

Recommendations of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer 1985 - 1989



FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM
MAKE THE CONNECTION | <http://www.fdlp.gov>

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL
TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER 1985–1989
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
1985	4
Spring Meeting	5
Fall Meeting	17
1986	22
Spring Meeting	23
Fall Meeting	32
1987	46
Spring Meeting	47
Fall Meeting	50
1988	57
Spring Meeting	58
Fall Meeting	64
1989	73
Spring Meeting	74
Fall Meeting	81

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the recommendations of the Depository Library Council from the Spring and Fall Meetings 1985–1989. The recommendations are presented in sections sorted by year, then further divided by spring and fall sessions. This document replaces the minutes previously found on the Web pages listed below.

Please Note: This document serves only as an archival record of what was previously published. Links referenced in this document may not exist, may be superseded, or changed.

1985

Spring Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp85.html

Fall Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa85.html

1986

Spring Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp86.html

Fall Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa86.html

1987

Spring Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp87.html

Fall Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa87.html

1988

Spring Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp88.html

Fall Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa88.html

1989

Spring Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rsp89.html

Fall Meeting: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/rfa89.html

1985

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, MARCH 27-29, 1985 • ALBUQUERQUE, NM

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council congratulates Dan MacGilvray upon his appointment as GPO Historian and expresses its appreciation for the superb assistance given the Council over the past years, we wish him well in his new position.

Rationale: None required.

Response

The new GPO Historian, Dan MacGilvray, accepts with thanks the congratulations of the Depository Library Council. He considers it a great privilege to have worked with such dedicated people over the past nine years. Thanks is also expressed by the newly married GPO Historian and his wife, Marian, for the delightful wedding present so thoughtfully provided by Council members.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council thanks the Public Printer, the Superintendent of Documents, and the Director and staff of the Library Program Service for their efforts in providing more timely information and superior accommodations for this meeting. We appreciate their support in assisting us to carry out our revised meeting format.

Rationale: None required.

Response

The Public Printer and his staff are delighted over the acknowledged success of the Spring '85 Council Meeting and are gratified to have the thanks of the Depository Library Council for GPO's efforts in providing advance information and superior accommodations.

Recommendation 3

Given the urgency of the issue of updating the GPO tapes, the Depository Library Council recommends that GPO proceed as quickly as possible with its plans to develop specifications for and fund a contract to revise and update its retrospective cataloging records in accordance with the attached proposal.

Rationale: Proposal to Correct and Update the GPO Cataloging Records

The Government Printing Office has been producing cataloging records on OCLC since June 1976. The records are used to produce GPO's Monthly Catalog, and are available for sale through LC/CDS. The file presently contains approximately 200,000 records.

These records have been created under variable standards, with continually improving quality control. This project proposes to improve the quality and accuracy of the retrospective records so that they can be accepted by most libraries with little review. In order to ensure continuing quality, GPO should also begin procedures for reporting and correcting errors found in the future.

A more complete description of this proposal, and of the current state of the GPO records is being published in *Government Information Quarterly*, v. 2, no. 1 (January 1985), "The Government Printing Office Cataloging Records: Opportunities and Problems," by Judy Myers.

General Guidelines - 1. Conduct the project under the guidance of an advisory board consisting of representatives from the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Joint Committee on Printing. This group should contribute to the standards, procedures, and quality control assurances for the project. 2. Consider the needs of those who have already used the records, either from the tapes or from their cataloging utility. Provide and describe mechanisms for using the corrected tapes to replace older records in library files and other data bases. 3. Document the procedures, quality standards, and the results of the cleanup. 4. Distribute the corrected tapes through the Cataloging Distribution Service of the Library of Congress.

Typos and Other Random Errors - Recover as many as possible of the corrections made by GPO to the Monthly Catalog, but not transferred to the cataloging tapes. Check records on OCLC which were corrected there after being entered or used by GPO, correct the GPO record as necessary.

AACRII Flip - Do a computer flip of names to AACR II form, check the product for bad flips, correct as necessary.

Names - An estimated 30,000 names (this figure represents occurrences, not unique names) on the GPO tapes are not in the LCNA. These are either pre-1981 records or newer records with errors. Computer-match the name headings (including series names) used on the GPO cataloging tapes against the LC Name Authority file, correct errors on cataloging records or establish names in LCNA as necessary.

Uniform Titles - Identify, correct errors, establish in LCNA.

Number - Problem: Numbers not on records or not in correct MARC field; errors in numbers; multiple numbers belonging to individual parts of the title but not identified as such. Add to all records which lack them: OCLC Number (missing on about 5,000 records), SuDoc number (missing on about 100 records), and GPO Depository Item Number. Identify and correct errors in Item numbers and SuDoc Numbers (many of these corrections have been printed in subsequent editions of the MC, but have not been transferred to the tapes of cataloging records). When there are multiple numbers, such as stock numbers for separate volumes of a single title, identify which volume each belongs to. Tag all numbers correctly---when GPO began to catalog, MARC fields had not been established for many types of numbers used by GPO.

Subjects - Problems include 1) Subjects which are not valid LC subject headings, but which are tagged as LC headings. 2) Subjects which are tagged as locally assigned headings in LC form, but which are valid LC headings 3) Records which have no valid LC subject heading, after the headings on the records are re-tagged. Procedure to correct: identify mistagged subjects by computer matching the GPO tapes against the LC subject tapes (to the extent that this is possible), and/or by producing an alphabetical printout of the subjects together with the tags and the record format (book, serial), and checking this list. Correct typographical errors on records, re-tag headings as necessary, identify records which are left with no valid LC subject headings and do subject cataloging for them.

Multiple records - Problem: The GPO tapes contain many availability records which are not true cataloging records. These are records for individual parts of multi-part monographs and records for single issues of serials. The annual Serials Supplement tapes also contain repeated records for continuing periodicals. Comment: Availability records will appear in future issues of the Monthly Catalog. These records are useful to tape subscribers such as DIALOG who may be interested in availability information for a particular issue of a serial or a monograph. The issue-specific information (such as the pagination) may also be useful in library circulation systems. Therefore, the availability records should not be deleted from the GPO tapes. They should be identified and linked to the cataloging record for that title. When a record for a continuing periodical is superseded by the next year's Serial Supplement record, a delete record should be issued for the superseded version of the record.

Microforms - Problems: 1 Materials that are received by GPO in printed form and converted to microfiche for distribution are cataloged by GPO from the printed version. The catalog record produced does not match the publication received by depository libraries. These records need to be revised to provide the correct description. 2. Materials distributed by GPO in both paper and microform, under two Item numbers, are also cataloged only in paper. An additional record is needed for the microfiche version, each with the appropriate form of description and the appropriate Item Number. 3. Materials distributed primarily in paper, with some copies distributed in microform due to shortages, are also cataloged only in paper. An additional record is needed for the microfiche version, and either a note in a local data field or tape documentation (which notes the occurrence of each record of this type) is necessary to advise libraries that they need to check their holdings and select the record appropriate to the form in which they received the material. Procedure to correct: Catalog the microform record to the record for the printed version.

Assorted Errors and Inconsistencies - Identify and advise GPO of errors or inconsistencies in such areas as use of the 533 field, brackets around the GMD, consistent use of MARC format for similar material within a series.

Tape Documentation - Documentation should also be provided for distribution with the tapes, noting, for example, which MARC fields and formats appear on each tape, the occurrence of new fields or field definitions (such as the use of the 086 field instead of the 500 field for SuDoc Numbers), and the manner in which duplicate cataloging records for multi-part works and serials can be identified by users. The documentation should also describe the tape leader.

Future - GPO should pursue discussions with LC to initiate a subject authority cooperative program, similar to the name authority cooperative program. GPO should provide acceptable cataloging records for all materials distributed to depository libraries, including such materials as those provided by the Department of Energy. GPO should seek a means for providing these records cooperatively. GPO should institute an ongoing mechanism for correcting all types of errors, concurrent with the cleanup of the older records. The error correction programs should have the following elements: 1) Procedures for public reporting to GPO of errors and missing records, by individual libraries and bibliographic utilities. 2) Administrative authorization and procedures within GPO are corrected in the appropriate places. 3) Guidelines for distribution of error corrections. All corrections should be transmitted to OCLC and provided on GPO tapes (errors discovered before a tape is distributed should be corrected on tapes of error corrections). 4) The error correction mechanism should be documented and widely publicized.

Status of this proposal - The GPO expressed its intention to fund a contract to revise and update its retrospective cataloging records, generally in accordance with this outline, in September 1984. The status of the project is again in doubt, however, due to the appointment of a new Public Printer.

Comments are welcome, to Judy Myers, Documents Coordinator, University of Houston - University Park Library, Houston, TX 77004.

Response

Library Program Service staff have prepared a work statement for the proposed project of updating the LC tapes containing GPO cataloging records. This work statement can easily be developed into formal specifications. The proposed project contains ten major provisions, some of which in turn are broken down into several functional areas. A great deal of the project would entail manual searching of files, examination of documents, and re-keying records. The tapes cannot be updated by a simple process of matching and merging tapes. In some of the proposals's parts, especially those dealing with subject headings, names, and MARC tagging, an immense number of retrospective records would have to be changed as a result of new or changed standards, although the information in the record was correct at the time it was input. Because of the vast volume of data involved and because of the large amount of manual processing required, as well as computer processing, costs will be high. GPO cannot issue a contract to perform this project without first receiving both authorization and an appropriation from Congress.

Recommendation 4

Council recommends that GPO commit itself to playing a leading role in addressing the problem of government documents statistics. Council recommends that GPO convene a meeting to be attended by groups which have a vested interest in the collection of such statistics, e.g., the National Center for Education Statistics (HEGIS), the American Library Association Headquarters, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Library Administration and Management Association, the Government Documents Round Table, the Joint Committee on Printing, the Association of Research Libraries, the American Association of Law Libraries, etc. to discuss definition standardization, and reporting of government documents statistics.

Rationale: Rationale provided with original recommendation. See Morton article in *Government Publications Review*, vol. 11, no. 3 (1984).

Response

Due to the complexity of the subject; the number of interested parties; an apparent lack of consensus among these parties; and, considering the timeframe for the 1987 Biennial Survey, it is felt that a meeting, or series of meetings, of all interested parties as recommended by Council, would not lend itself to a timely agreement on statistics.

GPO has met with those groups that have a vested interest in the collection of Government documents statistics. These interested parties have been asked for their comments as to the type, method, and definitions to be used in the 1987 Biennial Survey. They have also been asked to develop some draft survey questions.

Final development of the Biennial Survey will commence as soon as GPO has gathered their responses. At the request of GODORT's statistical Task Force, the time period for comments has been extended until the mid-Winter meeting of ALA in January 1986.

GPO is committed to using the Biennial Survey as a principal means of gathering information from depository libraries. The final decision on which statistics to collect will be part of the development of the 1987 Biennial Survey.

Recommendation 5

Council recommends that GPO present to Council at its Fall 1985 meeting a status report about the planning for the 1987 Biennial Survey.

Rationale: Rationale provided with original recommendation.

Response

Although the planning for the 1987 Biennial Survey was only initiated late this summer, certain fundamental principles have already been established: 1) the survey will take place during Spring 1987; 2) answers will be encoded on optical scanable response sheets by the libraries (this will minimize manual handling; 3) software will be created, which will allow for cross tabulation of responses; 4) future surveys will not vary significantly from the 1987 survey (allowing for a comparison of surveys over a length of time; 5) sampling conversion tables, a glossary of terms and concise directions will be employed to minimize the workload on the libraries to facilitate statistical gathering.

Given the tremendous diversity in size, scope and functions among depository libraries, the survey instrument needs to be as flexible and as user friendly as possible.

In analyzing the results of past surveys, it was found that questions are asked, which many libraries find difficult to answer, survey responses received tend to be of little utility.

Some decisions have already been made as to the content of the survey. The survey will consist of an answer sheet, a self-addressed return envelope, and a questionnaire. The questionnaire will be divided into 3 sections. Section 1 will contain the first 8 questions of the 1985 survey and the information gathered from these questions will be used for the Committee Print and GPO records. Section 2 will contain approximately 6 questions of particular usefulness for the inspection team (access, facilities, etc.) Section 3 will contain approximately 5 statistical questions. This last group of questions can be crosstabulated to yield a number of different statistics and, hopefully, an accurate profile of the Depository Library System.

Since Council has offered to help with the planning for the 1987 Biennial Survey, GPO would like to suggest that Council appoint a representative to review the proposed statistical packages being submitted by various interested parties for inclusion in Section 3 of the 1987 Biennial Survey. This representative could then make a recommendation to GPO before the 1986 Spring Meeting of Council.

Recommendation 6

The Council recommends that separate item numbers be established for reprints and preprints of GPO publications. The policy of providing separate item numbers for these materials would save selective depositories high overhead costs of processing and housing would save GPO the cost of printing and distributing unselected publications.

Rationale: Many selective depositories have limited space and personnel. Their limited resources would be more effectively utilized in providing greater access to their collections than in processing and housing duplicate publications.

Response

See response to RECOMMENDATION 7. [Editor's note]

Recommendation 7

The Council requests that the Superintendent of Documents reconsider the position that articles reprinted from previously distributed depository publications are separate publications. Declaration that reprints are publications which may be handled as superseded documents would allow more flexibility to selective and regional depositories.

Rationale: The declaration that reprints are publications which may be handled as superseded documents would allow all libraries to dispose of reprints of materials already in their collections when the reprints are no longer in demand. This would also allow the use of these materials in current awareness or other programs which aid in the promotion of depository libraries.

Response

Council Recommendations 6 and 7 address the issue of reprints, which are defined as journal articles and other reissued excerpts from government publications that have already been distributed to depositories. The Superintendent of Documents has analyzed this issue and considered several possible solutions, each of which has certain costs and implications for service.

There are three basic concerns that a viable solution must satisfy. First, many depository libraries find these reprints useful, so a blanket policy to discontinue their distribution should be avoided. Second, the regional and selective depositories need relief from the burden of processing and housing unneeded reprints. Third, the dollar and labor costs to GPO of establishing item numbers for reprint would be substantial, especially during this time of limited budget staffing levels; moreover, this option would provide no relief to the regional depositories.

Recommendation 7 offers a good, practical approach in terms of handling reprints as superseded documents. Following this approach, GPO will continue to classify the reprints, list them in Monthly Catalog, and distribute them under existing item

numbers. However, depository librarians will now have the flexibility to handle reprints in the way that is best suited to local library operations and user needs. For example, reprints may be routed for current awareness purposes, entered into a vertical file, or simply treated as superseded documents. Depositories are not obliged to maintain a shelflist, catalog, or to otherwise keep records on superseded documents.

During the summer of 1986, LPS expects to have available the services of a graduate student on loan, who will study this issue in depth and prepare a report with recommendations. Until this report is ready, however, this approach should greatly alleviate the reprint problem for both regional and selective depositories.

Recommendation 8

The Council recommends that GPO be encouraged to provide as much selectivity to depository libraries as possible. The appending of new publication series to existing item numbers is costly and cumbersome for depository libraries as well as increasing costs to GPO by distributing publications not desired by selective depositories.

Rationale: The savings to GPO in not printing and distributing undesired material should outweigh the costs of additional item numbers and/or surveys. The selective depository concept is that these libraries are permitted to select those materials they wish to receive. Although the addition of new series to existing item numbers allows for the expedient distribution of new publications in the depository system, it does not allow selective depositories to “select” materials for their collections. New series should be given separate item numbers and surveyed as soon as possible. Because many libraries believe they are losing their ability to be selective, they have sometimes dropped publications they wished to receive in order to avoid receiving materials which had been added to an existing item number.

Response

LPS endeavors to balance library preferences against the countervailing factors of GPO system and resource limitations. In order to expand library selectivity and still preserve this balance, LPS proposes two approaches for alleviating the burden on libraries. The first, a short-term project, will be to ask depository librarians to identify the 50 most problematical item numbers in need of being split. Once identified, these item numbers will be researched by LPS and split-out where appropriate. The second project will be long-term in nature and will require additional resources not presently available in LPS. The project will be to create a provisional item number under every issuing agency in the List of Classes. Thus, when a new series title is received in LPS, copies will be ordered for all libraries that selected the provisional item number under that particular issuing agency. This procedure will ensure that interested libraries do not miss the initial printing and buys time for LPS to survey the libraries with a permanent item number. In cases where the library declines a publication received under a provisional item number, the library may return the publication at the library's expense to an address specified by GPO.

The first, short-term project will commence before the end of 1985. The second project can commence when two additional staff positions become available to LPS to perform the work involved.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recognizes that the current LPS procedure for surveying selective depositories for publication titles often results in distribution delays and missed publications causing gaps in depository collections. In October 1984, LPS proposed a plan for expanding the List of Classes structure (attached). Council recommends GPO develop an implementation plan for an expanded List of Classes structure; this plan should meet all legal and administrative requirements and be workable from a systems standpoint.

Rationale: (The following proposal was distributed at the Fall 1984 Council meeting.)

Expanding the List of Classes - Background - It has been past classification practice to use a set of standard class subdivisions for such publications as annual reports, general publications, posters, etc. For many agencies these standard subdivisions are already set up in the List of Classes under an item number, despite the fact that no publications may have actually been issued for several years. However, the item and SuDoc class numbers are nonetheless maintained in order to distribute a new issue, if and when it is printed, and in order to avoid the 3 to 4 month delay required to survey the depository libraries.

Proposal: LPS recommends establishing an item number and class in the List of Classes for each agency, using the standard subdivisions listed below:

(Bureau initial(s) & number)

- .1 = Annual Report
- .2 = General publications
- .3 = Bulletins
- .4 = Circulars
- .5 = Laws
- .6 = Regulations, rules, instructions
- .7 = Press releases
- .8 = Handbooks, manuals, guides
- .Forms: = Forms

and the following non-standard subdivisions:

Posters Charts Maps Telephone directories

Some agencies will continue to have one class for all reports and publications such as most of the Y 3's.

Disadvantage: Initially, this would be a substantial project that would generate an additional number of surveys and expand the size of such products as the List of Classes, the Union List, the number of item cards, etc.

Benefits:

1. Over the longer term, LPS would have predetermined ordering counts established for many more new publications, thereby obviating the need to constantly survey and reprint new publications. Cost savings to the Government would be substantial.
2. LPS would not have to delay the distribution of publications for the survey process, since most standard publications would fall under one of the standard classes or would be so closely associated with one that we will be able to distribute by assigning the related item number. Document processing would be greatly expedited and libraries would receive their document sooner.
3. Considerable warehouse space is required to store documents being held pending survey. Fortunately, there has been ample storage space for this purpose in the Eisenhower Avenue warehouse. However, with the impending move to main GPO, where storage space will be severely limited, the time is right to reduce the need for so many surveys, and this proposal would accomplish exactly that.

Requested action: Council is requested to consider this proposal and recommend for or against its adoption.

Response

The Library Programs Service fully endorses the concept of an expanded List of Classes structure. However, successful implementation of the expanded structure presupposes two conditions. The first condition is an enhanced computer system capability that will manage a file of some 10,000 item numbers without severely degrading DDIS processing and terminal response time. LPS is issuing a formal request to have the necessary enhanced computer system capability developed. The second condition is that all personnel vacancies in the LPS Depository Administration Branch be filled before undertaking the task of creating an additional 4,000 item numbers. When these two requisite conditions are met, LPS will commence implementation of the expanded List of Classes structure.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that a Fact Sheet be issued which summarizes GPO's response to the improvements listed in the GAO report entitled Government Printing Office's Depository Library Program (GAO/AFMD-85-19).

Response

Although GPO is not required to respond to the GAO audit, Council is interested in knowing which of the list of improvements GPO has already implemented, which it plans to implement and with which it does not agree. Council did not believe that they could take any action on the report until they had received some response from GPO. Some of the improvements have been considered and endorsed by past Councils, on others no action has been taken by Council.

GPO submitted for Congressional testimony the following responses to GAO recommendations:

GAO Recommendation: GAO recommended that more definitive written criteria be developed for federal agencies to use when evaluating publications for inclusion in the Depository Library Program. It was also recommended that procedures be established with other federal agencies to ensure that GPO receives lists of all publications printed by the agencies and that... GPO consider requesting the JCP to ask the GPO legislative committees to amend Title 44 to enable GPO to fund the costs of printing and binding publications not printed by GPO for depository distribution (GAO Report, p. 3).

GPO Response

GPO will assist the Joint Committee on Printing in issuing such guidelines as may be necessary. We will also prepare a circular letter to remind agencies of their responsibility under Title 44 for furnishing lists of publications they printed. GPO is considering GAO's recommendation regarding funding for printing and binding.

GAO Recommendation: To improve the classification process, GAO recommended that GPO institute quality control procedures, improve monitoring of the classification backlog, date-stamp publications upon receipt, increase supervision training for document classifiers, and implement an automated system to improve classification accuracy. GAO also recommended that official classification (by Library Program Service employees) should be done before copies are ordered for depository distribution.

