

GPO's Library Technical Services Update – Audio transcript

[Please standby for realtime captions]

Hi, everyone. In about five minutes we will get started with our library technical services up date. welcome back, this is our library technical services update. We have a long list of presenters from library technical services, but we will start off with our chief of LTS . Fang?

Thank you, Kelly. Good afternoon, everyone. Or good morning depending on where you are. This is the chief of library technical services. Welcome, to all of you, to LTS update session. Yesterday, do a update I reported our major accomplishments of LTS. Today, I have the LTS team to give you more details of LTS activities. Let me go to the next page. Today we are going to start with Donna Kramer, one of the presenters. We have Donna Kramer, Stephen Carvin, Michael Dent, Marty Bo Cao, and Oksana Osborne. Marty and Oksana are data integrity and bibliographic librarians in LTS. We will start with Donna, who will present on LTS operational achievements for FY 21 . Followed by Stephen talking about cataloging metadata initiatives. Michael will report on cereals teamwork , followed by Marty who will be talking about authority work. Give you authority work updates, and also proposals. Last, but not least, Oksana will be talking about GPO preparation for the new RDA. Okay, Donna, take it away. Let me give the ball to you. One second. Here you go.

Thank you, Fang. Hi, everyone. My name is Donna Kramer and I am one of four LTS supervisory librarians. I would like to share some of our operational achievements with you, along with some exciting project you may not know about happening, now, at GPO. Let's get started. During the pandemic, LTS had to re-envision how we accomplish our tangible processing for the FDLP. Our new workflow currently has a content acquisition specialist working outside of the GPO building only a few days per week. They performed initial research for each incoming FDLP title , or performed check-in of issues for ongoing continuing resources. Next, the specialist scans in the title page or cover of the distributed publication from each shipping box, and sends a PDF attachment to the supervisory librarians. The supervisory library and enters the shipping list box number, publication title, classification stem, date of receipt, assigned cataloger code into a shared Excel sheet. A supervisor since the PDF attachment to the assigned cataloger, who classifies catalogs, or if available uses an online version as a surrogate substitute. If the cataloger feels they need to view the physical publication, our staff at the distribution facility may also copy directly to the cataloger's location and the cataloger completes classification and cataloging and returns the system number. On the shared tracking sheet, the supervisor fills in the date catalog. If the publication was sent to the cataloger and the ILS system number of the item. The content acquisition specialist then extract information from the finished bibliographic record and follows their normal shipping list processing work. Once all publications from the box are complete, the supervisory library and reviews each physical copy and matches it to the bibliographic record created by LTS staff members. If the physical publication was not sent to the cataloger, the supervisor correct or sends any missing information back to the original cataloger for that publication. After the supervisor confirms all of the bibliographic data is accurate and complete, the cataloger is instructed to authenticate the records for the program for Cooperative cataloging or PCC if they are eligible. Using the process, as I have just described, this slide reflect that, as of last month. LTS has completed 59 shipping list boxes and catalogued 381 FDLP tangible publications during fiscal years 2020 and 2021, since the pandemic began. One operational improvement with this new workflow

