. And as a matter of fact, I think Gwen has

already put something out on Regional-L, and she shared some
of that back with me.

What I was sort of envisioning as a first step was
putting everything in a matrix and sharing that, so people
will know what others are doing. And then we can do some
brainstorming on how we can work effectively and take a look
at what technologies are out there and, maybe, streamline the
process and maybe have some other outcomes from this as well,
like identifying fugitives for GPO.

BERNADINE ABBOTT HODUSKI: Bernadine Abbott Hoduski
from Montana. From 1965 through 1969, I was a selective
depository librarian in Missouri. We had no regional. And we
didn't have a regional until after I had been gone for several
years. My library spent considerable money on allowing me to
bind almost everything in the collection. Probably one of the
few places that bound every hearing and every USGS series, and
a bunch of other stuff.

And I made the mistake of going back to visit that
library later -- don't ever do that -- and the librarian very
proudly told me that she had gotten rid of half the
collection. I almost fainted on the spot, but then she said,
"No, no. I sent it to the regional."

Now, as somebody who was very close to the faculty
of that institution, who really guided what we selected, I did
not add selections unless the biologist, the economist, the

historians, they wanted these things. And I thought, Well,
what about my poor faculty that I left behind that really
wanted this, but it was comforting to know that the regional
at the University of Missouri at Columbia was keeping these
things.

So if you -- if a selective makes that terrible
decision, as a documents librarian, at the direction of their
director, who may not have the first idea of what's in that
collection or even care, you have a comfort that it's at the
regional and you can send your scholar or you can borrow it
back. So we need to think about the people using the
collection; the geologist, the biologist, the historians, the
associate. Those people are the ones we're doing this for, so
when people are talking about discarding things, it really
scares me if it's not done in a way to protect the users.

And I know the regionals have a tremendous job to
do, and I'm very grateful to anyone who agrees to be a
regional. I think we should all nominate them for sainthood
and raise money for their retirement parties.

But, anyway, I'm really -- the other thing, I think
if we had a complete catalog and a complete inventory and
every doc was bar coded, you could set up a national system
through GPO, and not just in the state but the whole country
would know that this is available, and if it had something in
there about the qualify. My hearings that I bound were

totally complete, and I made the effort to complete them,
including the index. They're a lot more valuable than unbound
hearings.

So there's a quality thing here of how good are the
copies, are they complete, do you have the whole run, and so
on, that needs to be known. And I think if we're going to
share, we need to share across the whole country and not just
within states.

TIM BYRNE: I think we sort of have a preliminary
list of some of the other recommendations that we will be
working on. So there will be something dealing with item
selections, quality control, public access assessments, dark
archives, and weeded material.

So I think it's the point that we actually start
closing down this meeting. Anything else Council wants to
bring up before we get into that?

GWEN SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of
Hawaii. I would like to thank all the outgoing Council
members who -- Denise Stevens, Denise Davis, Katrina
Stierholz, Ken Wiggin, and our outgoing chair, Tim Byrne,
thank you very much for your service. We enjoyed working with
you. (Applause.)

TIM BYRNE: I would like to thank the whole Council
for all the support and work that you've all done in the last
year. I'd like to thank GPO for all the cooperation and

support we've gotten from them. And especially thank Lance for -- and all of his people for the work they've done in this conference. (Applause.)

If there's no other comments, business or anything, I'll declare this meeting adjourned. (Applause.)

(Session concluded and meeting adjourned at 12 p.m.)