GPO Response

Steps have been taken to improve the classification process. For example, an instruction manual was developed to provide rules and examples for assignment of new Superintendent of Documents classification numbers. The classification backlog has decreased from over 10,000 titles at the time GAO compiled data for the report to approximately 6,600 titles. The Superintendent of Documents is considering a plan to reorganize all classification technicians into a single unit to improve supervision and quality monitoring. Requirements are being developed for a new automated system which will provide the capability to track a document and will improve monitoring of classification backlog and classification accuracy. GPO is considering GAO's

recommendation on the date-stamping of publications upon receipt. The Library Programs Service was relocated to main GPO in mid-February. This will substantially improve communication with the GPO Customer Service Staff, which orders depository copies for most government documents printed by GPO.

GAO Recommendation: GAO's most significant recommendations concerning cataloging for government documents were: 1) improve procedures for cataloging performed under contract; 2) discontinue personal name authority work; and 3) implement a cooperative cataloging project with other federal agencies.

GPO Response

Procedures for cataloging documents under contract have been modified to reduce document handling, recordkeeping, and review by GPO. The contractor is now entering cataloging records directly into the On-line Computer Library Center (OCLC) computer system, and providing printouts (instead of worksheets) to GPO for review. The cataloging contract has been changed so that documents are submitted in batches, the contractor must ensure that the entire batch meets the quality standard in order to be paid. GPO officials recently met with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Library of Congress, and other parties to open discussions on cooperative cataloging for maps. We do not plan to broaden the cooperative catalog program until adequate resources, including an in-house cataloging system, are available to support it. GPO reaffirms its position on the GAO recommendation to discontinue name authority work. GPO committed itself to performing full name authority work when it became a partner in the Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) project administered by the Library of Congress. Performance of this work by GPO is part of being the national authority for cataloging government documents.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO investigate the use of a delete record plus local field, as opposed to the 500 field, for the linking note between corrected entries in the Monthly Catalog.* (*A delete record is the mechanism used on LC MARC tapes to indicate that present record deletes an earlier one.)

Rationale: The linking note in the printed Monthly Catalog might be better included in a local field, so that libraries loading tapes could search for and delete the note if they so desire. This would enable GPO to provide a high quality product consistent with its statutory mission.

Response

The Public Printer shares Council's concern for quality Monthly Catalog publication and subscriber tapes. Therefore, the Government Printing Office has submitted a proposal to the Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress, to develop a field that would display the obsolete Monthly Catalog identification number. GPO will keep Council apprised of progress on this task.

Recommendation 12

The Depository Library Council recommends that LPS review the paper "The Senate Numbering Scheme Revisited" by John A. McGeachy of North Carolina State University (attached). The DLC recommends that LPS then also poll the depository library community on its preference in using this numbering scheme in the SUDOC classification. This poll should query each depository as to which Senate items are selected, the desirability of separate item numbers for Senate hearings and prints, and its classification preference between the present scheme (S. PRT., S. Hrg., etc.) and the past policy of classification (e.g. Y 4. F76/2:W84).

Rationale: Two years ago a decision was made to change the manner by which Senate reports, hearings, and committee prints were classified. This change in classification policy has had adverse effects on retrieval and reference service in many depositories. Council wishes to reevaluate its previous recommendation concerning this classification policy, but feels more information about the needs of all depositories selecting these items is necessary before such a decision can be unilaterally made. With the information gathered from LPS's polling of the depository community, Council will be able to consider the issue at the October 1985 meeting and recommend changes if necessary.

Response

Since the results of the survey on Senate numbering have been tabulated and are being announced in AdNotes, V. 6, n.10, and_ the response to J. McGeachy's paper is also appearing in that issue, I have revised the response to Council Recommendation No. 12 as follows:

"The Senate Numbering Scheme Reviewed"; by John A. McGeachy has been reviewed by LPS staff and a response will be published in Administrative Notes, volume 6, number 10. In Administrative Notes, vol. 6, no. 5, LP polled the library community on its preference for continuing the use of Senate numbering in the SuDocs class, of returning to past practice, or using some other method of classifying Senate publications. Of 567 responses received, 22 were in favor of using some other method, 211 were in favor of returning to past practice, and 330 were in favor of continuing to use Senate numbering in the SuDocs classes. On 4 responses, no preference was indicated. In light of these results, no changes are contemplated in the classification of Senate publications.

LPS plans no changes in its assignment of Item numbers for Senate publications; therefore the survey did not query depositories on Item numbers.

Recommendation 13

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer review "SOD-13". In particular Council asks that both the dual distribution of reference works in paper and fiche (e.g., gazetteers, Official Gazette and the prohibition of fiche conversion for publications fewer than 15 pages in length be studied.

Rationale: The Depository Library Council feels that there should be greater flexibility within "SOD-13" so that certain titles and/or series can be considered on a case-by-case basis should a request be presented for the microfiche conversion of such titles. When the Superintendent of Documents Decision 13 was originally issued there was a fear within the library community that titles might be converted wholesale to microfiche without consideration of the usefulness or appropriateness of such titles in this format. Since that time acceptance of the microformat has grown and depositories have become accustomed to the medium. It now appears that there may be cost advantages both to the GPO and to depositories if certain titles are offered in both formats and depositories can choose the format appropriate for their library. Similarly, the prohibition of ficing titles of less than 15 pages was instituted in "SOD 13". However, the use of this arbitrary figure has resulted in certain series (e.g. GAO letters) being distributed in both paper and microfiche, dependent totally on pagination. This has caused filing and retrieval problems in certain depositories.

Response

LPS agrees to offer Official Gazette to depository libraries in both paper and fiche formats. LPS will use this title as a case study to assess the workload impact on LPS before considering an expanded dual-distribution policy for other titles. The 15-page minimum standard was established as the result of a cost-benefit study some years ago. While this standard has proven practical, GPO would not hesitate to modify the standard if good reason is indicated.

Recommendation 14

The Depository Library Council reiterates its recommendation that GPO catalog monographic series, e.g., U.S.G.S. Professional Papers, as serials records, in addition to the individual analytics for each monographic series. These records should appear in the Monthly Catalog products ASAP. Until these records are printed in MOCATS, a printed list of these serial records for the purpose of identifying them on the GPO tapes should be made available.

Rationale: These records are necessary since many members of the depository community use or are planning to use such “umbrella” records for maintaining a record of their holdings in their online catalogs. The depository community plans to utilize such records because numerical check-in under a single classification stem makes initial processing of depository shipments much easier and, thus, enables the library user to gain access to the material almost immediately upon its arrival in the depository.

Since most depositories would like to be able to use GPO records to add their U.S. government publications holdings to their online catalogs, it is necessary that these serial records be created and that they be linked with the analytic records using the appropriate MARC field. These serial records should be printed in the Monthly Catalog annually as we have recommended. However, the second and succeeding appearances of the serial on the GPO tapes should include a delete record note to inform users that an earlier record has been superseded.

Until these serial records are printed in the Monthly Catalog, a printed list (including OCLC record number) should be made available to depositories and through the sales program to facilitate the identification of these records on the tapes or in OCLC. This will enable selective use of these records by libraries who are now using or are planning to use a vendor to produce their online catalog for them.

Response

Even though the Library Program Service does not have the staff to provide collective cataloging records for monographic series in the OCLC data base, it recognizes the importance that such records have for libraries that maintain their records in online catalogs. If the Library Program Service were going to embark on this project by itself, serial backlogs would increase beyond manageable levels and the timeliness of serial cataloging records in the Monthly Catalog would be adversely affected. Therefore, we believe that the most equitable, cost effective, and efficient way to deal with this request is by having the following cooperative project, which would enhance the bibliographic information contained in the GPO/LC Monthly Catalog tape products, thus increasing their marketability.

Libraries wishing to participate in this project would:

- a. Classify the documents by following the guidelines listed in the three paragraphs of the article Locally assigned SU-DOCS numbers (Administrative Notes, January 1983, v. 5, no. 1). An x should always be placed before the colon to indicate that it is a locally assigned classification number. This is required for serial records, as opposed to monographic records where the x is placed at the end of the classification number, because only the classification stem is retained in the OCLC data base. Another useful approach would be to use the guidelines of the Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System, otherwise known as the Classification Manual.
- b. Catalog the monographic series in accordance with the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition, and OCLC's Online Systems: Serial Format. Please note that monographic series have an m in the Serial type (Ser tp) fixed field.
- c. Contact the Serial Record Division at the Library of Congress, and have them authenticate the descriptive cataloging for each record. Surrogates, or copies of title pages, would probably be required by Library of Congress for each monographic series. Perhaps the Library of Congress or one/several depository libraries would consider assigning one or more catalogers to catalog the series in the LPS series authority file. The vast majority of these series have already been cataloged in the OCLC data base, so it would not be an insurmountable task.

- d. Once the series records have been authenticated by the Library of Congress, periodic notices would be provided to the Library Program Service, listing the monographic series and their corresponding OCLC numbers.
- e. The LPS editorial staff would then generate an annual tape with the above information, and a new Monographic Series Supplement would be the end product. If there are not enough monographic series to justify the issuance of a separate publication, then an appendix to the December issue of the Monthly Catalog would take its place.

If the members of the Depository Library Council accept this cooperative endeavor, the Library Programs Service would set up a meeting with officials at the Library of Congress to propose an agreement.

Recommendation 15

The Depository Library Council applauds the Superintendent of Documents' efforts promoting the sales program through the depository system and promoting the depository system through the sales program.

Rationale: None required.

Response

The Superintendent of Documents thanks the Depository Library Council for its enthusiastic support of our plans to develop cooperative projects between the depository and sales programs. We are currently designing a pilot study on local promotion of Government publications by depository librarians, and considering the acquisition of portable display units for use by librarians at local conferences. We will keep Council informed of the progress of these studies as they develop.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 16-18, 1985 • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO survey current and past subscribers to the Monthly Catalog and report the results of the survey at the Spring Council meeting. The collected data should include characteristics of libraries which currently purchase Monthly Catalog; characteristics of libraries which have dropped subscriptions; information regarding on-line or cumulative products used in place of Monthly Catalog; and the usefulness of “one-step look-up” of various indexes which are now produced in Monthly Catalog. A copy of the survey should also be sent to all depository libraries. Pending the results of the survey, the decision to change the formats should be postponed.

Rationale: Depository Library Council needs adequate information on current and past subscribers to Monthly Catalog and users in the depository community in order to make a rational decision on new formats for the Monthly Catalog.

Response

A survey to collect the information requested by Council has been prepared for distribution to current sales subscribers and all depository libraries. Unfortunately address information was not available for former subscribers, so they could not be included in the survey. Results of the survey will be announced at the Spring meeting.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Government Printing Office publish technical documentation to accompany the Monthly Catalog tapes describing GPO’s use of MARC field and subfields in the preparation of bibliographic records including (but not limited to) which fields have been used, the dates of their use, and the use of field and subfields not defined in the official MARC formats.

The Depository Library Council also recommends to the Public Printer that representatives from the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress’ Cataloging Distribution Service begin discussion to verify that any changes made in the Monthly Catalog tapes are clearly understood by each agency, and to establish procedures by which additional documentation will be produced as a result of any changes made to the tapes or to bibliographic practices.

Rationale: Such documentation is presently insufficient for interpretation of the tapes and confusion exists as to the responsibility for these tapes.

Response

GPO concurs with the sense of the resolution, that adequate documentation of the tapes should be available to subscribers, and is endeavoring to determine what constitutes adequate documentation, as well as the various organizational roles and responsibilities involved in developing such documentation and providing it to users. To this end, GPO has been in contact with the Cataloging Distribution Service of the Library of Congress, which has provided GPO with internal LC documentation describing the Monthly Catalog record fields as they occur in several versions of the tape.

To satisfy Council’s additional request for an historical record of fields and subfields utilized, the GPO Data Systems Service has produced a summary report of the cumulated Monthly Catalog history file (1976-1985) reflecting fields and subfields detected for each year.

Preliminary discussions with the Cataloging Distribution Service have resulted in an agreement in principle between GPO and LC regarding respective roles: CDS is responsible for providing information on the physical format of the tapes and LPS is responsible for providing information regarding the cataloging policies and practices used in creation of the record.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Request for Proposal document for the update of the Monthly Catalog tapes be sent to Council members at the time of its release to those attending the November 14, 1985, meeting, announced in the October 10, 1985, issue of the Commerce Business Daily. Council further recommends that it be kept apprised of developments with regard to this contract.

Rationale: Since Council's request for the documents could not be accommodated because of the need for confidentiality, it requests that copies be provided at the point of its general distribution to the public in order to have information on the development of the contract to provide to the library community.

Response

Any solicitation document releasable to interested contractors will also be sent to Council members at the time of its release. However, a solicitation has not yet been issued in connection with the Monthly Catalog tape update project. The Briefing for Vendors document which was issued to those attending the November 14, 1985, meeting, has been published in Administrative Notes, vol. 7, no. 3, February 1986.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO plan, fund, and implement an adequate integrated automated support system for Library Programs Service.

Rationale: The present system isn't adequate!

Response

The Public Printer is keenly aware of the need for additional automated support for Library Programs Service operations. While the general objective is to achieve an integrated, automated support system for LPS, the system development plan is based on a phased, incremental approach. During 1985, GPO completed numerous enhancements to the Depository Distribution Information System (DDIS), including the lighted bin system. During 1986, efforts are focused on automating the acquisitions, classification, and related functions under the Acquisitions, Classification, and Shipment Information System (ACSIS). The emphasis being placed on ACSIS development can be best understood by considering the anticipated system payoffs: fewer publication shortages and rainchecks, fewer classification errors, fewer duplicates distributed, and improved accuracy of shipping lists, to name a few. Because the benefits of ACSIS promise to be so substantial for the entire depository library system, LPS is committed to developing ACSIS on a priority basis.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council is pleased that the Library Programs Service is working toward the development of the 1987 Biennial Survey, and the Council enthusiastically assigns Bruce Morton as its representative to review the proposed statistical packages developed for the survey.

Response

The Library Programs Service gratefully accepts Council's advice and support in the development of the 1987 Biennial Survey. As Council's representative, Bruce Morton will be kept abreast of the progress being made on the survey and he will be given ample opportunity to contribute to the development of the 1987 Biennial Survey.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that in any long-range planning effort for the depository library program, that the Depository Library Council be appropriately involved and used in its advisory capacity.

Rationale: Meetings are now being held regarding long-range planning for the depository library program, and the Council wants to be an active participant in this activity as appropriate.

Response

The Public Printer appreciates the offer of the Depository Library Council to be involved in any long-range planning for the depository library program. Currently, the Superintendent of Documents chairs a Depository Study Group which concerns itself with strategic positioning of the many elements of the depository library program to meet the requirements of depositories, the public, and the Government in the next decade and beyond. A principal function of this group is to consider all of the recommendations that have been made by the Depository Library Council since its formation, and to devise a framework by which these recommendations can be consolidated into a single depository library program plan. Therefore, not only does the Depository Study Group draw on the advice of the Depository Library Council, but it derives its existence, in large part, from the needs expressed through the cumulative recommendations of the Council. Naturally, if the Council wishes to add concerns not already on the record as formal recommendations of the Council, the Study Group will appreciate receiving them. In order to be certain that any such recommendations are considered in the appropriate context, it is requested that they be submitted to the Superintendent of Documents at the next Council meeting in March 1986.

It is anticipated that the advice of the Council will be required on many occasions in the deliberation and drafting stages of this plan, and the Study Group will provide early copies of its documents to Council members for review and comment.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service will fill out-of-print claims with a microfiche copy if a microfiche master exists.

Rationale: Rather than go through the often time-consuming process of reprinting a document to fill rainchecks, it seems more efficient to provide microfiche when a microfiche master exists.

Response

GPO believes that the provision of microfiche copies for out-of-print paper claims, in lieu of our current practice of ceasing to honor claims when the paper stock has been exhausted, is not in the best interests of the depository library community. Improved procedures in LPS geared toward reducing the overall number of claims, have resulted in fewer claims that would be candidates for microfiche fulfillment. The inordinate amount of staff time that would be required to locate the master fiche, reproduce it, and refile it, were we to provide fiche copies, would substantially reduce staff-time available to address critical operational tasks such as microfiche conversion and shipping list preparation.

Recommendation 8

Council is concerned with the overwhelming number of unfilled rainchecks, causing substantial administrative burden on libraries and delayed delivery of depository documents for public use. Council recommends that the Public Printer take action to expedite the reprinting of short supply publications so that 90% of rainchecks can be redeemed within 90 days of their issue date. Council recommends that this fulfillment standard be implemented by the Spring 1986 Council meeting.

Rationale: This recommendation is self-explanatory and related to Recommendation 7.

Response

The Superintendent of the Departmental Account Representative Division at GPO provides the following response: In an effort to assist the Depository Library in rectifying shortages, and keep costs as low as possible, we are taking the extra time needed to obtain printed copies from the publishing department, or at least printing films when possible.

Previously, this office was processing SF-1's for all shortages, whether the initial printing was by regional procurement or main GPO. In trying to make regional offices more keenly aware of the scope of the problems caused by shortages to the Depository Library Program, it was decided to send all SF-1's for regionally procured products which were received short or not ordered at all, to Regional Procurement for resolution, along with the Pub. Alert which would have been forwarded to Regional Procurement by the Depository Library Program approximately 3 weeks prior.

SF-1's are normally processed by DARD approximately 4 weeks after receipt, unless we feel further investigation is warranted (i.e. - 4-color process, multi-color, case bound, specialty items, etc.)

There was a considerable backlog of these orders a year ago. We are now current with the orders and will remain so.

Recommendation 9

Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO include in its Education Task Force deliberations, consideration of an internship or personnel exchange program for Library Programs Service staff, both junior and senior, enabling them to work in depository libraries and for depository library staff to work at GPO.

Rationale: This recommendation supports current Council and GPO initiatives for education and training.

Response

The Public Printer believes that the timing is unpropitious for LPS to be undertaking discretionary projects, such as an Education Task Force. With prospects for reduced appropriations to support a constant or increasing workload, LPS is concentrating its resources on performing and improving the essential functions required by statute. If and when GPO does form an Education Task Force, however, the proposal for an internship or personnel exchange program will be submitted for consideration.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that Library Programs Service contact Council for input prior to making major policy changes affecting depository library operations, and upon implementation of such policy changes, a full explanation be provided in Administrative Notes.

Rationale: The effectiveness and efficiency of the depository library program will be improved as a result of better communication (and greater understanding) between GPO and the depository library community.

Response

The Public Printer appreciates the fact that major policy changes in LPS can substantially affect the delivery of products and services to depository libraries. It is, therefore, reasonable that Council be notified in advance of such policy changes, and the LPS agrees to do so. LPS also agrees to publish appropriate notice in Administrative Notes.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that at one of the regular meetings of GPO bookstore managers, a formal presentation on the depository library program be given, and that bookstore employees be encouraged to tour a depository library in their area.

Rationale: Many GPO bookstore employees do not have an adequate knowledge of the depository library program. Such an educational program will allow the GPO bookstore and the depository Library program to work more effectively in providing Government information to the citizenry.

Response

I appreciate the interest shown by the Council in our cooperative projects involving the Depository community and the Government Printing Office Bookstores.

For the past two years, members of our Marketing staff have made presentations on the Depository Library Program to the bookstore managers and assistant managers at their annual conferences.

Marketing has also encouraged the bookstore managers to become involved in local library conferences and meetings.

For instance, several managers are preparing to speak at local library conferences. The Manager of the Dallas Bookstore is scheduled to speak in Shreveport, Louisiana on March 20, 1986, and in Tulsa, Oklahoma on April 24, 1986, at the State Library Conferences. The Manager of the Jacksonville bookstore is scheduled to speak in Tampa, Florida on May 2, 1986, at the Florida Library Conference.

In addition, the bookstore managers have been contacting Depository Libraries in their local areas and arranging to tour their facilities.

I have directed that these cooperative endeavors be continued.

Originally input Oklahoma State University

1986

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, MARCH 5-7, 1986 • ST. LOUIS, MO

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO outline a plan for assigning two SuDoc numbers in the Monthly Catalog record for all serial titles recurring within a series, the first being the series number and the second being the number assigned to the serial title. In order to facilitate the use of the GPO tapes in online catalogs, Council suggests that the series number be tagged with a delimiter “Z”. Example:

L 2.3:3329

L 2.3/2:985

Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1985 (Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, no. 3329)

Rationale: The use of two numbers in the Monthly Catalog record would allow more flexibility to libraries in handling serial titles within series.

Response

Having researched and considered this proposal to assign dual SuDocs numbers to certain serial publications, GPO has determined the proposal to be impractical. The principle of “one document, one SuDocs number” is well established in the Depository Library Program. While the SuDocs Classification Scheme has certain well-documented drawbacks, we judge one of its notable strengths to be the simplicity inherent in the “one document, one SuDocs number” principle. GPO believes that the assignment of dual SuDocs numbers to publications would serve to complicate the SuDocs system in exchange for only marginal benefits.