ensures a bibliographic record is already available for each item catalogued or contained in a shipping box before the physical boxes are sent to depository libraries from our distribution facility. Please note, this statistic is from internal processing figures only, and does not reflect final distribution statistics of total boxes or shipping lists posted for depository library issues. LTS is keenly aware and actively monitoring the library community discussions and developments toward building diversity, equity, and inclusion or DI. LCM and LTS staff continue to support DI -- here are some of the outreach activities that LTS staff are actively involved in, including attending virtual conferences, meetings, and workshops. Maintaining strong communications and connections with tribal libraries and HBC you librarians. Our dedicated team continues to seek out information and recommendations on how GPO can help meet the needs of their patrons and support the Federal depository library program in underserved communities. They also send or post suggestions of resources or collections that might be of interest to each community, and strive to bring in new agency content or collections that might be of interest. For more information, we invite you to listen to a session that was, actually, presented yesterday entitled, addressing the unaddressed, the significance of tribal and historically black college and university FDL's. The cataloging policy and documentation committee or see PDC has been busy revising suggestions of the general policies chapter. One operational achievement occurred while updating the section on braille cataloging policies. The committee had seen that there bibliographic utility was systematically removing subfield H or medium in 130 and 240 Mark Fields. This subfield removal had a direct impact on GPO's ability to catalog braille and other expressions of National Park Service maps and some other expressions of other agencies work accurately. The CPDC contacted OCLC, the program for Cooperative cataloging and Bibb Co. and with their support and help were successful in convincing OCLC to retain subfield H in those two Mark Fields. Also of note, LTS staff recently sent revised text for the Superintendent of documents classification section for the forthcoming participant manual. Here is an example of the subfield H, that I just mentioned, and cataloging of work, or say, a printed map can be expressed through a braille printing of the map. This is called an expression of the work. Here is one example of subfield H retained in a 240 uniform title field for a braille expression record of the Acadia national Park, Maine map in the catalog of U.S. Government publications. In the red outlined boxes, note the inclusion of the 240, subfield H or medium, tactile text, and the provided linking field which will aid a user and locating the original printed map or work for this braille expression record. With the pandemic, we not only had to change the way we accomplished our tangible processing, we also had to change the way we train new LTS staff. In federal government documents lifecycle management. During the past year, four new technical service librarians have joined GPO. As all technical service library and positions are currently eligible for 100% telework, we have also had to change our training methods to match this new work posture. GPO's 10 week training plan involves a high volume of information presented in a very short period of time. There is a lot to absorb. During the pandemic, we began using a videoconferencing platform for all life training sessions. We began recording every session, which enables new, as well as existing technical services librarians to rewatch eats session multiple times. We found using the recordings helps new staff learn more quickly, it results in better retention of the high volume of information presented. We also follow the recordings with a new Q&A session with our subject matter experts, to allow for any new questions that arise while watching the recordings. We're also very careful to ensure that the recordings do not contain outdated information or become stale. We offer opportunities to record new sessions if needed. The ability to review it LTS local policies and processes in action with real-world examples and even step-by-step instructions, in some instances, also helps to build confidence in their new skills and knowledge of LTS lifecycle management work more quickly than the former training method where everyone assembled in the same conference room and the presenter shared a PowerPoint slide with that days training topics. GPO began a project to remove obsolete category classes from the list of classes such as addresses, bibliographies, lists of publications, and directories. LTS staff has completed the first phase to inactivate superintended of documents

classification and item numbers for these categories. During the first phase, 64 category classes were inactivated. No hits means the item number that was listed in the spreadsheet used for this project wasn't found in any records in our integrated library system. There was a need to perform bibliographic file maintenance on open cereal records prior to inactivating some other categories. To date, we have about 219 more category classes remaining to inactivate, once the bibliographic record maintenance is completed. Web tech notes have also been published for any category classes that were removed during the first phase of the ongoing project. Here is one example of a web tech note for one category class. Addresses for the Air Force department. That was inactivated. Another exciting project is our return to the historic shelf list. This project aims to create catalog records for the remaining card catalog files at GPO. We have hired four contractors to complete this work, and the contract started just this month. You should start to see new historic shelf list records very soon for this work. We estimate, based on industry accepted measurement averages of titles per inch of cards, that there are about 66,000 to 88,000 cards remaining to be catalogued. With around 66,000 estimated titles. For this project, contractors will be cataloging bibliographic data from the historic shelf list cards in OCLC's bibliographic utility with export of the final records to the catalog of U.S. Government publications. You can find records for the historic shelf list by searching, historic shelf list, " Tatian marks or for locating specific titles you can use the historic shelf list catalog search box found under the catalogs to search section of the CGP. Here's a very small sample of some of the work being performed by our technical service librarians in LTS. This collection of cataloging statistics gives you an idea of the scope and wide variety of the types of cataloging project, and how we are working with our FDL partners in LTS every day. My hope is, this slide may inspire you to consider forming a partnership to work with GPO and LTS for items in your own government documents collection, too. Thank you, all, for your attention. I'm going to turn the presentation over to Stephen at this time. Stephen, take it away.