Moreover, the process of assigning dual SuDocs numbers would impose a substantial, added burden on the document classification and shipping list operations in LPS, resulting in delayed distribution of documents to depositories. The risk of increased error rates in LPS operations also poses a concern. These adverse consequences would affect the entire depository community and are not justified by the 17% of libraries that might benefit from assignment of two classification numbers. The 17% refers to those librarians who had recommended that LPS revert to its former practice for classifying serials within series, as reflected in the survey conducted by the Depository Library Council in 1986.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service continue and pursue further negotiations with executive agencies to provide “time-sensitive” materials, such as the Official Gazette from the U.S. Patent Office, to depository libraries by first-class mail.

Rationale: Materials which are of immediate need to the user often lose much of their value due to delays in the preparation of shipping lists, mailing by fourth-class mail, and other routine distribution problems. Preferential mailing would be beneficial to the mission of the agency as well as providing better access to government information for the public.

Response

In early 1986, the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) approached GPO to explore the possibility of providing expedited delivery of certain time-sensitive periodical publications to depository libraries. In subsequent discussions with GPO, both DOL and PTO asked that GPO develop cost estimates for the special handling and first-class postage that would be required to comply with the agencies' requests. In early June 1986, GPO provided DOL and PTO with the requested cost estimates. DOL has already informed GPO that DOL is not willing to pay the cost for expedited delivery of General Wage Determinations Issued under the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts, so the prevailing, fourth-class distribution mode will continue. PTO has not yet notified GPO as to whether PTO is willing to subsidize special handling and first-class mailing for depository distribution of their Official Gazette weeklies.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that a member of the Depository Library Council be appointed to GPO's Depository Study Group.

Rationale: Council applauds the long-term planning effort of GPO. However, it recognizes that although the Depository Study Group is well-rounded, there is lacking the important perspective of the depository library itself.

Response

On March 19, 1986, the Superintendent of Documents appointed Depository Library Council member Peggy Prudden to the Depository Study Group (DSG). As a practicing public librarian, Peggy is expected to bring to the DSG a fresh perspective from the public user's point of view.

The DSG was formed in September 1985 to consider the future of the Federal Depository Library Program in a rapidly changing society. Changing social patterns, technologies, and federal fiscal policies are among the challenges being addressed by the DSG in pursuit of a viable and balanced plan that will meet the future information needs of the American public.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the GPO enter into discussions with the Association of Research Libraries' Office of Management Studies for the purpose of developing management seminars specifically for depository librarians.

Rationale: The enhancement of management skills is a matter of critical importance both to GPO and depository librarians. The QMS already offers management seminars for librarians in general. Sessions could be held in Washington as a pre-conference at Fall Council meetings or taken on the road, as deemed appropriate.

Response

The Public Printer recognizes the critical importance of good management skills for developing and maintaining effective operations and services in depository libraries. The idea of utilizing the available talents and resources of ARL/OMS for developing such skills in depository library managers seems particularly promising, and the Public Printer directed his staff to pursue the idea without delay. Meetings between GPO and ARL/OMS have produced encouraging results. ARL/OMS has agreed to offer up to two Basic Management Skills Institutes for Government Documents Librarians during 1987, one in the east and one in the west. Depository librarians will be kept apprised of further developments through Administrative Notes.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that LPS accept the report and recommendations presented at the Spring 1986, meeting regarding the raincheck procedure. (See Attachment)

ATTACHMENT TO RECOMMENDATION #5

RAIN CHECK COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The concept of the rain check system when publications are short is still a valid one. The problem is not inherent in the rain check system; it is the inability to supply certain documents to some of the depository libraries in a timely fashion.

The remedies must be developed within GPO; all we can do is identify the nature of the problem and suggest points for consideration.

Recommendations

1. Revise Council recommendation of October 1985 requesting 90% of rain checks to be filled in 90 days. Library Programs Service Director should review rain checks outstanding after 90 days and should use Administrative Notes as a vehicle to report status.
2. Identify item numbers providing major problems, analyze the problem, and look for solution other than reprinting.
3. Evaluate items being rain checked and reprinted.
 - a. Give top priority to core list publications, e.g., U. S. Code, CFR and Census Catalog which have been rain checked. Discuss replacement from sales side of GPO. Investigate cause of shortfall significant enough to be rain checked.
 - b. GPO internal publications such as Subject Bibliographies which are free should not have to be reprinted. These publications have had significant shortfalls. Review sales side contacts and procedures for placing orders.
 - c. GPO subscription sale items, e.g. Driver, etc. should be replaced from sales side, if shortfall is reasonable. At end of normal retention period, issues should be sent to LPS claims area for filling shortfalls.
 - d. Publications such as TOP Bulletin should not be reprinted. These are normally held for 90 days. Reprints and preprints should also be reviewed for value before reprinting.
 - e. Agency publications such as the IRS Bulletins, a major shortage item, should be checked out with the agency and/or GPO's accession procedures before reprinting. IRS Bulletins, at the time they are distributed, should be available from IRS. If IRS cannot cooperate with GPO, libraries should be encouraged to acquire their own copies directly.

Response

In order to furnish a framework for LPS' response, we are providing a description of procedures routinely used to obtain additional stock of rainchecked publications.

When the Acquisitions Section of the Depository Administration Branch becomes aware of a shipping list shortage, standard procedures are initiated to obtain additional stock. Procedures vary depending on whether or not the rainchecked publications had been printed through GPO.

For GPO-printed publications, LPS requests additional copies from Documents Sales Service if the document is in the sales program. If Sales cannot supply LPS with the necessary stock, or if the publication is not a sales item, LPS informs appropriate

personnel in GPO's Departmental Account Representative Division, who attempt to obtain copies from the publishing agency. If copies cannot be obtained from the publishing agency, staff of the Departmental Account Representative Division initiate procedures to reprint the publication.

For publications not printed by GPO, LPS requests additional copies from the publishing agency, and simultaneously notifies the Joint Committee on Printing that the request is being made. If the agency subsequently fails to provide the depository copies requested by LPS, the Joint Committee on Printing is so informed.

1. LPS Director should review rainchecks outstanding after 90 days, and should use Administrative Notes as a vehicle to report status.

As can be seen from the above description of procedures, obtaining additional stock to fulfill rainchecks may be a complex process, extending beyond the organizational boundaries of LPS. The administrative burden which would be imposed on both LPS and other involved organizations to continuously track the status of each individual raincheck through various stages of fulfillment processing is prohibitive. It is not in the best interest of the depository library community for LPS to utilize its resources in this manner; therefore we cannot make reports on the processing status of rainchecks. However, LPS can provide information as to whether rainchecks have been fulfilled or are still outstanding.

Depository libraries were provided listings of fulfilled and outstanding rainchecks (as of May 31, 1986) in an August issue of Administrative Notes (Vol. 7, No. 12). As time permits, we will update this list for publication in future issues of Administrative Notes.

2. Identify item numbers providing major problems; analyze the problem; and look for solution other than reprinting.

LPS maintains records on publications shipped short, and periodically analyzes the data to identify underlying causes of shortages. As these causes are identified, LPS attempts to correct, through whatever means are appropriate, the root causes of the shortages. As can be seen from the description of procedures that GPO follows to obtain additional stock, reprinting is the solution of last resort.

3. Evaluate items being rainchecked and reprinted.

- a. Give top priority to core list pubs., U.S. Code, CFR, and Census Catalog that have been rainchecked. Discuss replacement from sales side of GPO and cause of shortfall significant enough to be rainchecked.

All LPS processing of shorts is completed well within our specified timeframes. Since there is no backlog in LPS' processing of rainchecked titles, there is no need to assign a priority to the above-mentioned publications.

LPS routinely requests additional stock from Sales and regularly attempts to identify underlying causes of shorts.

- b. GPO internal publications such as Subject Bibliographies which are free should not have to be reprinted. Shortfalls are significant. Review sales side contact and procedures for placing orders.

LPS is in close contact with appropriate individuals in the Sales program. As each Subject Bibliography is printed, there is coordination between Sales and LPS to ensure that LPS distribution needs are included in determining the total number of publications to be printed.

- c. GPO subscription sales items, e.g. Driver, etc. should be replaced from [the] sales side, if shortfall is reasonable. At the end of normal retention period, issues should be sent to LPS claims area for distribution of shortfalls.

Sales and LPS already have in place cooperative arrangements whereby LPS receives stock from Sales wherever possible.

- d. Publications such as TOP Bulletin should not be reprinted. These are normally held for ninety (90) days. Reprints and preprints should also be reviewed for value before reprinting.

Reprinting is a last resort for obtaining additional copies of a publication. LPS' mission, as set forth in Title 44 USC (Section 1902) is to distribute all Government publications "except those determined by their issuing components to be required for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security." LPS does not have discretionary authority to review publications for value.

- e. Agency publications such as the IRS Bulletin, a major shortage item, should be checked out with the agency and/or GPO's accession procedures before reprinting. IRS Bulletins, at the time they are distributed, should be available from IRS. If they cannot cooperate with GPO, libraries should be encouraged to acquire their own copies directly.

The IRS Tax Bulletins, item 0946-B, are GPO printed publications, which have been short in the past due to a contractor error. The problem has been solved, and LPS does not anticipate its recurrence.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO convene a one-day pre-council meeting to which all regional depository libraries should send the coordinators of regional depository operations.

Rationale: The purpose of the meeting would be to train in GPO policy and procedures as well as to determine what services GPO expects regionals to provide to selective depositories in their regions.

Response

The Public Printer has invited representatives from regional depository libraries to assemble for a one-day meeting at the University of Maryland on October 14, 1986. The meeting will address such matters as the role and responsibilities of regionals, their relationships with selective depositories, as well as regionals' problems, both current and projected. This meeting is seen as an important step toward elucidating regional issues and concerns, so that they can be factored into the overall planning process for the Depository Library Program.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO begin planning for an integrated automated management system for the Library Programs Service. Such an automated management system should be part of or interface with other related GPO automated systems dealing with cataloging, classification, distribution, acquisition, and bibliographic control.

Rationale: It is apparent that Library Programs Service does not have the automated management tools to apply to operations issues that recur at Council meetings. The installation of such a system will allow Library Programs Service managers to better monitor daily and long-term operations and make appropriate management decisions.

Response

The Public Printer is firmly convinced that current, accurate management information must be readily available to GPO executives if they are to make appropriate, effective decisions for planning, managing, and evaluating their operations and programs. Under his direction, an automated Executive Information System (EIS) was developed to meet the need of GPO executives for timely management information. Even though the scope of the EIS is GPO-wide, an array of statistical indicators is available or under development to provide significant data relative to the Superintendent of Documents' organization. On the Library

Programs Service, for example, statistics will cover document inventory and distribution quantities; titles cataloged; shipping lists issued; and numbers of libraries designated, deleted, and inspected. EIS statistics and graphic charts can be called-up at terminals in the offices of the Public Printer and most GPO executives. Within the Library Programs Service itself, provisions for more detailed operational data are being built into the functional requirements specifications for the ACSIS (Acquisition, Classification, and Shipment Information System). ACSIS is being developed to both directly and indirectly assist technical processing operations by supporting individual tasks associated with the control of individual publications: it will serve both as a source of information in support of task performance, and as a store of data generated as a result of task performance.

The system will facilitate document processing by providing an online, historical record on every depository publication. This information will enable LPS to readily determine the status of an individual title. In the aggregate, processing history data will provide an invaluable source of management information to be used in monitoring workflow and turnaround times, proactively identifying problem areas, assessing productivity, and evaluating overall program performance.

Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council asks the Public Printer that copies of the “Purpose” and “Historical Background” drafts of the Depository Study Group be provided to Council.

Response

The Public Printer is pleased to provide each member of Council with copies of the draft “Purpose” and “Historical Background” sections of the Depository Study Group report. Council is cautioned to remember, however, that these sections are considered talking points by the Group, and may undergo substantial revision before they are released in final form, as parts of the finished report.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer announce the availability of the “Summary Report of the Cumulated Monthly Catalog History File” in Administrative Notes.

Rationale: This information has been requested by libraries who are attempting to automate their government publications records.

Response

An announcement of the availability of “Fields detected in the Monthly Catalog Database, 1976-1985”, as well as a description of the contents and format of this report, was published in the May 1986 issue of Administrative Notes (Vol. 7, No. 7).

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the following items be considered by the Depository Study Group:

- inclusion of electronic information in the depository program; - viability of regional libraries and methods to solve problems faced by these institutions in light of Title 44;
- feasibility of the Monthly Catalog in a format other than paper or microfiche;

- viability of the present Depository Library Program operations as a way of providing government information to the people in light of evolving information technology;
- increasing item selectivity for depositories;
- development of a comprehensive integrated automated data system

Response

The Public Printer appreciates Council's suggestion of topics for consideration by the Depository Study Group. Of course, most of the recommended topics already appear on the Group's agenda but the important point is that all of the listed items will be addressed by the Group, with one exception; the "viability" of the Depository Program is not thought to be compromised by the emergence of electronic information dissemination technologies. The challenge to the Study Group is to find ways for the Depository Program to realize its traditional economies in the utilization of these new technologies.

Recommendation 11

In response to the Superintendent of Document's letter of February 20, 1986, to the Council requesting guidance in the selection of titles for microfiche conversion, the Depository Library Council submits to the Public Printer the following categories and/or titles for consideration: (Listed in priority order.)

- Zip Code + 4 Directories
- Addresses and speeches
- Environmental impact statements (draft and final)
- Telephone books
- Course announcements
- Annual reports (except significant statistical compilations)
- House and Senate Journals
- Selected Water Resources Abstracts
- Nuclear regulatory guides
- Gazetteers
- Slip treaties (only if a paper finding guide is provided)
- Slip laws (only if a paper finding guide is provided)
- "Periodicals in a magazine format" (see "SOD 13c") except those indexed in Index to U.S. Government Periodicals.
- Foreign Relations of the United States
- Bound Congressional Record (only if paper index and Daily Digest are provided)

Response

The Public Printer appreciates having the guidance of his Depository Library Council in selecting additional depository items for conversion to microfiche format. The depository items recommended for conversion by Council shall be implemented by GPO to the maximum feasible extent in order to achieve Congressionally-mandated cost reductions.

Recommendation 12

Council has identified several actions which, if implemented, could substantially enhance the effectiveness of LPS and/or prove beneficial to the depository library community. Council has divided the recommendations into Group 1, those which could be put into effect immediately, and Group 2, those which would require additional time and effort. The following are recommended to the Public Printer.

GROUP I

- Prepare and publish guidelines for informational material supplied by the depository community for inclusion in Administrative Notes;

Guidelines for a Readers Exchange column were published in Administrative Notes, Vol. 7, No. 6. A number of informative and useful articles have been submitted by depository librarians and published in Administrative Notes since then.

- Develop a standard, easily readable form for class corrections. Rosalind Jacob has volunteered to help in the design of this form.

A revised class correction form has been designed for use within LPS with distinct blocks for the following types of corrections: shelflist, publications, PRF sales database, OCLC, Depository Administration Branch files, and Monthly Catalog. This has helped ensure that corrections are made in each place where the class number is recorded, and has been instrumental in the recent improvements in processing classification correspondence.

- Publish in Administrative Notes the decision concerning the retention of reprints which was announced at the October 1985 Council meeting;

The decision concerning retention of reprints was published in the October 1985 issue of Administrative Notes (Vol. 6, No. 14) and in Transmittal #24 of the “Instructions to Depository Libraries” issued in August 1986. Excerpts from GPO’s response to Council Recommendations #7 (March 1985) will be published in the next issue of Ad Notes.

- Establish separate item numbers for those serial titles which have been separated from numbered series;

LPS will continue to distribute serial titles which have been separated from numbered series under the same item number as the main series. While LPS appreciates the benefits to the depository library community in establishing separate item numbers for the separated serial titles, resource constraints prohibit our assuming this additional workload at the present time.

- Cease any further separation of serial titles within series from serial titles based on geography or serial titles composed of chapters or parts;

The vast majority of serials with series publications based on geography have already been assigned separate classes. The current practice facilitates the future automation of the GPO shelflist, and it is in accordance with the preferences of the majority of depository libraries, as expressed in the classification survey conducted by the Depository Library Council.

- Commence any reclassification/separation only with the beginning of a new volume or calendar year.

With the classification of 155,946 publications in FY 1985, and with an expected increase as a result of the December 1985 promulgation of “OMB Circular A-130” (instructing Federal agencies to provide copies of their publications to the Depository Library Program), it is not feasible to make exceptions to the policy of implementing new classes as the publications are processed. It has been LPS’ experience that each procedural exception in the classification process impedes the workflow and results in increased errors.

This resolution also goes against the basic tenet of the SuDoc classification system which been in existence since 1895. As it is stated in A Practical Guide to the Superintendent of Documents Classification System, the classification number assigned to publications of any Government author is determined by the current organizational status of the issuing agency. Since most Government reorganizations take place beyond the first subordinate office, and since the classification number is not broken down below the level of the first subordinate office in the majority of cases, most classification numbers will remain unaffected.

GROUP II

- Publish a list of item numbers with corresponding class numbers and titles (an inverted List of Classes

Such a list exists, it is the Union List of Item Selections. The item cards also provide the same information.

- File the LPS microfiche in SuDocs order in order to improve the on-demand service;

As time permits, LPS devotes resources to filing microfiche in SuDocs order. However, LPS has placed a higher priority on expediting source document conversion.

- Shelf the National collection at LPS; Make all corrections issued to depository libraries on the documents in the LPS collection.

In March 1986, LPS began a concerted effort to shelve the documents in the working collection. In addition to having one full-time staff member regularly shelving current materials, staff of the Cataloging and Classification Branch have been working on an overtime basis to shelve the accumulated backlog. As of September 19, 1986, the working collection has been shelved. Corrections to the classification numbers will be made as time permits.

Recommendation 13

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Monthly Catalog be continued as is with the addition of an enhanced title and subject index containing the following items:

- a. entry number
- b. title
- c. author
- d. class number

Rationale: An enhanced Monthly Catalog would positively respond to the user survey. LPS has investigated the feasibility of adding author and classification number to the title and subject indexes of the Monthly Catalog, in accordance with the Council recommendation. This enhancement will not require major changes to the Monthly Catalog software, nor will it result in a significant increase in the page-count (and therefore the price) of the printed version. Therefore, beginning with the January 1987 issue of Monthly Catalog, both the subject and title indexes will be augmented with the inclusion of author and classification number.

Originally input Oklahoma State University

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 15-17, 1986 • WASHINGTON D.C.

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer on the preparation, printing, and distribution of the booklet *The Designation Procedure for Federal Depository Libraries* (GP 3.2:D 44/9 OCLC #13569353).

Response

The Public Printer thanks Council for this commendation. The *Designation Procedure for Federal Depository Libraries* has served to improve communication between GPO and libraries interested in becoming depositories. In fact, the entire designation process has been revised in an effort to provide interested libraries with a clearer understanding of the designation process and the responsibilities of Federal Depository Libraries.

This latest publication both expands and improves the comprehensive body of documentation that has been developed in recent years for the Depository Library Program. This body of documentation not only promotes understanding of the Program, but also provides a framework for effective management, accountability, and library practice.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council to the Public Printer is pleased that the long-awaited shipping lists for USGS maps have finally come into reality. Council recommends, however, that all depository libraries receive all USGS shipping lists even though they may not receive any maps for those shipments.

Rationale: Council realizes that not all federal depositories select maps. For those that do, it is not possible for the libraries that select maps to determine if they have received all the maps which they have selected.

Response

The USGS provides the following response: LPS and USGS agree on the need to provide shipping lists for USGS maps to all map depository libraries; investigations to determine the most cost effective and efficient method are being conducted. Council should note, however, that since all depository libraries are not necessarily map depository libraries, that the shipping lists will be provided to all map depository libraries.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that Section 4-5 of the “Guidelines for the Depository Library System” suggesting that depository libraries select a minimum of 25 percent of available item numbers be deleted. Council further recommends that the Inspection Team be asked to report to Council at the Spring meeting more reasonable criteria based upon their experience.

Rationale: Depository libraries should select only those publications necessary to serve their patrons and their congressional district.

Response

The Public Printer agrees that section 4--5 of the “Guidelines for the Depository Library System” should be deleted and replaced by a collection development guideline that better comports with the goals of the Depository Library Program.

The Inspection Team recommends that the new guideline read: “Depository Libraries, either solely or in conjunction with neighboring depositories, should make demonstrable efforts to identify and meet the Government information needs of the local area.” This guideline together with Section 1 of the “Instructions to Depository Libraries” and Section 2 of the Federal Depository Library Manual provides a realistic collection development standard for all depositories. A minimum percentage of item number selections will not be required but, based on the item number selections of similar type libraries, inordinately low or high item number selections could affect Inspection Report scoring.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council accepts Option A of the Director, Library Programs Service’s memo dated August 22, 1986, regarding distribution of the EEOC Decisions on microfiche. Council recommends that the Public Printer direct the Library Programs Service to pursue the inclusion of the SuDoc class stem in the header of future microfiche editions. Council also suggests that a notice explaining that the EEOC Decisions are being sent directly to selecting libraries from Information Handling Services (IHS) be included in Administrative Notes as well as on a shipping list in advance of the initial distribution.