Thank you, Donna. I want to join my colleagues in expressing my sincere gratitude to you for your great work for your communities and the Federal depository Library program. I would like to offer my deep appreciation to the staff of LTS for their wonderful work during this year. During the past six months we have continued our efforts to review our current procedures, services, and products. Explore options to improve and enhance them, and to develop new ones. Our overall goals are to use programmatic methods and tools to facilitate and expedite our workflows, capitalize on structured metadata to advance our operations, enable our staff members to apply their expertise, knowledge, and talents to the most challenging and demanding aspects of our work, gain efficiencies and time savings in respect to repetitive aspects of our work, and incorporate the programmatic methods and tools that we develop and implement into our processes and build our operational infrastructure. I would like to provide some brief updates on several of our project to expedite and facilitate our cataloging and metadata operations. I would like to express, again, my gratitude to all the staff members of LTS and other GPO departments that have made critical contributions to these initiatives. Over the past five years, we have received approximately 3000 inquiries in the unreported publications category. We have been testing a new process for these materials. We export the metadata submitted in the form on ask GPO, batch process that structured metadata into MARC records. Import those preliminary MARC records into OCLC for cataloging. Add the completed records to the CGP. This process increases our efficiency considerably, and provides us with opportunities for global enhancements of the records. Since April of this year, we have tagged records catalogued for unreported publications submissions, and we have posted that data on the reporting to GPO page on FDL.gov. This is the data that we have compiled as of August. We recently added data for September. Our first poll question is, have you looked at the unreported publications data on FDL.gov? Do you have any suggestions about other data that you would like to see us include on this page?

Give me one second, I am queuing that up. Less than 10 seconds remain to complete the poll, and then it will begin wrapping up. Stephen, results will display in about 10 seconds.

Great, thank you, Kelly. Thank you to everyone who answered the poll. We hope you have a chance to look at that data at some point. Send us any recommendations about data that you would like to see us include. For the document discovery process, federal agencies notify GPO of publications that they have newly issued according to title 44 . They submit spreadsheets of what these publications by ask GPO. We have been using automated processes similar to those I described for unreported publications to convert the metadata into preliminary MARC records, import the records into OCLC. Finish the records and add them to the CGP. Here is a snapshot of the data that we have collected, as of September of this year, on the number of submissions -- single submission. That is one publication at a time or multiple submissions are a spreadsheet. A number of publications, the number we processed, and the number of publications that we have catalogued. Our staff have been very busy on working on these submissions from agencies. LTS catalogs MARC records for GPO's digitization processes. We are implementing the use of the mark 583 action note field to indicate our intention to digitize publications. This will streamline our cataloging process and expedite the digitization process. We will provide faster access to the digitized publications and accelerate the distribution of the online version records. We have tested this for a couple of records, and you will start to see more of these records in the near future. Here, you can see one of the test records that we did. The 583 field in the same record before and after the digitization process was completed. We changed the information in the 583 fields to describe the digitization status of the publications represented by the records. Our next poll question is, would you like GPO to distribute or suppress these records?

About 20 seconds remain to answer the poll.

This is, as a new process for us, we would like to get some feedback on how this may affect your processes. Thank you, very much, for everyone who has responded. It looks like, from the 65 responses, there is a pretty general consensus that you would like the records distributed. Thank you, very much. That is very important information for us. We are realigning our approach to brief bibliographic records, or brief bids, for short. Brief bibs are records that we catalog with pretty minimal metadata that we create for cataloging and indexing materials. Cataloging and indexing materials and publications that we catalog to meet title 44 requirements, and we do not distribute those materials to Federal depository libraries. The purpose of this change is to give us more flexibility in managing the high volume of resources that we need to catalog. In the near future, we will retire brief bibs and implement acquisition records. We will catalog acquisition records at MARC encoding level five, and create them to represent the cataloging and indexing order records. We will then enhance the acquisition records into basic records. We will catalog basic records of MARC encoding level three, and include adequate data level to prescribed the publications. We will start cataloging, only cataloging and indexing materials as basic records. Again, we do not distribute these materials. We will shortly update the GPO cataloging guidelines in the overview chapter. The section on cataloging and metadata encoding levels, to document and reflect these changes. Here is an example of a basic record. We include an authorized access point for the issuing agency, and one library of Congress subject heading. If necessary, more than one Library of Congress subject heading. Our last poll question is, do you foresee these changes causing any issues for you?