Rationale: Council weighed the advantages of both IHS-and GPO- produced fiche. Since the IHS fiche could be provided to depositories in a timely manner, it was felt that microfiche distribution by IHS was the best alternative between the two choices offered to Council. Other areas of the library that receive commercially-produced materials may not realize the EEOC Decisions are part of that library’s depository shipment. A note in *Administrative Notes* could lessen confusion about the receipt of this fiche and would decrease letters of inquiry to IHS.

Response

LPS is pursuing the inclusion of microfiche for EEOC’s Federal Section in their depository library program. We have transmitted Council’s expressed desire that the SuDocs class number appear in the headers to appropriate officials at EEOC. Prior to actual distribution of the hearings, we will advise libraries via *Administrative Notes* and the Shipping Lists as to the specific arrangements that have been made.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that all Department of Defense material in the nature of “handbooks, manuals and guides” be microfiched to the fullest extent possible with the exception of the *Area Handbooks/Country Studies*.

Rationale: The proliferation of DOD publications presents an opportunity for savings in LPS. It was felt that these materials were little used, frequently did not require transmittals, and were excellent candidates for microfiche distribution to depositories.

RESPONSE: LPS will review item number/class stems which represent, or include, Department of Defense publications in the nature of handbooks, manuals, and guides, with the exception of *Area Handbooks/Country Studies*. We will microfiche these publications to the fullest extent possible, while adhering to guidelines promulgated in “SOD 13” regarding physical suitability for microfiching.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer for the development of the Executive Information System (EIS) and the Acquisition, Classification and Shipment Information System (AC SIS). However, Council recommends that the Public Printer study enhancement of the DDIS system to allow more selectivity for depository libraries and continue planning for an integrated automated management system for the Library Programs Service, which would be a part of or interface with other GPO systems.

Rationale: An enhanced DDIS or similar system will allow the Library Programs Service to secure substantial savings resulting from more accurate selection of items to meet the patron needs of individual libraries. An integrated automated management system will help the Library Programs Service be more efficient in meeting its statutory mission and to communicate with other GPO functional areas.

Response

The Public Printer thanks the Council for its support of the Executive Information System (EIS) and the Acquisition, Classification and Shipment Information System (AC SIS). The DDIS system has recently been converted from an ISAM (Indexed Sequential Access Method) to a VSAM (Virtual Storage Access Method) file structure. While the enhancement has resulted in improved query response time, it does not enable us to add additional item numbers, significantly over and above what is already being added as a result of routine surveys, and small scale special efforts such as breaking out the top 20 problem item numbers. The problem is not with the quantity of item numbers per se (the item file), but with the resultant size of the selection file, which contains one record for each unique combination of library number and item number. The size of the selection file increases rapidly with the addition of each new item number; e.g., the addition of 368 new item numbers in FY 86 (assuming an average selection count of 425) resulted in approximately 156,400 new records being added to an already massive file.

Data Systems Service has examined various approaches to breaking the selection file into smaller files, and has concluded that splitting the files offers no solution. The solution lies in converting the DDIS system to a database environment.

GPO is currently evaluating database management systems for applicability to GPO system requirements, specifically including Superintendent of Documents requirements. We anticipate eventually converting DDIS to a database management system. Once this is accomplished, the capabilities/capacity of the DDIS system itself will no longer be an obstacle to adding additional item numbers.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that he seek changes to Title 44 U.S. Code and/or reconsider previous GPO interpretations in order to allow Regional Libraries to have more flexibility in assuring the maintenance of a complete depository collection available to the region's library communities.

Rationale: Regionals are facing crippling space problems due to the permanent retention requirements in Title 44 and in the literal interpretations of that Title by GPO Legal Counsel.

Response

General Counsel provides the following response to the Director, Library Programs Service:

BACKGROUND

In your memorandum seeking our advice with respect to this recommendation, you explain that while regional libraries are required to receive and retain one copy of all publications sent through the depository system, in certain cases the regionals can designate selective depository libraries within the area they serve to receive and house segregable portions of the depository collection.(1)

According to your memorandum, the library designated to receive these documents is acting as the regional's agent, but the regional remains responsible for the integrity of the depository collection and adherence to the regulations of the Superintendent of Documents.

Your view is that LPS would not necessarily oppose satellite housing of portions of the regional depository collections - indeed, you assert that it may serve to reduce the number of duplicate publications in the depository library system.

DISCUSSION

Recommendation No. 7 does not indicate what changes the DLC believes the Public Printer should seek to Title 44. Without a specific legislative proposal to review, we are unable to offer our views with respect to the advisability of any legislative changes.

1. Specifically, you note that special arrangements are already in place for the separate housing of United States Geological Survey (USGS) maps and "Department of Energy Technical Information Center Reports" (DOE/TIC Reports).

We observe also that neither the recommendation nor the "Rationale" identifies the interpretations of this office which are restricting the regionals' flexibility in maintaining their collections. So far as we can determine, the only opinion of the Office of General Counsel (OGC) that may be causing concern for the regional librarians was the one issued on April 6, 1982, entitled "Depository Libraries, Regional - Selection and Discard Policies." (Copy attached.) In that opinion, we concluded that regional depository libraries could not selectively choose Government documents for their collections, nor could they discard documents except as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents when superseded or later issued in bound form. We have reviewed that decision and the language of the relevant statutory provisions and discern no reason for us to alter that prior opinion.

In the course of our review of this issue, we have discovered that this office has already rendered a number of opinions which recognize LPS' authority in providing regionals with some flexibility in maintaining their collections, including satellite housing of the regionals' collections. For example, in an opinion entitled "Documents - Joint Regional Depository Libraries" dated January 9, 1975, we stated that there would be no objection were the regional libraries to make arrangements with another depository library for housing part of the collection as long as the criteria set forth in [T]itle 44 are met and it is clear that primary responsibility rests with the designated regional library.

More recently, in at least three separate situations, OGC has reviewed plans submitted by regional libraries which would provide for shared responsibility for maintenance of the depository library collection.(2) This office did not object to these plans even though an entire regional depository collection would not be physically housed in one location. Finally, we were involved in reviewing and approving the USG[S] maps and DOE/TIC Report distribution plans.

Based on our informal discussions with you regarding this issue, we believe the more critical problems for LPS may be operational. As we note above, it remains a requirement, with certain narrow exceptions, that the regional depository library receive and retain a copy of all documents distributed by LPS. Also, the regional has an obligation to make that collection accessible to the public. 44 U.S.C. §§ 1911, 1912. It may be that as the administrator of the depository

library program, you will want to impose limits on shipping points (e.g., that a regional depository receive all publications and that it be responsible for any further distribution), to impose record-keeping conditions on a regional with satellite housing, or to establish the minimum measure(s) of accessibility by the public to the collection.⁽³⁾ Obviously, we offer here only legal counsel and therefore leave these programmatic decisions to your discretion.

2. These cooperative arrangements were or are between the Thomas Jefferson Library, St. Louis University of Missouri at St. Louis, and Southwest Missouri State University Library, Springfield, Missouri; the Nebraska Library Commission and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries; the Robert Muldrow Cooper Library, Clemson University, the Thomas Cooper Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina and the Ida Jane Dacus Library, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina.
3. As an example, you might decide to require that a patron of a regional be able to obtain any document in the system within “X” weeks, days or hours. We believe you have the authority to issue such regulations. However, should there be any doubt as to the propriety of a proposed regulation, you may seek the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. See 44 U.S.C. § 1914. Assuming such approval is granted, the regulation would be binding on all depository libraries with regional status.

Recommendation #7 (Attachment)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OPINION OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES, REGIONAL - SELECTION AND DISCARD POLICIES

Opinion

Chapter 19 of Title 44 does not permit the regional depository libraries to selectively choose available Government publications or to selectively discard Government publications unless authorized by the Superintendent of Documents pursuant to 44 U.S.C. #1911.

Facts

At its Spring 1981 meeting, the Depository Library Council passed a resolution recommending that the GPO seek authorization from the Joint Committee on Printing to permit regional depository libraries to selectively choose certain publications that are developed on a geographical basis (i.e. Flood Insurance Studies, Soil Surveys). The Office of the Superintendent of Documents referred the matter to the General Counsel’s Office for comment with the further request that this office address the issue of selective discarding of publications by the regional depository libraries.

As the depository system now functions, regionals must accept into their Government publications collection all documents made available by the GPO either in printed format or in microfilm. They must also retain all of these documents unless directed to do otherwise by the Superintendent of Documents. Depository libraries, on the other hand, can selectively choose which documents they would like to obtain and may discard them after five years. Under this system the depository should be able to obtain any document not in its own collection from a state regional by inter-library loan. However, pursuant to this resolution these regional libraries would in the future like to be able to selectively choose certain geographic material relevant only to their particular region and discard publications no longer relevant, topical or in demand in order to better manage the limited space available to them.

Discussion

The regional depository library was a creation of the Depository Library Act of 1962, Pub. L. 87-579, 76 Stat. 352. Prior to this legislation, there were no regional libraries and all depository libraries were required to maintain their Government collections indefinitely. This onerous requirement apparently influenced many libraries to curtail their requests of materials. To alleviate this problem, in its overhaul of the depository system, Congress enacted 44 U.S.C. #1912. This provision deals with the establishment of regional depositories and reads in part as follows:

Not more than two depository libraries in each State and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may be designated as regional depositories, and shall receive from the Superintendent of Documents copies of all new and revised Government publications authorized for distribution to depository libraries. . . . that the (regional) library will, in addition to fulfilling the requirements for depository libraries, retain at least one copy of all Government publications either in printed or microfacsimile form (except those authorized to be discarded by the Superintendent of Documents); and within the region served will provide interlibrary loan, reference service, and assistance for depository libraries in the disposal of unwanted Government publication (Emphasis added.)

The intent of this language is clearly evident in the Senate Report which accompanied H.R. 8141 which was later enacted as the Depository Library Act. Congress' unambiguous intention was that these regional libraries would have to accept and retain all Government publications made available to the depositories. Complete document collections would be accessible to all regular depositories within a State. S. Rep. No. 1587, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., pp.9, 13-14, 23 (1962). This revision, therefore, permitted individual depository libraries to discard unwanted documents, while at the same time, ensure that all Government publications would remain available and accessible to all interested parties through the regional depository libraries.

Since, Congress intended that the regionals were to maintain a complete collection of Government publications, the regionals are prohibited from discarding any documents except as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents. This prohibition is set out in 44 U.S.C. #1911 which reads as [f]ollows:

Depository libraries shall make Government publications available for the free use of the general public, and may dispose of them after retention for five years under section 1912 of this title, if the depository libraries not served by a regional depository library, or that are regional depository libraries themselves, shall retain Government publications permanently in either printed form or in microfacsimile form, except superseded publications or those issued later in bound form which may be discarded as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents.(Emphasis added.)

It appears that regional depository libraries must receive copies of all Government publications regardless of the geographic nature of the publications and must retain these collections permanently. It has been suggested that 44 U.S.C §1914 be used to permit circumvention of these legal obligations. The section empowers the Public Printer to use any measures to implement Chapter 19 with the JCP's approval. However, since all of these provisions must be construed together in harmony, this section cannot be used to violate Sections 1911 and 1912.

Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the regional depository libraries cannot selectively choose documents for their collections and they cannot discard documents except when superseded or issued later in bound form

GARRETT E. Brown, Jr.

APR 16 1982

Recommendation 8

Council has identified several actions which, if implemented, could substantially enhance the effectiveness and economies of LPS and/or prove beneficial to the depository library community. Council has divided the recommendations into Group 1, those which could be put into effect immediately, and Group 2, those which would require additional time. The following are recommended to the Public Printer.

Group 1

8.1a.) Publish a list of Depository Study Group members in *Administrative Notes*.

Response: The list of Depository Study Group members will be published in an upcoming issue of *Administrative Notes*.

8.1b.) Publish announcements from the Association of Research Libraries/Office of Management Studies on management seminars available to depository librarians in *Administrative Notes*.

Response: Three announcements from ARL/OMS regarding their management workshops have been published in *Administrative Notes*: in Vol. 8, no. 1, p. 5; in Vol. 8, no. 3, pg. 11; and in Vol. 8, no. 6, p. 7. We will continue to publish information about the ARL/OMS Workshops as we receive it.

8.1c.) Publish the Preliminary Draft (October 1986) “Guidelines on Provision of Government Publications to Depository Libraries” in *Administrative Notes*. This will allow for maximum input by the depository community.

Response: Preliminary Draft (October 1986) “Guidelines on Provision of Government Publications to Depository Libraries” was superseded by a March 1987 version, which has been provided to members of the Depository Library Council.

Staff of the Joint Committee on Printing anticipate publishing the March 1987 version of the guidelines in an upcoming issue of *Administrative Notes*.

8.1d.) Cease any further classification separation of serial titles within series for the following : a) serial titles based on geography (e.g., County Business Patterns), and b) serial titles composed of chapters or parts (e.g., *Medicare Intermediary Manual*). Diane Smith has volunteered to answer questions on this recommendation.

Response: The establishment of individual serial classes for titles based on geography has been largely completed for existing serial titles. LPS has only established individual classes for publications issued in chapters or parts in very limited circumstances. This application is only used for titles which have a very complex or confusing pattern of issuance, and is considered a last resort classification. The Council may be assured that this practice is only used after thorough review and the elimination of all other possibilities. These processes have been conducted in accordance with the publicized GPO classification principles and are of vital importance in the future automation of the GPO classification shelf list. Every new class or reclassification action taken at LPS is reviewed by a Classification and Cataloging Branch supervisor for accuracy and consistency with the guidelines. The reclassification of serial titles is a policy change that was not undertaken lightly, one in which certain short-term inconveniences are necessary in order to achieve a long-term improvement in the system. LPS feels it would be counterproductive to reverse this policy after so much work has been completed.

8.1e.) Make an exception to GPO’s policy of separating out serial titles as the publications are processed, when the next issues of the serial title to be changed comes in the middle of a volume or calendar year. Diane Smith has volunteered to answer questions on this recommendation.

Response: As stated in the response to a similar recommendation from the Spring 1986 Council meeting, it has been LPS' experience that introducing procedural exceptions in the classification process impedes the workflow and results in increased errors. During FY 1986 LPS has expended a great deal of effort in improving the classification process, by establishing a peer review quality control procedure, increasing the timeliness of classification, and in improving the responsiveness to user inquiries. These efforts required a major commitment of personnel resources, and with the continuing heavy workload in classification it is simply not feasible to make an exception to implementing new classes as the publications are processed.

Again, as in Recommendation 8.1d, the reclassification of serial titles that occurred within series is a process that has been largely completed, and libraries have already felt the bulk of the impact. To reverse this policy at this late date would be counterproductive and confusing, while slowing LPS processing and very likely increasing errors.

- 8.1.f) Ask that the *Congressional Serial Set Supplement to the Monthly Catalog* not be included in the cumulative indexes for the Monthly Catalog and that the entry numbers not be in the range of other Monthly Catalog entries. Should this be done, the individual reports and documents would not be indexed twice within the cumulative Monthly Catalog indexes. Susan Tulis has volunteered to answer questions on this recommendation.

Response: The Joint Committee on Printing has advised LPS that the Serial Set Committee will be convened later this Spring to consider these and other recommendations concerning the format of the Congressional Serial Set Supplement to the Monthly Catalog. Initial indications are that the Serial Set Committee will look favorably on the Council recommendations concerning the catalog entry numbers and indexing.

- 8.1.g.) Secure the inclusion of the various *EPA Technical Reports Series* in the Depository Library Report. (Item 431-I-11, 431-I-12, EP 1.23/3, 431-J-13 inactive since 1983, 431-I-24, 431-J-11, 431-I-62, 431-K-12 + 431-J). Recently, only selected report summaries have been distributed.

Response: Library Programs Service will work with the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that EPA publications falling into the item numbers cited in the Council's recommendation are distributed through the depository library program.

- 8.1h.) Ask that information regarding the use and availability of map indexes be included in the Federal Depository Library Manual.

Kathleen Eisenbeis has agreed to work with the Library Programs Service on this project.

Response: GPO has contacted Ms. Kathleen Eisenbeis concerning the updating of Section 7 of the *Federal Depository Library Manual*. The Chief, Inspection Team has agreed to work with Ms. Eisenbeis this summer on revising Section 7. After this section is revised, it will [be] distributed as part of the next transmittal of the *Federal Depository Library Manual*.

- 8.1i.) Split up the problem item numbers identified in the recent Library Programs Service survey.

Response: As announced in the January 1987 issue of *Administrative Notes* (Vol. 8, No. 3), LPS will be splitting out the top 20 problem item numbers identified through responses to the questionnaire which appeared in the December 1985 issue of *Ad Notes* (Vol. 6, No. 18).

Group 2

- 8.2a.) Commend the Library Programs Service on getting the working paper collection shelved. However, we ask that a high priority be given to file the microfiche collection. We also recommend that a concerted effort be made to make the classification corrections to both the microfiche and the paper collection.

Response: Acting on an earlier Council recommendation, LPS staff shelved the working paper collection of documents listed in the 1986 Monthly Catalog. This task was completed in September, and LPS thanks Council for its recognition of this achievement. LPS is also pleased to announce that the filing of the microfiche diazo collection in classification number sequence was completed in early December 1986.

- 8.2b) Seek General Counsel's guidance on whether or not LPS needs to fill rainchecks for those publications which are or have been superseded.

Response: The General Counsel has provided the following response to the Director, Library, Programs Service:

Based on a review of the statutes involved, and discussions with you and Mrs. Trivizas, our impression is that the DLC request poses an operational, rather than legal pro[blem]. Section 1904 of Title 44 requires the Superintendent of Documents to issue a list of Government publications to facilitate the selection of only those publications needed by depository libraries. The selected publications shall be distributed to the depository libraries in accordance with regulations of the Superintendent of Documents, as long as they fulfill the conditions provided by law.

Section 1905, in turn, provides that "Government publications selected from lists prepared by the Superintendent of Documents, and when requested from him, shall be distributed to depository libraries...." 44 U.S.C. § 1905. Accordingly, it is clear that the Superintendent of Documents has an obligation both to prepare lists which enable the depository libraries to select the publications they desire, and to distribute the documents selected.

It is likely that the DLC's request is prompted by the language of 44 U.S.C. § 1911, which, in general, requires depository libraries to retain all publications for a period of five years, "except superseded publications or those issued later in bound form which may be discarded as authorized by the Superintendent of Documents." The DLC recommendation suggests implicitly that cost savings may be possible if LPS is not required to backfill rainchecks issued to depository libraries for publications which were not distributed in the first place, and which, through the passage of time, have become superseded.

Simply stated (from our perspective), any depository library has the right to receive a copy of a publication that it has selected. Concomitantly, LPS has an obligation to fill the orders from the libraries for that publication. As we understand it, once LPS becomes aware that there is a shortage of a particular document which prevents complete distribution to all selecting libraries, it makes various efforts to obtain sufficient copies from other sources. If those efforts prove unavailing, LPS must submit a print order to satisfy the shortage. Because LPS has no direct control over how much time it may take for a particular document to be reprinted, it can not know whether it will have the documents before it is superseded.⁽¹⁾ Additionally, there very well may be selecting libraries which wish to receive and retain copies of a particular document even though it has been superseded. Obviously, as we have noted above, those libraries still would have the right to receive copies of the document, albeit on a delayed basis, because they had selected them initially.

If it were feasible and economical from an operational standpoint, we would have no legal objection to a system which would permit a selecting library to choose not to receive a publication that had become superseded. From the information you have provided to us, it appears that even if such a system could be designed, it would not result

in significant cost-savings because the printing requirement would have already been established and the document either would have been printed, or the order may have been processed to the point where it would be impossible to alter the quantity requested. Thus, all that would be saved is some marginal distribution and shipping costs.

We would be happy to discuss this with you further if you believe the situation warrants.

- (1) We note also that the publishing entity, and not LPS, has control over whether and how quickly a document becomes superseded.

Congressional Record (vol. 131), for distribution to depository libraries. It appears that a substantial number of libraries have not received all the issues of this volume.

Response: The Superintendent, Congressional Printing Management Division has responded to this recommendation as follows:

Suggestion

- 8.2c. has precedent: I would suggest we go ahead with it. I would also suggest that before preceding you check with the Chief Indexer, Carl Hebert, 275-9020, concerning where the files reside, and the amount of man-hours necessary to produce the desired product.
- 8.2d.) Produce an inverted List of Classes, i.e., a list of item numbers with corresponding SuDocs numbers, titles, frequency and format. Susan Tulis has volunteered to work with LPS on this.

Response: LPS concurs with the intent of this recommendation, to provide item number-to-class stem access to the List of Classes. The arrangement of both the Union List of Item Selection and the item cards is by item number, providing the item number-to-class stem access Council is seeking, and the existence of these two tools was the basis for our inability to support a previous recommendation of Council (Spring 86, #12, Group II). However, we have since reconsidered our previous decision.

In considering the desirability of item number-to-class stem access, we examined three approaches:

- a. A QUARTERLY FULL INVERSION IN ADDITION TO THE CURRENT LIST OF CLASSES.

This option Consists of a list of item numbers with corresponding SuDoc numbers, titles, frequency, and format, to be published quarterly as a component of the List of Classes. This option would add approximately 140 pages to each issue of the List of Classes; LPS would incur in excess of \$24,000 annually in additional printing costs.

- b. AN ANNUAL (OR SEMI-ANNUAL) FULL INVERSION IN PLACE OF ONE (OR TWO) QUARTERLY EDITION OF THE LIST OF CLASSES

This approach would consist of the same full inversion as option A above; however, since issues of the List of Classes in which the arrangement was by item number would replace issues in which the arrangement was by SuDocs class stem, LPS would incur no additional printing costs.

- c. ENHANCEMENT OF THE CURRENT LIST OF CLASSES TO INCLUDE AN INDEX BY ITEM NUMBER

This approach would provide an index arranged by item number. Within each item number only the associated Sudocs class stems would be listed. This “index” option would require the user to refer to the class stem listing for full identification of the entry (and thus does not provide the “one stem lookup” that a full inversion would). The additional printing costs associated with this option would be minimal.

LPS believes that Option C represents a reasoned balance between cost and utility, and is working with staff of Data Systems Service to provide an item number index to the List of Classes.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer investigate the possibility of making GPO's OCLC/MARC archival tapes available for sale on a subscription basis through GPO Sales as well as through the Library of Congress.

Rationale: The physical and field changes that the Library of Congress makes to these tapes adds another layer of difficulty to their use by depository libraries, especially those that have tailored their local, online catalogs to use OCLC/MARC tapes rather than USMARC (LC's version). At least 100 libraries have already expressed an interest in the tapes in this format.

Response

The Public Printer has investigated the possibility of making GPO's OCLC/MARC format Monthly Catalog tapes available on a subscription basis. The preliminary estimates are that, in the event such a product would be produced, the annual costs for a subscription consisting of twelve monthly tapes and one Periodicals Supplement tape would be \$1,153 domestic and \$1,442 foreign.

There would be, of course, a substantial number of technical and procedural details to be resolved before such a product could be offered for sale. Before investing considerable resources in the resolution of these complex issues, GPO wishes to examine the results of the depository library market survey requested by Ms. Sandra McAninch, distributed in *Administrative Notes*, Vol. 8, No. 5, in order to determine if the potential demand justifies the expenditure of resources.

Recommendation 10

In light of recent developments, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer reconsider his General Counsel's opinion on the status of machin[e]-readable files as government information which could be distributed by the GPO. In addition, Council suggests that the Public Printer consider submitting the PRF as a possible JCP pilot project.

Rationale: More and more government agencies are distributing information only in a machine readable format, e.g., BLS diskettes. Consequently, this information is not being made available to depository libraries and the citizens they serve. GPO's participation in the Joint Committee on Printing's pilot projects would seem to be appropriate.

Response

The Public Printer is deferring consideration of PRF as a pilot project, pending Congressional review of the fiscal year 1988 appropriations request by the GPO. The outcome of the budgetary process should provide clear indication of Congressional support for the pilot projects. Meanwhile, PRF continues to be available to the public in microfiche format from GPO as well as online from commercial sources.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service for its willingness to experiment with allowing selectives to drop item numbers at any time, not just during the item selection revision period, and recommends that this practice be continued on a permanent basis.

Rationale: It gives selectives more options and saves GPO money by reducing the number of copies which will have to be distributed.

Response

LPS thanks the Depository Library Council for its commendation, and is pleased that the practice of allowing selectives to drop item numbers at any time has proven to be so beneficial as to warrant continuation. As stated in the June 1986 issue of *Administrative Notes* (Vol. 7, No. 8), this practice is being tested over a one-year trial period, extending from October 1, 1986, to October 1, 1987. As part of our evaluation, we will certainly consider this endorsement from Council. However, the trial period has only been in effect for 6 months, and we believe that it is premature for LPS to make a permanent commitment at this time.

Recommendation 12

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service explore the possibility of providing for groups of depository libraries, at their request and for a fee to cover costs, union lists of the item selections of those libraries.

Rationale: Many depositories are now planning local cooperative resource sharing. These union lists would encourage cooperation, reduce total item selections, improve regional access, and save money both for depository libraries and for the Library Programs Service.

Response

Reference is made to Vol. 7, No. 20 of the publication, *Administrative Notes* dated December 1986 (reproduced below), which addresses this recommendation in great detail. There are no plans to offer any other version of this sales item.

GPO DEPOSITORY UNION LIST OF ITEM SELECTIONS

Magnetic tape

During the recent meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, held in Washington, D.C., October 15-17, LPS received several inquiries regarding the availability of a machine-readable version of the GPO Union List of Item Selections. GPO does not provide customized sub-sets of the Union List on tape; however, the entire tape is available at a nominal cost for libraries wishing to do their own tape processing. Libraries with the capability to produce customized products from the Union List tapes may wish to consider providing this service to other libraries.

The GPO Depository Union List of Item Selections is comprised of two parts: The first part provides bibliographic and descriptive information for over 6,000 item categories, which represent United States Government documents distributed through the Federal Depository Program administered by the U.S. Government Printing Office. Each item entry is followed by depository numbers for up to 1,400 libraries which receive that item. An appendix provides complete addresses and telephone numbers for the broad range of public, academic, government, and other special libraries which participate in the Depository Library Program.

The tape sold by this Office is a print imagee tape used for producing microfiche. It is a high quality nine track tape recorded at 800, 1,600, or 6,250 BPI. Tapes contain IBM standard labels, and 20 records to a block. Each record, which corresponds to a line of print, contains 133 characters for a block size of 2,660 characters.

The price of GPO Depository Union List of Item Selections in magnetic tape format is currently \$183. Like regular sales items, remittance must be money order, or cash, or charged to your VISA, MASTERCARD, GPO or NTIS deposit account. Please provide the expiration date when using a credit card. Tapes will be duplicated as orders are received, so please allow four to six weeks for delivery. When ordering, please provide the stock number for the union list magnetic tape shown in the Publications Reference File (PRF): 021-000-00115-5. Please send your order to the address below:

Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Chief, Order Division (SSO)
Washington, D.C. 20402

Recommendation 13

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer prepare and distribute a bi-weekly, cumulative COM index to the daily edition of the Congressional Record in lieu of the current paper product.

Rationale: The change would allow GPO to distribute a more timely, useful, and cheaper index to the Congressional Record rather than that currently available through the sporadic distribution of the bi-weekly paper product.

Response

This recommendation has been referred to the responsible official within the GPO, with a request that a reply be directed to the Chair of Depository Library Council.

Recommendation 15

The Depository Library Council recognizes the present fiscal restraints under which the Library Programs Service must operate. However, the Council refrains from replying to Issue 8G-2 (see attached) until a full financial report on savings from current and previous Council recommendations is made. In the interim, Council continues to seek input from the depository community concerning titles and/or item numbers which should always be available in paper.

Response

The Public Printer can appreciate the difficulties inherent in Council's effort to develop a contingency list of 500 items that should always remain in paper, and he is encouraged to know that Council is continuing to seek input from the depository community for purposes of preparing such a list. It is highly unlikely that the list would be needed by GPO prior to September 30, 1987. After that date, however, it would be most helpful if Council were prepared to produce the list on 30-days notice from GPO. Should a need for the list arise and a list is unavailable from Council, GPO would have to proceed unilaterally in selecting more titles for microfiche conversion.

Recommendation 17

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that at a minimum all regional depository libraries continue to receive both paper and microfiche copies of all publications currently distributed in dual format. The regional depository will ensure the availability of the paper copy for a minimum of five (5) years.

Rationale: The regional will be able to respond to current needs of the selective depositories for paper publications as a response to GPO's budgetary problems.

Response

As long as Regional libraries continue receiving both paper and microfiche copies of all publications currently distributed in dual format, Regionals will only be required to retain one copy of a publication.

Recommendation 18

In addition to the policies expressed in "Superintendent of Documents Policy 13 (SOD 13), the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the following factors be considered in determining whether paper or microfiche be sent to depository libraries.

- a. the ability of the GPO to get the rider rate;
- b. the ability of GPO to procure/produce computer output microfiche;
- c. the ability of GPO to procure competitively high-quality, indexed, enhanced microfiche at no less than current GPO contact specifications.

Rationale: It is expected that all these factors could provide GPO with substantial cost savings.

Response

The Public Printer thanks the DLC for the guidance expressed in recommendation #18, and wishes to assure Council that these considerations will be factored into future decisions on the distribution of hardcopy or microfiche to depositories.

Recommendation 19

The Depository Library Council would like to convey to the Public Printer its support of the Joint Committee on Printing's policy as voiced in their October 3, 1986, letter regarding the depository community's right to choose between paper and microfiche editions of the same publication.

Response

The Public Printer delivered a formal statement on February 23, 1987, before the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee concerning budget estimates for fiscal year 1988. The Public Printer's statement included the following request, "... we have received further direction from the Joint Committee on Printing to continue to provide hard copy publications to libraries that requested them. Because of this, I am requesting that an additional \$1.2 million be derived from the Revolving Fund to fund the additional cost of hard-copy publications." Actual availability of this \$1.2 million in fiscal year 1988 is as yet undetermined.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

1987

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, APRIL 1-3, 1987 • SAN DIEGO, CA

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council wishes Parker Covington the best in his new job and thanks him for his years of work in Library Programs Service.

Response (from Parker Covington)

I greatly appreciate Council's expression of support. The years spent in LPS have been rewarding and gratifying, both through the knowledge that the Depository Distribution Division was performing a task vital to the dissemination of government information, and through the opportunity they provided me to work with the many talented and dedicated people of LPS.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service (LPS) in the prompt distribution of the Tower Commission report and encourages the same alacrity in distribution for future newsworthy publications. Council also commends the Library Programs Service for *Administrative Notes*, v. 8, n. 4, which contains the "Required Documents for Depository Libraries" list and the statistical questions requiring data for the 1987 Biennial Survey. This information is very helpful in the proper management of depository libraries.

Response

Library Programs Service thanks the Depository Library Council for recognition of the special effort required to distribute the Tower Report the same day it was released. LPS will continue to monitor the processing of high demand publications in the future, thus ensuring their prompt distribution. LPS also acknowledges Council's commendation regarding information published in *Administrative Notes*, and will continue to maintain *Ad Notes* as a vehicle for the timely dissemination of high interest information to the Depository Library Community.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that Sections 4-5 of the "Guidelines for the Depository Library System" be changed to read "Depository Libraries, either solely or in conjunction with neighboring depositories, should make demonstrable efforts to identify and meet the Government information needs of the local area," and that the "Instructions to Depository Libraries" provide an adequate definition of "demonstrable efforts," and reflect the importance of a written collection development policy.

Rationale: The Depository Library Council agrees that the Inspection Team's proposed wording, along with suggested changes to the Instructions, will better serve the various types of libraries in the Depository Library system and their service communities.

Response

The August 1987 issue of *Administrative Notes* includes a notice concerning the change in the wording of Guidelines 4-5 that was approved by Council. The "Instructions to Depository Libraries" will be revised in the Winter of 1988. This revision will reflect the change in Guidelines 4-5 and will provide further guidance on depository collection development.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council is pleased that the Library Programs Service is splitting out the top 20 problem item numbers. After the List of Classes with the item number index becomes available, Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service resurvey the depository community for identification of additional problem item numbers.

Rationale: Very few libraries responded to the call for a list of problem item numbers, in large part due to the inability of libraries to easily identify all the classes attached to an item number.

Response

The Depository Administration Branch staff has reviewed the top 20 problem item numbers. Because many of them can be broken out into separate items, batches of new item cards will be issued gradually to depositories. For some of the reported problem items, it seems to be more of a dispute about a classification number than an item number. For a few items, it is unclear as to what the specific concern is because librarians responding to the poll just listed the item number without a reason for their choice.

Programming changes to DDIS (Depository Distribution and Information System) are complete for generating an item number index to the List of Classes (option C, DLC recommendation #8.2d, October 1986). A documents librarian from New Jersey graciously volunteered to edit the printout for discrepancies. Depository Administration Branch personnel will then review and correct the data before this product is issued. Our goal is for this item number index to appear in the December 1987 *List of Classes*.

When this new index becomes available, depository librarians will be surveyed through Administrative Notes to identify additional problem item numbers.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Programs Service analyze the claims fulfillment situation and report back at the October Council meeting.

Rationale: It appears that there are insufficient copies for claims, given the present number of depository libraries, and no consistent causes have been determined to explain the problem. A problem also exists since the claims supply may be exhausted before Western libraries have received their shipments.

Response

The Depository Distribution Division has undertaken a study of claims fulfillment, and will present the results at the October 1987 meeting of the Depository Library Council, in addition to publishing them in *Administrative Notes*.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that he form a committee with representatives from GPO, Depository Library Council, JCP, and the Census Bureau to study and make recommendations concerning the format and the distribution of 1990 Census data.

Rationale: Council feels that such data is important and that appropriate planning for its timely distribution is essential. At the midwinter meeting of ALA such a committee was suggested by the Government Documents Round Table.

Response

Superintendent of Documents and LPS personnel met in early June with representatives of the Census Bureau to exchange information regarding the 1990 Census. The parties agreed to sponsor a one-day workshop on October 13 in Washington. This workshop will afford depository librarians the opportunity for “give and take” session with Census officials concerning publishing and distribution plans for the 1990 Census data.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council commends GPO for pursuing the possibility of offering its OCLC archival tapes for sale. The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer proceed with the remaining “technical and procedural details” to make these current and retrospective tape files available for sale through either GPO or LC.

Rationale: Since the Library of Congress currently sells only 23 subscriptions to the USMARC tapes, the interest expressed by the respondents to the Depository Library Council survey (vol. 8, n. 5, Administrative Notes) represents a substantial increase in the potential market for either GPO or LC. (Survey interest: 60 current subscriptions, 50 retrospective files.)

Response

The Documents Sales Service has advised LPS that it will initiate a tape subscription service to the Monthly Catalog in machine-readable format, consisting of the bibliographic records from 13 regular catalog issues; i.e. the Periodicals Supplement plus 12 monthly issues. The basic subscription period will be one year, commencing with the 1988 Periodicals Supplement through the December 1988 *Monthly Catalog* issue. The subscription tapes will be in ASCII format, recorded at 1600 BPI, and the bibliographic records will be in OCLC/MARC format. Pricing for the subscription service should be finalized prior to the October Council meeting.

A retrospective tape file, consisting of all *Monthly Catalog* records compiled from OCLC tapes since the July, 1976 issue through the December issue of the last complete catalog year, will also be offered for sale, pending the successful conversion of the data to the current OCLC/MARC format. This file will increase in both size and price each year, as the latest year’s complete data are added.

Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that in contracting for the procurement of microfiche for distribution to depository libraries, GPO’s own tapes be the source for the generation of computer-output microfiche (COM).

Rationale: Creation of microfiche masters through the use of computer tapes prepared by GPO for the production of paper copies would result in more timely, better quality, and more accurate microfiche products for distribution to depository libraries. The current practice is to produce such masters from paper copy instead of going directly to microfiche from computer tape.

Response

This recommendation was tabled.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service reinstate complete compliance with “SOD-13”. The Council also recommends that the Library Programs Service offer dual format selection for additional titles. A subcommittee within Council will help in identifying suitable candidates.

Rationale: Council feels “SOD-13” has proven to be the best guideline to judge the suitability of items for conversion to microfiche. More titles offered in dual format would reduce demand for paper copies, resulting in cost savings.

Response

The Library Programs Service has resumed complying fully with “SOD-13”. However, any publications that have been converted to fiche at Council’s recommendation (i.e. list of 966) shall remain in fiche format.

LPS would be pleased to evaluate any suggestions from the Depository Library Council for dual-format candidate titles.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council (DLC) recommends that the Public Printer ask the Library Programs Service (LPS) to investigate generation of shipping lists using microcomputer technology. Further, the DLC recommends that these computer-generated shipping lists be produced in a printed format which can be effectively scanned and read by machine. In addition, timely cumulations of the shipping lists should be made available in machine-readable form. LPS should distribute to all depositories appropriate documentation on how the printed shipping lists can be optically scanned, and how the machine-readable cumulations of the shipping list can be obtained and read.

Rationale: The data processing capabilities of a microcomputer will increase productivity at LPS and result in more accurate shipping lists. The ability to create machine-readable records at the local level will increase productivity in the depositories, and improve public service and promotional activities, as well. The cumulative, machine-readable shipping list file will serve to provide a quick and easy reference to items that have been shipped, long before they appear in the Monthly Catalog.

Response

The Library Programs Service is gratified to have Council’s encouragement for the expanded use of computer technology in depository operations. Our plan to generate shipping lists by microcomputer is one of many projects that fall within the scope of the Information Technology Program. The application for generating paper shipping lists will be designed to include the potential for production of cumulative products in multiple formats from a shipping list data base.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that GPO resume regular meetings of the Depository Study Group.

Response

The Depository Study Group was initiated to provide the Superintendent of Documents with background information on various areas of interest to him. As these areas have now been covered satisfactorily there is no longer a need for this group.

Recommendation 12

In view of the response to recommendation #15 from the Fall 1986 meeting, the Depository Library Council will continue to solicit through Administrative Notes additional input from the depository library community concerning items which should always remain in paper.

Rationale: “It is highly unlikely that the list would be needed by GPO prior to September 30, 1987. After that date, however, it would be most helpful if Council were prepared to produce the list on 30 days notice from GPO. Should a need for the list arise and a list is unavailable from Council, GPO would have to proceed unilaterally in selecting more titles for microfiche conversion.” (DLC Recommendations and Responses, April, 1987, no. 15)

Response

GPO appreciates having Council’s assistance in identifying depository items that should never be converted to microfiche. Should future circumstances require the need for such a list by GPO, the availability of a carefully considered list would be invaluable.

Recommendation 13

The Depository Library Council expresses its appreciation to Dave Brown for all his work.

Response

The Director of Marketing has provided the following response: “I heartily endorse Recommendation #13. Mr. Brown does a fine job in his capacity as official arranger for the semi-annual Depository Library Council meetings.”

Recommendation 14

In order to provide depositories government information in the format most appropriate for their user communities, the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that adequate annual appropriations be requested from Congress.

Rationale: The Council feels strongly that depositories should be able to choose the format in which information is distributed to their libraries to best serve their clientele.

Response

The Comptroller provides the following response: “GPO supports the most effective and efficient dissemination of Government information from the standpoint of the user community, the libraries, and the Government. GPO will request funding levels from the Congress in support of this goal and consistent with the policies of the Joint Committee on Printing. For our fiscal year 1988 request, we have submitted an amended budget for additional funding to continue the dual-format distribution of publications to depository libraries.”

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 14 - 16, 1987 • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Library Programs Service continue to list the Corrections for Previous Monthly Catalogs in each issue of the Monthly Catalog, and to cumulate the corrections in the annual index volume. The proposal to delete one or the other should be considered only when a suitable substitute is available for all recipients of the *Monthly Catalog*.

Rationale: Council recognizes the variety of ways in which depository libraries and other recipients currently use this information. Both the timeliness of the monthly corrections and the convenience of the annual cumulation are important to users. Substitute information provided exclusively to depositories will not address the needs of non-depository recipients.

Response

Based on the guidance of the Depository Library Council, the listing of Corrections for Previous *Monthly Catalogs* will continue to be a regular feature of each *Monthly Catalog* issue. The Library Programs Service will also continue to cumulate the corrections listing in the annual index volume for the convenience of users.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council has no objections to the Library Programs Service proposal to discontinue the listing of “New Classification Numbers” in the *Monthly Catalog*.

Rationale: Alternative sources such as the Shipping List or the new “Weekly Updates” to the *List of Classes* are adequate to handle the depository library requirements for this information and should prove to be more timely than the *Monthly Catalog*. However, the Depository Library Council advises the Public Printer that this proposal may not meet the needs of non-depository recipients of the Monthly Catalog.

Response

The Library Programs Service appreciates Council’s advice concerning the proposal to discontinue the listing of “new classification numbers” in the *Monthly Catalog*. This catalog feature has been eliminated with the first issue of 1988. LPS is confident that the needs of most users for this type of information will be better served by such alternative sources as the Shipping List or the “Weekly Updates” to the *List of Classes* now published in *Administrative Notes*.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council applauds the Public Printer for the establishment of the Information Technology Program (ITP) and the appointment of Jan Erickson to head the effort. The Depository Library Council needs to be an active participant in the planning for production and dissemination of information in electronic format. As the request for FY 1989 GPO appropriations, which will include funds for pilot projects, will be submitted prior to the Spring Depository Library Council meeting, Council offers its help in the development of plans for pilot projects through a subcommittee of Council. The Chair will appoint the members of the subcommittee.

Rationale: Because of the significant impact of dissemination of electronic information to depository libraries, Council should be an active partner with GPO in planning and seeking funding for pilot projects. The Depository Library Council subcommittee can bring the depository library perspective to the IT planning process and strengthen Depository Library Council understanding of this vital issue.

Response

The Public Printer appreciates having the assistance of Council's subcommittee for the Information Technology Program. The Library Programs Service will keep the subcommittee informed of decisions in the IT area and will seek the advice of the subcommittee as needed.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council wishes to thank the Superintendent of Documents, Library Programs Service personnel and the Bureau of the Census for sponsoring the October 13th workshop on the 1990 Census. Council feels the next step should be the formation of a planning committee by the Public Printer to work with the Bureau of the Census to identify and meet depository library users needs for Census products. The committee should include representatives from GPO, the Depository Library Council, the Joint Committee on Printing, the Census Bureau and a depository librarian associated with a State Data Center. The Depository Library Council further recommends that the Chief of the Depository Administration Branch be designated liaison between the Committee and the Bureau of the Census.

Rationale: The Library Programs Service should take immediate advantage of the Census Bureau's strongly expressed interest in meeting depository library needs by establishing the Committee and a liaison in order to satisfy, at the minimum, the following depository library needs:

1. Advance identification and early notification to depository libraries of Census publication plans so that libraries will be able to evaluate their current item selections and revise them well before publication, including:
 - a. Early surveys of depository libraries for Census products new to the system, with provision of geographical selectivity by state for all possible products - particularly bulky microfiche sets.
 - b. Early notification of depository libraries (a year before actual survey, if possible) regarding machine readable products such as CD-ROM which will be distributed in the depository system. This should include clear and detailed descriptions of hardware and software needed for their use, so the libraries may fit these needs into their budgets and fundraising plans.
2. Acquisition and dissemination to depository libraries of all Census print and microfiche products, and, at least, those electronic products (such as CD-ROM and floppy disks) that can be used on a microcomputer.

Response

The Library Programs Service has discussed this recommendation with the Census Bureau and has determined that the proposed "interagency Committee" approach would be an inappropriate and relatively inefficient means for identifying and expressing depository library users' needs for Census products. It would seem both quicker and simpler for librarians and library groups to communicate their needs directly to the Bureau of the Census. In fact, one purpose of the October 13, 1987 Census workshop was to acquaint Council members and other attendees with the Census Bureau's plans and staff members in order to foster a direct, continuing dialogue between the Census Bureau and the depository library community.

LPS intends to continue monitoring Census publication plans in order to provide early depository surveys for facilitating timely library selections of projected Census publications. Moreover, LPS has offered the Census Bureau free use of our Admin-

istrative Notes newsletter as a vehicle for keeping the depository library community apprised of decisions and developments of interest. Soon to be published in Administrative Notes will be “Tentative Plans for 1990,” the Census Bureau’s latest report on product plans for the Decennial Census.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that a serials control system be implemented at the Library Programs Service.

Rationale: The Library Programs Service urgently needs the capability to insure that all issues of serials are received and distributed through the depository system. This control mechanism would provide the Library Programs Service with information essential to make timely and concerted efforts to acquire missing issues. Depository libraries experience significant problems with missing issues due to the absence of adequate serial controls within LPS.

Response

A serials control subsystem, which will proactively alert LPS to overdue issues of regularly serials has been included in the requirements for ACSIS (Acquisitions, Classification & Shipment Information System). In the interim, LPS has instituted manual procedures which will identify “missing” issues of serial publications in a timely manner, enabling the Acquisitions Section to pursue their inclusion in the Depository Library Program.

Recommendation 6

Once a specification for paper permanence is formally adopted by the Joint Committee on Printing, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer notify government publishers of the availability of permanent paper and the benefits of using it. The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO encourage the use of permanent paper for publications with enduring research value.

Rationale: The library community has expressed to Council a concern about the deterioration of older government documents printed on acidic paper. Council shares this concern and believes that the Joint Committee on Printing should include consideration of archival life in paper specifications in order to minimize this problem in the future.

Response

GPO’s Customer Service Staff has provided LPS with the following response:

When a paper specification is adopted by the Joint Committee on Printing, it is forwarded to all Departments along with a cover letter from the JCP Chairman. Paper specifications contain appropriate information regarding its intended use. The Government Printing Office, as always, would continue to support the usage of appropriate JCP papers. The ordering agencies determine the requirements of their publications. Initially it is anticipated that limited demand and availability of permanent papers would be reflected in higher costs. Departmental selection of archival paper and the procurement of this work may at first be influenced by several factors. Availability of permanent paper from suppliers in appropriate quantities, turnaround time required, budget limitations, and suitability to meet the quality requirements of the particular job are necessary considerations. These factors, with the exception of the inherent quality capabilities of the paper, will diminish as demand increases and more mills decide to produce a permanent paper.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the Government Printing Office review its original agreement with the Department of Energy for the provision of bibliographic access to energy information through Energy Research Abstracts rather than the Monthly Catalog. The recent proposal by the Department of Energy to eliminate the paper version of Energy Research Abstracts may weaken the intent of the original assessment.

Rationale: The Department of Energy's proposal to stop paper production of Energy Research Abstracts has the potential to seriously reduce the bibliographic access by depository libraries and abstract users to energy information. Such a move would leave the user community with Government Reports Announcements, which currently has no abstracts or analytics, or the EPA equivalent on-line data base, which many libraries cannot afford.

Response

The Department of Energy has informed GPO that Energy Research Abstracts will continue as a paper and microfiche publication through the end of calendar year 1988. DOE is currently conducting an assessment (to be completed during April 1988) to determine the fate of ERA in 1989 and beyond. The determination to continue or discontinue ERA will be based on an assessment of the coverage and utility of ERA relative to that of other publications, such as Government Reports Announcement and Index, or other formats, such as the Energy Data Base on Dialog. Depository libraries who wish to provide input to the decision making process are urged to write directly to:

Carolyn Miller
Information Specialist
DOE/OSTI
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831

If the Department of Energy decides to discontinue ERA, GPO will re-evaluate the feasibility of including citations to Department of Energy materials in the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications*.

Recommendation 8

When additional bound editions of the Congressional Record are to be published, the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that dual format distribution be reinstated for depository libraries.

Rationale: The *Congressional Record* is a standard reference source and a primary historical document. A wide variety of library patrons make extensive use of this title. Depositories should have the option of paper copy as well as fiche copy for such an important source. The Depository Library Council recognizes that this cannot be implemented for Volume 131 which is already in production.

Response

In early 1986, the depository format for the bound *Congressional Record* (CR) was changed from hard-copy to microfiche as one measure toward achieving mandated expense reductions in the Depository Library Program. In its recommendation #11 of March 1986, the Depository Library Council concurred with GPO's decision to redesignate the bound CR for microfiche in consideration of competing alternatives for reducing costs.

What may not have been foreseen at that time, however, was the potential for reducing expenses while improving user access to the bound CR through the medium of CD-ROM. In recognition of this opportunity, the LPS Information Technology Program is presently working toward making this opportunity a reality.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service for increasing efficiency in the depository inspection program and encourages the implementation of a three-year inspection cycle. In support of this goal, Council recommends that the Library Programs Service fill the vacant inspector position as expeditiously as possible while maintaining established qualification standards.

Response

The Library Programs Service thanks the Depository Council for its commendation of the Inspection Program. LPS will continue to maintain the high qualification standards it has established for its Inspection Team personnel. To that end, GPO has distributed an Inspector's position description to all depositories and some qualified candidates have been identified. LPS expects to fill the Inspector position within the next few weeks.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council is concerned with the undistributed microfiche currently embargoed due to litigation. Council suggests that the title and SuDoc numbers of the documents in that microfiche be made available in *Administrative Notes* and that the Library Programs Service develop a tracking system to identify the status of all titles and issues between the print order and mailing of the titles and issues, regardless of format.

Rationale: Repeated inquiries to the Library Programs Service and members of Council could be handled more effectively by having the titles and SuDoc numbers of the documents in question.

Response

LPS has determined that the compilation and publication of titles and SuDocs numbers for material awaiting microfiche conversion is impracticable. The capability of comprehensively tracking individual publications from the time they are ordered to the time they are distributed is included in the ACSIS requirements documents.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council commends Susan Shaw, Judith Snow, Barbara Stock, Allison Supancic, Christine Ta and Kathleen Eisenbeis of the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Texas, Austin for the completion of the *Administrative Notes Index*. Council further commends the Library Programs Service for the prompt distribution of the Index.

Response

Kathleen Eisenbeis has responded to this recommendation as follows:

Speaking on behalf of the students of the GSLIS of the University of Texas at Austin, we are honored to be commended by the Depository Library Council. It was a job that needed to be done and the importance of providing the Index for the benefit of so many outweighed the effort that was required of so few. The satisfaction I receive each time someone tells me how useful the Index is, makes it all seem worthwhile. I encourage members of the Depository Library community to pursue similar projects from which we all benefit and overcome the tendency to wait for someone else to do them. There are real contributions waiting to be made.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

1988

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, MARCH 9 - 11, 1988 • CHARLESTON, SC

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council congratulates the Superintendent of Documents for being awarded the GSA Excellence in Administration *Certificate of Merit*. The entire depository library community has benefitted from his broad experience and standards of excellence. We extend our best wishes for continued success.

Response

The Superintendent of Documents thanks the members of Council for their commendation. He believes that the pursuit of excellence is a team endeavor and that awards are not won by individuals. He feels that GSA's Certificate of Merit is a recognition of the dedication of the community of documents librarians and he gratefully acknowledges their major role in the success of Documents operations. The Superintendent points out that the greatest reward of our area of public service is the knowledge that access to Government publications has been improved.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service for the creative new column "Whatever Happened to ..." in *Administrative Notes*.

Rationale: Sharing the information, gathered in response to questions, such as those raised by John McGeachy that involve considerable effort on both the part of the librarian and the Acquisitions Unit, will save the time of many others in the depository library community. It is an efficient and valuable means of communication.

Response

The Library Programs Service, and particularly the Acquisitions Unit, appreciates this praise from the Depository Library Council. We also receive great satisfaction from the comments of depository librarians on how useful the column is for their record-keeping.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council commends the catalogers at the Library Programs Service for 10 years of participation in the National Coordinated Cataloging Operations (NACO) during which LPS has provided nearly 65,000 name authority headings to the Library of Congress. These headings are incorporated into the LC automated name authority file to enhance its value to users in the international library community.

Response

The Library Programs Service cataloging staff appreciates Council's recognition of their continuing contributions to the Library of Congress automated name authority files.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer ask the Joint Committee on Printing to consider recommending to the House Rules Committee and the Senate Administration Committee that 44 U.S. Code be clarified to show the Congressional interest that Executive Branch printing be done through the GPO.

Rationale: Section 308(a) in the Continuing Resolution, P.L. 100-202 is only effective for FY 88. In view of the Administration's action on the FAR, more permanent provisions are needed to insure that all appropriate Executive Branch publications are made available to the depository program by being handled through GPO.

Response

While I appreciate the DLC's concern that, to date, there has been no permanent resolution of the controversy over the FAR amendment, I believe it would be highly inappropriate for the Government Printing Office to intervene in the matter, as suggested by the DLC.

In my view, the JCP is keenly aware of the implications of the FAR language, particularly as it relates to the availability of Executive Branch publications for the depository libraries. Further, I believe that the JCP would vehemently oppose any threat to the continued availability of these publications for the depositories. I defer to congressional discretion as to the determination of the appropriate form the protection of interests of the depositories should take.

However, because we are in the midst of a presidential election year, Congress is making a determined effort to adjourn as early as possible. With a full legislative agenda, which includes a number of appropriations bills still awaiting floor debate, it is doubtful that any additional items will come up for consideration by both Houses.

Although my position is not supportive of this recommendation, I appreciate being kept apprised of Council's concern and I will be monitoring the FAR situation carefully.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council respectfully asks the Public Printer to convey the thanks of the depository community to the Joint Committee on Printing for directing that the new edition of the Constitution of the United States, *Analysis and Interpretation* (Senate Document 99-16) be distributed in paper to all depositories. The Council recognizes that there are some other recurring Congressional publications of similar overwhelming significance, popular interest or utility which are almost useless to the public in microfiche and important for all depositories to have in paper. Examples include such diverse publications as the Biographical Directory of Congress, *Policy and Supporting Positions* (the "Plum Book,") and *Citizens Guide to the Freedom of Information Act*. Council recommends that when new editions of such publications are printed they be supplied to all depositories in paper and offers to solicit input from the depository community for a short list of additional suggested titles.

Rationale: Many librarians save the depository program a good deal of money by selecting Congressional hearings, prints, reports and documents in microfiche, or by not selecting them at all where their districts have no need for the vast majority of them thereby unwittingly depriving their users of these occasional important publications designed particularly for wide public use.

Response

The Joint Committee on Printing has periodically directed GPO to distribute specific publications to all depository libraries in paper, regardless of the format designation of the series and regardless of whether or not an individual library has selected the corresponding item number. The two most recent examples of this practice are the Biographical Directory of the *United States*

Congress and *The Capitol*, which will be distributed to all depositories in paper. GPO will continue to distribute specific publications to all depository libraries in paper, when directed to do so by the Joint Committee on Printing. Depository librarians are urged to suggest appropriate publications for universal paper distribution to the Joint Committee on Printing, prior to the printing of the publication, so that the Depository Library Program will not have to bear the expense of press charges.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that agencies be advised when they place print orders to consider the need of libraries to bind publications. Adequate margins need to be allowed to compensate for trimming during necessary binding and rebinding processes.

Rationale: So little margin was allowed for some 1980 Census titles that data was lost if a volume had to be rebound. Since the agencies are the publishers, the GPO should advise them of the need of the library community for adequate margins for binding purposes.

Response

The Superintendent, Departmental Account Representative Division, has provided the following response: We have issued “Circular Letter 156” which suggests a 3 “to 4” pica bind margin [see attachment]. A draft copy of the “American National Standard for Information Sciences---Durable Hard Cover Binding for Books” calls for a 5/8 inch bind margin which almost parallels our 3” picas [see attachment]. I believe that the 1-inch margin casually referred to on page 181 [of the Council transcript] may be out of the question.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council applauds the GPO on the announced imminent distribution of the Census Bureau’s Test Disc #2 to all depository libraries as a pilot test. Council recommends that this distribution be announced in *Administrative Notes* along with a list of basic equipment needed to use CD-ROM products.

Rationale: The Ad Hoc Committee on Depository Library Access to Federal Automated Databases had recommended that pilot projects be conducted offering government information to depository libraries in a variety of electronic formats. Although no money has been appropriated to fund such pilot projects, GPO, with the encouragement of JCP, has sought to identify “projects appropriate within existing funds.” The Census Bureau’s Test Disk #2 provides an ideal test for distribution of electronic products. It provides depository libraries with data previously unavailable to them; it will include agency-developed software for using the CD products and it is formatted to High Sierra standards. Although some libraries already have appropriate hardware, this test will aid others in planning for future distribution of electronic information products to depositories.

Response

Distribution of Census Test Disk #2 was announced in *Administrative Notes* (v. 9, #10) in accordance with Council’s wishes. Information describing basic equipment requirements for using CD-ROMs will accompany distribution of the test disc.

Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council appreciates the effort that GPO is making to keep communications open to the Census Bureau regarding the 1990 Census. We recommend that LPS produce at the earliest possible moment a complete list of Census products to be distributed to depository libraries. We also recommend that decisions be made and communicated to

depositories about which existing item numbers will be used for which 1990 Census products, early enough so that depository libraries will be able to amend their selections and have the amendments go into effect before printing and distribution. We urge again that item numbers be split along geographical lines and all new items and newly divided item numbers be surveyed well in advance of publication.

Rationale: The depository community needs time to investigate to make sure that no products have been inadvertently omitted from the list of census products. Timely selection of Census item numbers is critical to the selective depositories in view of the fact that Census materials are used heavily and for decades if not centuries.

Response

The Library Programs Service (LPS) and the appropriate Census Bureau staff will be working closely together in order to achieve an accurate and timely distribution of 1990 Census products. As yet, no final list of 1990 products and their corresponding formats is available.

While LPS will attempt to break out item numbers geographically, formats such as CD-ROM and floppy disks may not make this breakdown feasible. Further, it may prove impracticable to survey, i.e. create annotations, assign item numbers and SuDocs class numbers, for products not yet in existence. LPS will confirm what current publications will exist in 1990 so that libraries can select the corresponding item numbers during the 1989 Annual Item Selection Update Cycle.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer for his efforts to provide Council representation for all library types within the depository community. Council is concerned that resignations occurring within the past two years have resulted in a thirteen member council. Council recommends that the Public Printer replace members upon their resignation.

Response

The Public Printer appreciates having the commendation of Council for his efforts to achieve a balanced pattern of representation through his appointments to Council. As to the replacement of resigned Council members, the Public Printer has decided to appoint such replacements only in cases where the Council term is less than half-expired. In other words, only those vacancies with a remaining term of 1 and a half-years, or three Council meetings, will be filled.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that the final edition of the Congressional Record be returned to dual format status.

Rationale: In Recommendation #11 of March 1986, Council provided 15 categories at the request of the Superintendent of Documents, to be considered for conversion to microfiche to help GPO achieve mandated cost reductions in printing. These items were ranked in order to their suitability to be removed as paper products. The Congressional Record was ranked as the least suitable candidate because of its importance to the public at large and then only if the bound Index and the Daily Digest were to be provided to depositories in paper form. Due to the nature of the Congressional Record as a standard reference and primary historical document and in light of continuing difficulty with the bound paper index and the lack of a printed version of the Daily Digest, Council feels obligated to support the return to dual distribution. When the depository libraries and the public they serve are offered access to the *Congressional Record* through electronic media, Council will reconsider this question.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council requests that LPS make it a high priority to provide libraries that select the daily *Congressional Record* with copies of all bi-weekly indexes for Volume 131 (1985).

Rationale: It has been brought to Council’s attention that many depository libraries never received a complete run of these indexes. The daily *Congressional Record* is an important reference for users until the final edition with its index is distributed.

Response

It will be both costly and time-consuming to locate and reproduce the files for the bi-weekly index to the *Congressional Record* (daily) in COM microfiche. Reprinting these indexes in paper is simply not feasible. As the distribution of the daily *Record* in fiche did not begin until 1986, the silver masters are non-existent.

The only feasible solution is for one or more depository libraries to sacrifice individual issues of the bi-weekly index for volume 131 so that LPS can fiche and distribute them to the entire depository community. Volunteers for this project will be sought once LPS has microfiche conversion contracts in place.

Recommendation 12

Recognizing the efforts made in the planning for electronic dissemination projects, the Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that as plans develop for the Information Technology Program, Council be given copies of the reports in an expeditious manner. Council’s Subcommittee on Electronic Dissemination continues to be available for consultation and assistance with a view from the depository community.

Response

LPS thanks the Depository Library Council, particularly the Subcommittee on Electronic Dissemination, for your advice and support concerning the Information Technology Program. We will continue to keep you advised of our activities.

Recommendation 13

The Depository Library Council reaffirms the commitment of the depository library community to high quality microfiche for both GPO sales and depository library distribution. We support GPO’s efforts to ensure microfiche standards and to insist upon compliance by all GPO microfiche contractors.

Nevertheless, the resulting embargo of more than 1800 print orders since August 1987, with no immediate resolution in sight, has placed an intolerable burden on depository libraries and their users.

Therefore, the Depository Library Council suggests that extraordinary measures are necessary to provide the embargoed publications through alternative microfiche or paper distribution without further delay.

Response

The Library Programs Service appreciates Council’s support for our commitment to a quality microfiche product. While we are cognizant of the frustration of patron and librarian alike, Government procurement regulations preclude our purchasing “off the shelf” microfiche in place of the unsatisfactory fiche product. Going “back to press” to supply all of these titles in paper is impracticable, resulting in exorbitant charges against the budget. While the depository community has been extraordinarily patient, LPS has no choice but reproduce replacement fiche for the defective material.

Recommendation 14

The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer for conveying to the JCP's Paper Specification Committee the concerns of Council and the depository community on the problem of acid paper. Council offers examples of titles which could be used for evaluating the feasibility of using permanent paper. Titles suggested are:

1. Congressional Directory
2. Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress
3. Congressional Record final bound edition
4. Statistical Abstract of the United States
5. Vital Statistics of the United States

RESPONSE: The Superintendent, Departmental Account Representative Division, has provided the following response: We concur with the Depository Library Council that certain publications should be produced on a more permanent paper. We believe the *Congressional Directory* and the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* are good candidates for this paper. We will attempt to get approval from our customer agencies for this specification change. This will give us an opportunity also to see what additional costs, if any, are involved. As you know, because of recent budget cuts, our customer agencies are very concerned about costs. If additional costs are minimal, this will be a strong selling point in the process of converting other publications.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 12 - 14, 1988 • ARLINGTON, VA

Commendation 1

The Depository Library Council thanks Ralph E. Kennickell, Jr. for the fine job he has done as Public Printer of the United States. We appreciate his efforts to improve communication between the library community and the GPO. We wish him success and happiness in his new venture.

Commendation 2

The Depository Library Council commends the GPO for obtaining unique status for depository inspectors and thereby accelerating the hiring of two additional inspectors. Council also commends the Depository Library Inspection Service for completing a record 104 inspections in the last quarter and for creating the guidebook, *How to Prepare for A Depository Inspection*.

Commendation 3

The Depository Library Council thanks the Government Printing Office for agreeing to provide the bound *Congressional Record* for the years 1983-1985 in paper format to depositories and for seeking continuing funds for paper distribution of the bound editions for 1986 and succeeding years.

Commendation 4

The Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer convey to the Archivist of the United States our appreciation for inclusion of the GPO printed archives in its new Center for Legislative Archives. We also urge the Public Printer to encourage the National Archives to continue its efforts, such as the recent arrangement of the collection by SuDoc number, to make the collection more visible and accessible to depository libraries and the general public.

Response

The Acting Public has sent the following letter to the Archivist of the United States:

Mr. Don W. Wilson
Archivist
National Archives and Records Administration
7th & Pennsylvania Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20408

Dear Mr. Wilson:

At the request of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, I am writing to convey its appreciation of the National Archives and Records Administration's (NARA) efforts toward improved access to Government documents. The enclosed Recommendation from the October 1988 meeting of the Council expresses the importance of NARA's activities to the community of documents librarians.

Please accept my gratitude as well. GPO shares with NARA a common goal of making Government information products accessible to the American public, and the inclusion of the GPO documents library in the Center for Legislative Archives will certainly provide better public access to that collection than ever before.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. JENIFER
Acting Public Printer

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO Marketing develop depository library promotional posters for use in non-depository libraries. These posters would direct users to the nearest depository for their government information needs.

Rationale: This would help to increase public awareness of the Federal Depository Library Program by encouraging referrals to depositories from non-depositories. A blank space for identification of the nearest depository would allow for the customization of the poster by the recipient library.

Response

The Office of Marketing will be developing posters which promote the use of government documents for display in both depository and non-depository libraries. Provision is being made for those posters displayed in non-depository libraries to direct people to depositories. The library community has been solicited for suggestions through a notice which appeared in *DTTP*, V. 16, No. 4 (Dec. 1988) as well as through a notice in the February 1989 issue of *Administrative Notes* (Vol. 10, No. 4).

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council requests that Library Programs Service arrange for a report on the status of the development of the Acquisition, Classification and Shipment Information System (ACSIS) to be presented at the Spring 1989 Council Meeting. Council further requests that milestones past and future be specified and that a timetable for achievement of future milestones be provided. If units other than Library Programs Service are, or will be, involved in future stages of development, representatives of those units should be asked to comment on the aspects of system development in which they will be involved.

Rationale: ACSIS holds the promise of resolving a number of difficulties experienced by both GPO and the depository libraries which are serials control, flexibility of item selection, acquisition of fugitive documents, etc. Council and the depository community have a vital interest in its development.

Response

Library Programs Service has conveyed Council's request to the Office of Information Resources Management. They have arranged for John Beaton, Chief, Library and Support Systems Branch, to report on the status of the ACSIS System. Mr. Beaton's presentation is scheduled for Wednesday, March 8, from 11:15-11:45 a.m.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council urges the Library Programs Service Information Technology Program to identify electronic products produced by Federal agencies, and to actively solicit these products for depository distribution.

Rationale: Federal agencies are producing electronic products with increasing frequency. In order for depositories to fulfill their role as a key channel for public access to federal information, they will need access to these electronic products.

Response

When a Federal agency produces an electronic information product through the Government Printing Office, the Library Programs Service evaluates the suitability of that product for depository distribution. This was the case with Census Test Disk #2, which was the first such product distributed to depositories.

In January 1989, the Acting Public Printer established an Electronic Dissemination Task Force within the GPO. This Task Force was formed to centralize research, planning, liaison work, and intra-agency coordination of activities relative to the electronic dissemination of information. Bonnie Trivizas will appear before the Spring 1989 Council meeting to explain more about the Task Force and its activities.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council requests that the Public Printer make available the final report of The Academic and Public Depository Library User Study to the Depository Library Council by January 30, 1989. Council further recommends that a succinct summary be prepared for inclusion in the February issue of *Administrative Notes* and that copies of the full report be made available to the entire depository community upon its publication.

Rationale: The Council needs adequate time to study the final report in order to make informed comments at the March Depository Library Council Meeting. The summary will preview the published report and provide the depository community with timely information until such time as the full report is distributed.

Response

As noted in the Vol. 10, No. 1 (January 1989) issue of *Administrative Notes*, the delivery date of the contractor's final report has been extended until February 15, 1989. LPS will distribute copies of the final report to Council members upon completion of GPO's internal review and approval process. Additionally, LPS will publish a summary of the report in *Administrative Notes*, as well as print and distribute paper copies of the full report to all depository libraries. Due to the delayed delivery of the final report, the time frame which Council has specified will not be met.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO investigate the status of reports missing from the Depository Library system, such as those listed in the appendices of the Sears and Lewis article ("Currency of Selected U.S. Federal Government Agency Annual Reports Received by Depository Libraries," *Government Publications Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 323-341, 1988) and report their findings in Administrative Notes as a first step in resolving this type of problem.

Rationale: This study shows that many annual reports that are in the List of Classes are currently published, but not received by GPO for distribution; other reports were found to be discontinued, while still others were shown not to be current. The *List of Classes* is an important administrative and reference tool and should reflect more accurately what is being sent to depository libraries.

Response

The Acquisitions Section of LPS routinely follows up on all publications identified as not being distributed through the Depository Library Program. LPS becomes aware of missing publications through a variety of sources, including our own

internal systems, communications from individual depository libraries, and published literature such as the Sears and Lewis article cited by Council. The results of research conducted by Acquisitions are reflected in the “Whatever Happened to...” column of *Administrative Notes*, as well as with weekly updates to the *List of Classes*, and the *List of Classes* itself.

Recommendation (substitute) 7

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Programs Service distribute braille publications under the same item numbers as the non-braille edition of the same title.

Rationale: Needs of selective depositories vary. By providing for advance selection of braille publications, costs of printing and distribution of unwanted publications may be avoided.

Response

As announced in the Vol. 9, No. 20 issue of *Administrative Notes*, Library Programs Service has begun distribution of the braille edition of publications under the same item number as the non-braille edition of the same title.

Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Programs Service explore the development of a cooperative system with the Sales Program and other appropriate GPO offices to identify significant titles for which paper copies should be shipped directly to all depositories, whether or not they were selected by the library.

Rationale: Several times in the past year, GPO has distributed paper copies of significant publications to all depository libraries, regardless of whether or not the library had selected that classification or format in the previous Annual Item Selection Update Cycle. This is a commendable service to the libraries and their users and GPO should establish a mechanism to ensure that future publications of similar significance are identified in time to receive similar treatment.

RESPONSE: GPO is in the process of examining the feasibility of setting up a mechanism to identify significant titles for which paper copies should be shipped to all depositories, whether or not they were selected by the library. As part of this assessment, GPO issued the following memorandum to the Depository Library Council:

December 20, 1988

Director, Library Programs Service

Request for Advice of Council on Establishing Criteria for Identification of Significant titles for which paper copies should be shipped directly to all depositories

Depository Library Council to the Public Printer

Preliminary analysis indicates that the cooperative system proposed in Depository Library Council Recommendation #8 (October 1988) may be operationally feasible for GPO to implement subject to any budgeting limitations. Key to the effectiveness of such a system, however, is the establishment of definitive criteria to guide GPO’s selection of significant titles for which paper copies should be shipped directly to all depositories...” Given the diversity of interests represented among depository librarians and their communities, there could exist wide variance in judgment as to what constitutes a significant title.

Council is requested, therefore, to provide a set of definitive selection criteria with examples of significant titles to be used by GPO in conjunction with our analysis of the feasibility of implementing Recommendation #8. LPS would like to receive the criteria no later than February 1989.

MARK SCULLY

Upon receiving a set of definitive selection criteria from Council, GPO will assess whether or not the criteria constitute an adequate operational definition to be used by GPO personnel for consistently identifying such titles at the pre-printing stage, so that sufficient paper copies can be ordered for full paper distribution.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council acknowledges the hard work of the Library Programs Service Acquisitions Unit and commends the staff for their ongoing efforts to acquire publications. Due to the immensity of their responsibilities, the Depository Library Council recommends that professional librarians be added to the staff of the Library Programs Service Acquisitions Unit in order to provide staff which can effectively monitor and encourage the Executive agencies to provide copies of their publications for depository distribution.

Rationale: The increasing incidence of unavailable documents, the small professional staff in the Acquisition unit, the apparent inability to establish an effective program to acquire fugitive publications, and the lack of success at acquisition of various subsets of Federal government publications, when compared with commercial efforts, all lead to the conclusion that the depository program is a victim of inadequate staffing in the Acquisitions Unit.

Response

The Library Programs service shares Council's desire that Executive agencies comply fully with the law by providing their publications to GPO for depository distribution. In an effort to improve compliance, LPS officials consulted with the Office of Management and Budget during the formulation of "OMB Circular A-130", entitled Management of Federal Information Resources, to include a provision that would serve to monitor agencies in this regard and encourage them to comply with the law. Thus, OMB Circular A-130 states, "...agencies must establish procedures to ensure compliance with 44 U.S.C. 1902, which requires that government publications (defined in 44 U.S.C. 1901 and repeated in Section 6k of the Circular) be made available to the Federal depository libraries through the Government Printing Office." This effort of the OMB to establish an effective compliance program for their Executive agencies is appreciated and LPS stands ready to assist agencies in fulfilling their responsibilities under 44 U.S.C. 1902 and "OMB Circular A-130".

Council should be heartened to learn that LPS has planned and is about to implement a reorganization within Library Division, which will group like-functions (such as document acquisitions and classification), simplify work procedures, and improve operational efficiency overall. This reorganization reflects LPS' intent to make optimal use of the fixed number of FTE (full-time equivalent) staff positions that is allowed by Congress. Under the Federal personnel system, the authority to reclassify any LPS positions into the GG-1410 professional librarian series is reserved to the GPO Personnel Service.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Programs Service encourage their Acquisitions Unit to develop alternative methods for acquiring depository publications when agencies fail to respond positively to routine inquiries.

Rationale: "GPO's What Ever Happened To..." column has cited a number of titles which agencies have been unable to supply (*Administrative Notes*, Vol. 9, No. 14, p. 8, August 1988). These are titles which have already been established as depository

items. Selecting libraries are entitled to receive the publications which match their selection profiles, and failure to supply these publications impairs service to the public. The Acquisitions Unit should develop alternative mechanisms for obtaining fugitive publications such as photocopies, commercial microfiche copies, etc.

Response

Publication Request forms (see attached) are sent to agencies (with copies to the Joint Committee on Printing) to try and obtain adequate distribution stock of documents not printed through GPO.

In cases where the agency cannot supply the requisite quantity of paper copies, LPS routinely attempts to get two paper copies to evaluate the suitability of the title for distribution in microfiche. If the physical format is conducive to fiche, we convert the title and distribute it to depository libraries in microfiche.

GPO is not authorized to use appropriated funds to go back to press for agency produced publications, nor are we authorized to use appropriated funds to procure commercial microfiche copies of agency-produced publications. The originating agency must bear the cost of providing the requisite number of copies for depository distribution.

PUBLICATION REQUEST

DATE:

FROM: U.S. Government Printing Office

Library Programs Service (SLLA)

Depository Administration Branch

Washington, D.C. 20401

(Form may be returned to the above address.)

1. Under provisions of the United States Code, Title 44, Chapter 19 (Depository Library Program), the Superintendent of Documents distributes U.S. Government publications to officially designated depository libraries in the United States and its possessions. 44 U.S.C. Sections 1901-1903 and “OMB Circular A-130” section 8.a(12)(b) require Government agencies to furnish copies of Government publications obtained elsewhere than from the Government Printing Office to the Superintendent of Documents for distribution to depository libraries.

Our records indicate that the following publication(s) was produced by your agency and has not been distributed to the depository libraries:

We request that you forward copies of this and future issues to:

U.S. Government Printing Office

Depository Receiving Section

Jackson Alley, Rm A-150

Washington, D.C. 20401

Since the number of copies needed changes from time to time, if the next issue is not printed within 30 days, please contact the Acquisitions Unit on 202/275-1070 for a current quantity. Please contact this Office for quantity information as other material is issued by your Office.

2. On occasion, the publication that we are trying to acquire may have been printed through GPO. If this is the case, the copies are not required from your Office; however, we request provision of the GPO Jacket, requisition, program and print order numbers below, when available. For more information, please call 202/275-1071.

GPO Jacket # Program # Print Order #
Requisition #

3. IF THE ABOVE PUBLICATION SHOULD NOT BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES DUE TO AN EXCEPTION UNDER 44 U.S.C., PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW.

[Official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value 44 U.S.C. § 1902. No copies are available to the public.

[Classified for reasons of national security 44 U.S.C. § 1902. Should not be listed in the Monthly Catalog.

[Cooperative publication which must necessarily be sold in order to be self-sustaining.” 44 U.S.C. § 1903.

Not a U.S. Government publication as defined by 44 U.S.C. § 1901

4. IN ADDITION TO ASSURE THE CORRECT LISTING OF THIS PUBLICATION IN THE *MONTHLY CATALOG OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS*, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING:

Publication is available for sale by Price

Publication is free to the public upon request.

Frequency of issue is (circle) monthly, annual, irregularly, one-time, other

(Signature of Respondent) (Date)

GPO form 3526

(R 1-86)

ADDRESSEE

Recommendation 12

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO explore alternative ways of distributing titles designated for microfiche distribution when those titles are not suitable for conversion to conventional microfiche, i.e., oversized publications, publications containing maps, color, etc.

Rationale: There have been several notices in recent issues of *Administrative Notes* that indicate such titles will not be distributed at all since they cannot be microfiched. This appears to be a major shift in GPO procedure since similar situations in the past have resulted in paper distribution for the title in question.

Response

GPO routinely attempts paper distribution when the format of documents designated for microfiche distribution prohibits their being fiched.

When a significant number of publications associated with a single item number cannot be microfiched, LPS will change the item format from microfiche to paper.

When the bulk of publications associated with a single item number are fichable, occasionally LPS will receive individual documents that cannot be fiched. In these cases, the decision-making process is as follows:

When the document is printed through GPO, if it is a Sales item, LPS will request copies from Sales; if Sales cannot supply, or if document is not a sales item, LPS will reprint.

When the document is not printed through GPO, LPS will request paper copies from the agency; if the agency supplies paper copies, LPS will distribute; if the agency does not supply paper copies,

Thus, it is likely that the several notices in recent issues of Administrative Notes that identify titles which will not be distributed because they cannot be microfiched do not indicate a major change in GPO policy; rather, they are instances in which the publication is not printed through GPO. The similar situations in the past which have resulted in paper distribution are undoubtedly documents that were printed through GPO.

Recommendation 13

The Depository Library council requests that Library Programs Service explore and develop ways to ensure that those distribution policies that apply to regional libraries also apply to shared regionals.

Rationale: Regional libraries receive all the titles which are shipped. Shared regionals are treated in the same manner as selective depositories, and receive rain checks instead of documents when Library Programs Service has insufficient quantities for distribution. Furthermore, some items are shipped only to regionals. Complete distribution would ensure the availability of these items within states that are served by shared regionals and would encourage new systems to accommodate the provisions of regional service within states where no regional library currently exists.

Response

The current configuration of the Lighted Bin System recognizes shared regionals as selective libraries. LPS is investigating the feasibility of reconfiguring the system to uniquely identify shared regionals so that they do not receive rainchecks, and that publications, which are only sent to regionals, would be sent to each library of the shared regional if there is sufficient quantity.

Recommendation 14

The Depository Library Council recommends to the Public Printer that funds be made available to send Library Programs Service staff members to meetings of major library associations, such as the ALA and AALL, both to represent the GPO within the Library community and to further the professional development of Library Programs Service personnel.

Rationale: Due to an unfortunate budgetary situation, attendance of Library Programs Service personnel at annual library association meetings in the summer of 1988 was curtailed. No representative was able to attend the AALL meeting and fewer attended the ALA Annual Meeting than in past years. Council feels this was a disadvantage to the library community and to Library Programs Service, and the Depository Library Council hopes that this will not recur.

Response

The Acting Public Printer is pleased with Council's acknowledgement of the value of GPO representation at major library association meetings. GPO will continue to place a high priority on staff attendance at these meetings, within the Congressionally-mandated limits of our travel budget. The events of the summer of 1988, which curtailed GPO participation in professional meetings, were unfortunate. However, no organization in GPO is immune to fiscal constraints. While we all hope such a situation will not recur, we must recognize that future policy developments and budgetary limitations could impose new restrictions at any time.

Recommendation 15

The Depository library Council recommends that the Public Printer support the request of Regional Depository librarians for a Fall 1989 workshop in conjunction with the regular meeting of the Depository Library Council. We further recommend that Council members be included in the workshop.

Rationale: The regional depositories held a productive workshop and have several projects in motion to improve services and collection management which would be enhanced by their continuing contact as a group. Council members participation would ensure that we are fully informed and aware of the problems and concerns of regional depository libraries.

Response

The Acting Public Printer supports a Fall 1989 workshop of Regional Depository librarians, to be held in conjunction with the regular meeting of the Depository Library Council. Additionally, he encourages all Council members to attend, to ensure that they are fully informed regarding the issues related to Regional depositories. However, GPO cannot be responsible for Council members' expenses incurred in attending a Regional workshop.

Recommendation 16

The Depository Library Council recommends that future Fall Council meetings be scheduled during the third week of October.

Rationale: The Columbus Day Holiday on the Monday of the second week in October prevents opportunities for communication of the Depository Library Council with GPO personnel and other Federal government officials. The days before the Council meeting may be critical for last minute arrangements.

Response

The Superintendent of Documents agrees to schedule future Fall meetings of the Depository Council to the Public Printer during the third week of October.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

1989

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

SPRING MEETING, MARCH 8 - 10, 1989 • PITTSBURG, PA

Commendation 1

The Depository Library Council thanks Stephen Hayes of the University of Notre Dame and his staff for preparing a usable list of documents in the microfiche backlog of February to August 1987, using the GPO print order data. This project has been a valuable service to the depository library community.

Commendation 2

The Depository Library Council commends Cynthia Bower of the University of Arizona for her thorough research and analysis of the problem of fugitive government publications. Her efforts have helped to illuminate a complex problem affecting public access to government information.

Commendation 3

The Depository Library Council commends the efforts of Dave Brown in the quietly effective and efficient arrangement of accommodations and amenities for the members of the Depository Library Council and the Council meeting in general.

Commendation 4

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs Service Depository Administration Branch for implementing a new microcomputer-based system to generate shipping lists for depository libraries and for agreeing to distribute this database to the depository community in machine readable format (*Administrative Notes*, vol. 10, no. 4, February 1989, p. 7). This will be of great benefit to depository libraries that are automating processing and bibliographic record control.

Commendation 5

The Depository Library Council commends the Joint Committee on Printing for its selection of and the Government Printing Office for its use of alkaline paper in the recent publication: *Biographical Directory of the U.S. Congress*. We urge GPO to assume a leadership role in promoting the use of permanent paper in government publications and set an example for other publishing entities.

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council recommends that a regular column appear in *Administrative Notes* to provide depository libraries with timely notification of developments in electronic media so that they have adequate time and sufficient information to prepare for receipt and use of such products.

Rationale: Depository libraries need information on GPO plans and projections for electronic publication in order to plan and budget for the effective use of these materials in their libraries.

Response

In response to Council's request, a new column called "Electronic Corner" has been added to *Administrative Notes* to notify depository libraries of forthcoming electronic products and to pass on news and information pertaining to electronic dissemination to depository libraries. The new column, which made its debut in the May 22, 1989 issue (v. 10, #9), will appear as often as necessary to inform the depository community of new developments.

Recommendation 2

The Depository Library Council recommends that GPO improve the distribution of aeronautical and nautical charts produced by NOAA and NOS. In the interest of public safety we encourage that these materials be delivered to depository libraries in a timely and efficient manner and that additional authorization be requested to accomplish this. Similarly, we urge that every effort be devoted to lessen the current backlog of nautical charts and that they be shipped to depository libraries via first class mail.

Rationale: Current maps and charts are vitally important for navigational purposes. Since these specific maps and charts are revised often, it is imperative that pilots and sailors have available the most current editions for the safety of all citizens.

Response

Funding ceased for the National Ocean Service (NOS) depository program on September 30, 1988. Beginning October 1, the Library Programs Service (LPS) assumed responsibility for the distribution of NOS aeronautical and nautical products with neither additional funds nor staff. In its special survey 88-100 for NOS products, LPS forewarned the depository community that the materials would be shipped by Fourth Class mail. In addition, upon advice of its General Counsel, LPS required depositories to stamp a phrase such as "Do Not Use For Navigation" to forestall a library's liability in case the materials were received late.

The depository community may not be aware that at the same time NOS mails the charts to its paid subscribers, it ships numerous packages of the materials by United Parcel Service to LPS. LPS in turn counts, sorts by item number, assigns SuDocs class numbers, then uses its mailing contractor to expedite shipment.

LPS explored an interagency agreement with NOS patterned after the U.S. Geological Survey model. However, because the NOS and LPS computer systems are incompatible, NOS cannot mail by item number, nor can LPS add thousands of individual aeronautical and nautical charts to DDIS (Depository Distribution and Information System).

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends that Library Programs Service survey the depository library community at the earliest possible date for their selection of CD-ROM and other electronic products (for example Census).

Rationale: In view of the report presented at this Council meeting concerning the imminent distribution of data from the 1987 Economic Census by the Census Bureau, libraries should be apprised of the content of the products in new formats and the status of existing item numbers.

Response

Library Programs Service will survey the depository library community at the earliest practical date to determine their requirements for publications in electronic format. The surveys, in addition to describing the information contents of the product, will contain information on required equipment and/or software, as well as a description of any accompanying documentation.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends that all publications available through the GPO Sales Program be included in the Depository Library Program.

Rationale: If a publication has enough public value to make it marketable, it meets the criteria for depository library distribution as a title of public interest. Furthermore, placement in the Sales Program increases the visibility and frequency of requests for the publication.

Response

By definition, publications determined to be of sufficient public interest to be in the Documents Sales Program are also within scope of the Depository Library Program. The situation where a sales publication is not simultaneously distributed to depository libraries, is the result of human error in a complex workflow. GPO makes every attempt to minimize the occurrence of these omissions, and to rectify those that do occur.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council recommends that statistical summaries from the April 1989 “Biennial Survey of Depository Libraries” be shared with Council. Council is specifically interested in the responses to Question No. 23 (number of claims to GPO in a month). We urge that this data be divided and presented as summaries for each state

Rationale: While the number of claims to GPO has been reduced in the last several years, Council believes it may still be a problem in certain regions. This data would allow Council and GPO to review this issue and provide much useful statistical information.

Response

Summary results of the 1989 “Biennial Survey of Depository Libraries” will be published in *Administrative Notes* when they become available.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends that Library Programs Service review the procedure for assigning item numbers for Presidential Commission, and assign a single item number for them.

Rationale: Many libraries did not receive the Report of the *Presidential Commission on the Human Immunodeficiency Virus Epidemic* (Pr 40.8:H 88/R 29), which was sent on Shipping List 88-436-P, because they had not selected Item No. 851-J-4. That item number was surveyed under the title “Advisory Board for Radio Broadcasting to Cuba.” The HIV Epidemic Commission report was added to Item No. 851-J-4 as of the shipping lists on which it was distributed. Assuming that reports of other Presidential Commissions may be added to this item number or other item numbers in the future, depository librarians need clarification so they can make informed selections.

Response

As announced in Vol. 10, no. 7 of *Administrative Notes*, Library Programs Service has combined all of the Presidential Commissions into a single item number, 0851-J.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council requests that GPO send a staff member as a consultant to a meeting to be arranged by the Depository Library Council which will be held at the American Library Association Annual Meeting in Dallas. The purpose of the meeting is to begin a dialogue among the users of the GPO cataloging tapes and other bibliographic products regarding the needs of the tape users.

Rationale: Many libraries are developing local online public access catalogs (OPACs) and these libraries want to include their government publications. The GPO tapes are generated to produce the *Monthly Catalog*. The *Monthly Catalog* is viewed as an availability record. The tapes contain multiple records for issues of serials and parts of sets. This makes these tapes unusable for an OPAC without large amount of personnel resources. We believe that discussions among knowledgeable representatives of the stakeholders can result in agreement on recommendations which will meet the needs of all parties. Such a meeting needs a consultant from GPO who is well informed about the policies and procedures of GPO in producing its cataloging tapes.

Response

Gil Baldwin, Chief, Classification and Cataloging Branch, represented GPO at the June 23 meeting, and presented details of a proposed GPO cataloging tape, which may eventually replace currently available *Monthly Catalog* tapes.

Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council requests that Library Programs Service arrange for a progress report on the development of the Acquisition, Classification and Shipment Information System (ACSIS) to be presented at the Fall 1989 Council Meeting. Council further requests that a higher priority be placed on ACSIS within GPO and that milestones for its development be established and made known.

Rationale: It appears that no milestones have been set for the development of ACSIS and that the project has not been scheduled. ACSIS holds the promise of resolving an increasing number of difficulties experienced by both GPO and the depository libraries; therefore, Council and the depository community have a vital interest in its development.

Response [*Submitted by John Beaton, Office of Information Resources Management*]

GPO-wide automation priorities are established by the Information Resources Steering Committee based on input provided from the functional areas throughout GPO. The ranking of the priorities is related to a project's contribution to the mission of GPO. Currently, the top five projects are as follows:

1. Corporate Database GPO-wide
2. Integrated Processing System Documents
3. Bid Information Center Operations & Procurement
4. Online Submission of SF-1s Operations & Procurement
5. Acquisition, Classification, & Documents

Shipment Information System (ACSIS)

The higher priority projects do not, however, conflict with the ACSIS project, or in any way retard its progress.

Estimated milestones have been established for ACSIS:

- Major Tasks Estimated
- Start Date Completion Date
- Analysis & Design 2/89 1/90
- Software Development 12/89 10/90
- Systems Test & Acceptance 11/90 12/90
- System Implementation 1/91 5/91

ACSIS is currently in the Analysis & Design phase of the various phases associated with designing, developing and installing a new ADP system. One of the key activities of this phase involves translating the user requirements specified in the Detailed Functional System Requirements (DFSR) document into a set of structured data flow diagrams and descriptions of the processing related thereto. To date, diagrams and processing descriptions have been completed that define ACSIS from an overall perspective and the functions it includes. These functions (receiving publications, depository shipment preparation, classification, acquiring publications, shortages & overages depository shipping list preparation, and micrographics) are being further defined with detail diagrams and processing descriptions. Sessions are in progress to review this work with the Library Programs Service personnel.

Effort is also being directed toward investigating the possibility of using off-the-shelf software to meet ACSIS requirements. Other phase activities include:

1. Determining hardware needs;
2. Establishing security requirements;
3. Estimating online storage requirements;
4. Identifying alternative design solutions;
5. Prototyping and data modeling;
6. Finalizing the systems design.

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer request authorization from the Joint Committee on Printing to convert volumes 129 to 131 of the final edition of the Congressional Record to microfiche. These volumes are currently authorized for production in paper only, and this decision, if followed, will leave those 850 depository libraries requesting the microfiche version with no final edition. Council further recommends that GPO maintain dual format (paper and microfiche) until such a time as a CD-ROM version of the bound Congressional Record has been tested and proved effective.

Rationale: It was never Council's intent that the microfiche format be eliminated (See Recommendation #10, Spring 1988, that requested the restoration of dual format for the final edition *Congressional Record*).

Response

On June 13, 1989, the Public Printer sent the following letter to the Joint Committee on Printing:

Honorable Wendell H. Ford June 13, 1989
Chairman, Joint Committee on Printing
SH-818, Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed, for your consideration, is Recommendation 9 from the March 1989, meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer. As additional background information, we have provided copies of pertinent pages from the transcript.

As you know, an April 20, 1988, letter from the previous Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing directed the Government Printing Office (GPO) not to provide depository libraries with the microfiche version of the final *Congressional Record*. GPO has been holding the contract in abeyance since that date, and is prepared to move expeditiously with the procurement upon receiving authorization.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. JENIFER
Acting Public Printer

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer notify those agencies that have been granted exemptions from 44 U.S.C. 501 (i.e., Territorial Sea Commission, National Ocean Policy Commission, Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, and the National Institutes of Health, and other agencies) that these agencies are still responsible for provision of copies of their publications in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of the depository community.

Rationale: These publications are of critical importance to the users of the depository system and the agencies may require further education concerning their obligations and responsibilities to meet the statutory provisions of Title 44 relating to distribution of agency material to depository libraries.

Response

Agencies, which have been granted waivers from 44 U.S.C. 501 by the Joint Committee on Printing, were reminded of their responsibility in a notice that appeared in *GPO Newsletter*, Vol. 13, no. 6). *GPO Newsletter* is distributed widely among Federal agencies.

Recommendation 11

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Joint Committee on Printing and the Government Printing Office consult with the Council and other interested stakeholders in the development of guidelines for the establishment and evaluation of electronic pilot projects for depository libraries. These guidelines should then be given the opportunity for wide public debate.

Response

In May 1989 the Library Programs Service was directed to plan and implement the electronic pilot projects and evaluate the subsequent results. To ensure that proper research design and methodology would be used for the pilot projects, GPO asked the General Accounting Office (GAO) to assist LPS in this effort. With the expert support of the GAO, LPS has been able to make good headway in designing projects that will yield the valid and meaningful results that are needed for subsequent planning purposes. A detailed status report on the pilot projects will be presented at the upcoming meeting of the Depository Library Council.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES

FALL MEETING, OCTOBER 18 - 20, 1989 • ARLINGTON, VA

Commendation 1

The Depository Library Council commends Gil Baldwin for his efforts to produce an alternative GPO tape product which eliminates availability records, creates collective records for serials and multi-part items, improves access to corrected records and is available with an earlier release date.

Commendation 2

The Depository Library Council commends the Public Printer for appointing Earl W. Lewter Jr. as Section Chief for the new Acquisition and Classification Section in the Library Programs Service (LPS) and urges that he receive adequate resources to accomplish the goals and objectives of this essential Section.

Commendation 3

The Depository Library Council commends the Library Programs service (LPS) and its staff, particularly Jan Erickson, for the demonstrated commitment to the Information Technology Program and for the progress that has been made since May 1989 when Congress authorized the pilot projects. Council looks forward to seeing the early implementation of all the Pilot Projects.

Commendation 4

The Depository Library Council commends the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) for its ongoing support of the Depository Library Program. Council wishes to acknowledge in particular the inclusion of electronic government information products in the Depository Library Program through the implementation of the Pilot Projects as approved by JCP on May 3 1989.

Response to the Public Printer's 4th Request for a Recommendation by Council from Spring 1989

The Depository Library Council commends the Government Printing Office (GPO) for instituting a user study of the Depository Library System. Users of Academic and Public Depository Libraries, by Charles R. McClure and Peter Hernon provides baseline statistics on the numbers of users of these libraries and identifies selected characteristics of those users. The report also allows that Depository Libraries are currently effective in reaching certain groups. Students, professionals and managers among others can be identified as regular users. The study also suggests that more could be done to address the needs of a broader audience.

The Hernon-McClure survey identified current users in academic and public Depository Libraries. Council believes that the Depository Program would better serve its constituents if we also had substantive data (1) identifying current users in other types of Depository Libraries (2) determining the characteristics of potential users for all classes of Depository Libraries and (3) analyzing the characteristics of collection use throughout the Depository Library System.

The Depository Library Council therefore recommends that GPO pursue a study of these aspects of the Depository Library System using a small, but statistically valid and reliable sample of all classes of Depository Libraries.

Recommendation 1

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Programs Service (LPS) install a dedicated telefacsimile (FAX) machine and telephone line in the Claims Section for claims and related communications from Depository Libraries.

Rationale: A dedicated telefacsimile (FAX) machine for the Claims Section will expedite communication between GPO and the Depository Libraries and increase efficiency.

Response

Library Programs Service has ordered two FAX machines; one for the Depository Distribution Division and one for the Library Division. These machines are in addition to the two FAX machines dedicated to the Acquisitions/Classification function.

Recommendation 2

To correct agency violations of Title 44 requirements to provide publications for the Depository Library Program, the Depository Library Council urges that the Government Printing Office (GPO) and the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP):

(a) inform such agencies of their obligations under Title 44 through continued educational and outreach activities and through prompt publication and wide distribution of the pending JCP Guidelines and (b) in case of persistent agency non-compliance, require agencies to fulfill their obligations using appropriate provisions of Title 44.

Rationale: As regularly reported in Administrative Notes, many eligible publications are not made available to Depository Libraries. These cases of non-compliance with Title 44 should be vigorously pursued by both GPO and JCP on behalf of Depository Libraries and the citizens they serve.

Response

LPS regularly participates in the Interagency Printing Assistant's Workshops, which are three-day workshops presented by GPO, designed to acquaint Agency Printing Officers and their staffs with GPO policies, procedures, and capabilities. LPS is allocated a time slot during which the Chief, Depository Administration Branch, provides a brief overview of the Depository Library Program and the Agency responsibilities as described in Title 44. She then elaborates on the acquisitions function and ways in which the Agencies and GPO work together to obtain stock for distribution to Depository Libraries. LPS staff is also available to participate, as appropriate, in training activities of the Federal Printing Institute. Additionally, in the past LPS has routinely appeared before the Federal Publisher's Committee, providing information on the Depository Library Program, with special emphasis on acquiring publications.

The "Guidelines for the Provision of Government Publications for Depository Library Distribution" have been finalized and submitted to the chairman, Joint Committee on Printing, for approval. When approved, they will be issued as a GPO Circular letter, as well as incorporated into the "Agency Procedural Handbook". Additionally, LPS will be using the Guidelines as a stand-alone handout as opportunities arise.

Additionally, J.P. and LPS have discussed revising the procedures used to request publications from the Agencies (the Publication Request Forms). There is agreement on the nature of the changes that will be made; LPS will begin revising the text of the publications request letter itself in the near future. This step is being undertaken in an effort to encourage Agency compliance with the requirements of Title 44; GPO has no enforcement authority under the law.

Recommendation 3

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office (GPO) provide the unpublished data collected in the Herson-McClure study to qualified researchers with the name and address fields deleted, if necessary.

Rationale: The printed report revealed only portions of the data collected by the survey. This data would provide valuable descriptive information on the surveyed Depository Library collections and their users.

Response

GPO does not object to providing machine-readable data from the Herson-McClure study. In order that the confidentiality of responding libraries be maintained, however, certain modifications must be made to the files so that data on individual libraries are not divulged.

Recommendation 4

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Library Programs Service (LPS) give priority to Regional Depository Libraries in filling claims.

Rationale: Giving priority to Regional Libraries in the claims process will provide a stronger network through which depository publications can be accessed. Delays in the receipt of shipments and claim requests cause some Regional Libraries problems in obtaining claim copies before supplies are exhausted. To correct this situation, LPS will need to hold all claims for a period of time to allow an opportunity for Regional Libraries to submit their requests before LPS begins fulfillment of claims.

Response

LPS appreciates the concerns of Regionals, given their responsibility to maintain a comprehensive archive of government publications. As current quality control procedures have not proven totally effective in eliminating regional claims, LPS will begin allowing regional libraries to fax claims directly to the Claims Section of LPS. As soon as the new fax machine has been installed, LPS will publish revised claiming procedures for Regionals in *Administrative Notes*.

Recommendation 5

The Depository Library Council supports the continued choice of format for the bound *Congressional Record*, including the options of CD-ROM, microfiche, and paper. The unknown factor of the archival quality of diazo microfiche and CD-ROM reinforces the importance of paper copy as a permanent record. Since depository libraries will be offered only the choice of microfiche or CD-ROM, the Depository Library Council recommends that the Public Printer consider increasing the volume of paper copies of the bound *Congressional Record* available through the Sales Program. The Council further recommends that GPO survey the Depository Libraries to determine how many would like to purchase paper copies of the bound Record to ensure that adequate supplies of the paper edition are available for purchase by Depository Libraries.

Rationale: The *Congressional Record* is a critical primary source of government information and every effort should be made to anticipate and meet the demand for paper copies, particularly in Depository Libraries that should be eligible for free distribution of the paper distribution.

Response

The Bound *Congressional Record* is sold by the Superintendent of Documents and at this time sufficient stock is available to meet our present demands. Should sales warrant, we will be glad to increase our requisition quantity to meet any increase in demands. The latest edition published is the 100th Congress 1st session 1987, and Volume 133 (1987) and 134 (1988) will be released soon. A request for information concerning possible additional demand for the bound *Record* may be found on page 4.

Recommendation 6

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office actively pursue public domain information retrieval software necessary for CD-ROM applications so that electronic government information is not being withheld from the Depository Library Program solely due to software licensing fees.

Rationale: Some CD-ROM products are not currently offered to Depository Libraries because funds for software licensing fees are not available. It is critical for GPO and its Depository Library Program to include CD-ROM applications from federal government agencies in order for them to meet their missions of an informed polity and citizenry.

Response

The choice of software to accompany CD-ROM products is based on the requirements set forth by the publishing agency for particular retrieval functions, display characteristics, speed of access, etc. To date, we have experience with only one CD-ROM product (the *Toxic Release Inventory*) involving proprietary software and a licensing agreement stipulating restrictions for its use. In that instance, GPO elected to pay a one-time fee in order to satisfy all of the Government's distribution requirements, including copies for depository libraries. In the future, terms of licensing agreements for CD-ROM products developed by GPO are likely to vary from one product to another. For example, in order to provide comprehensive, high-quality CD-ROM publishing services to other Federal agencies, GPO has just awarded four multiple-use contracts with per disc fees ranging from \$5.00 to \$60.00.

Recommendation 7

The Depository Library Council recommends that a distinctive, incremental accession or control number that includes the year in which the item was cataloged or processed be an integral part of all records in the new GPO cataloging tapes.

Rationale: Many libraries use the *Monthly Catalog* identification number for a variety of purposes. Some of these include the unique identification of map records in local systems and the unique identification of some commercial microprint/microfiche reproductions purchased by many libraries to minimize their storage problems. Absence of a *Monthly Catalog* number can be alleviated by such a new, and perhaps less costly, numbering system without sacrificing the benefit of more timely availability of the information.

Response

LPS noted the concern about the *Monthly Catalog* identification number which was expressed by a number of librarians and tape users at the Fall 1989 meeting of the Depository Library Council. Following the meeting, LPS requested that the program which produces the new GPO cataloging tapes be modified to provide for a control number which will have the look and feel of the *Monthly Catalog* identification number, and this modification was successfully completed in December, 1989. This control n-number will be in the format yy-nnnnn, where yy represents the catalog year for which the record was processed, and nnnnn is a sequential control number which begins each year with 50000. This different numerical range is being employed to avoid duplicating the *Monthly Catalog* identification numbers. This sequential control number may prove useful in identifying and selecting records, particularly with replacement records.

Recommendation 8

The Depository Library Council respectfully requests that the Public Printer again request that the Joint Committee on Printing (J.P.) authorize the use of funds appropriated for publication of the final Congressional Record in microfiche.

Rationale: Council is concerned that these funds will be lost if they are not spent. Council is also very concerned about the state of the 850 Depository Libraries who selected the Congressional Record microfiche who now have no copy of this vital publication in any format.

[TABLED UNTIL SPRING COUNCIL MEETING]

Recommendation 9

The Depository Library Council recommends that the Government Printing Office (GPO) in cooperation with the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) develop a preservation plan for master copies of GPO-produced publications, regardless of format.

Rationale: Preservation is a growing concern for libraries faced with information produced on a variety of media. The Council recognizes the efforts taken to preserve paper documents, and looks forward to continued efforts toward preservation of all formats.

Response

According to Title 44 USC, statutory responsibility for preservation of government documents, including non-print materials, is vested in the Archivist of the United States. Accordingly, the Public Printer will advise Archivist Don W. Wilson, who directs activities of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), of the concerns expressed by the Depository Library Council. GPO will continue to fulfill its role in preserving government publications by making available for transfer to NARA a complete collection of all publications, regardless of format, that are cataloged by GPO and distributed to depository libraries.

Recommendation 10

The Depository Library Council recommends that the paper edition of the bound Congressional Record be offered for depository library distribution at least to all of the Regional Depositories.

Rationale: The *Congressional Record* is a critical primary source of government information and every effort should be made to have at least one paper copy available through each Regional Depository Library.

Response

The Joint Committee on Printing and the Government Printing Office have communicated Council's concern to the House and Senate Appropriations committees. All parties are working together to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution; however, as of March 30, no formal decision regarding paper distribution of the final Congressional Record had been reached.

Originally input at Oklahoma State University