Poll is wrapping up, you should see results in about 15 seconds.

Thanks, again, for your responses. It seems like there is, again, a pretty general consensus that these changes would not cause any problems for you. That is the end of my section. I will hand it over to Michael.

Thanks, Stephen. Hi, everyone. I name is Michael, I am the supervisory library and for the serials management team. We are a new unit that was established in March of 2020. This is my first time reporting out to the FDL community. I want to provide a brief introduction to the serials management team and highlight some of our activities and upcoming plans. We are unit of five consisting of two technical services librarians. Susan Goldin and Don Pavo. One cataloging librarian, David Hitchens, one library technician, and myself. We are responsible for cataloging serials and implement resources and maintenance for documenting continued resourcing cataloging processes and providing training record reviews and for responding to questions both from GPO catalogers and from the FDL community through ask GPO. We are also responsible for establishing best practices for item level data. Initially, a lot of our time and energy is spent on documentation. This began before my time with GPO , with the serials process working group or as PWG and continued as I came on board. We reviewed all existing documentation for item and holding record processes, which amounted to about 10 very detailed documents. We consolidated them all into one and extensively reviewed and edited them and updated them and edited many sections and created one comprehensive, user-friendly, standard operating procedure for holding and item record processes for continuing resources. That was approved in the spring of 2021 and was posted online then. We organize the information in a way such as that we hope to share it in the future with the FDL community more broadly online through the FDL cataloging guidelines. Also, we would like to coordinate a FDL webcast, at some point, on that topic. We also established a continuing resources cataloging training program for GPO. We developed comprehensive training sessions for cataloging serials , cataloging and converting resources for dock pacification and item number assignments, and for cataloging holding and item level data. We have had three technical services librarians go through that program already with an additional four that will be moving through it in the not-too-distant future. Along with that, we established a structured -- we also have a plan for providing record reviews for everyone and a centralized tracking spreadsheet so that everyone is on the same page and can track. We currently have nine catalogers that are in various stages of progressing toward independence and continuing resources cataloging. They are all under review. We also established a new ISS and workflow. The first step in that was establishing that all GPO catalogers are responsible for making their own ISS and determinations. We revised the criteria for making these determinations and updated the FDL cataloging guidelines. We also coordinated training sessions with the ISSN center and using their new application for submitting ISSN applications. So staff are all up to date on how to make determinations in how to submit applications. I also want to highlight some of the project work our team members have accomplished. In particular, the project that has been made on the Fraser project. One of our team members is responsible for cataloging work on this project. There was an initial backlog of 2224 entries. Of which he has completed 2123, or about 95%, of the backlog. She has done that, in addition to maintaining quarterly lists of the titles that come in. I think that our statistics for this project don't really capture the complexity and how involved some of these titles become. I just wanted to go through an example or two, here. This first title, money stock measures. It was one entry on a spreadsheet, and as Donna researched the title, she noticed several major changes, changes in title, changes in responsible corporate body. This one entry quickly blossomed into needing eight bibliographic records. There is also other related maintenance that she needed to reassign classification numbers several times for these records. There is also often a print version of these titles. All of the entries are the electronic version, but it is often a print title as well. We often catalog the print version as well which is in the initial records. Quickly blossomed into 16 original records and multiple classification numbers. I just wanted to emphasize how involved some of these entries can be, and to

think Donna for all the great work she is giving this project and bringing it current. Also I want to highlight upcoming plans that we have for our team. As I mentioned, I hope to continue developing our holding and item record documentation making that available to the FDL community online and providing a webcast or webinar on that topic. We have ongoing training plans, record reviews, and we provide support to answer questions constantly from internally and through ask GPO. We have several areas we have identified that also need documentation and continuing resources processes and best practice. We are working on collapsing processes and are gathering the various documents that exist for that. We will work toward consolidating those. We're also working on the list of classes and heading up different sections of that. On several data cleanup projects those are all in process, now. As we mentioned, we are growing the technician team in July and she has done great work in bringing many of the print backlogs on site at GPO. Including the serials check in backlog. I want to be sure to thank her for all of her great work and her contributions to the team. And to think all of my team members for their great work. That will bring my review to a close. I will go ahead and, feel free to reach out to me at anytime if you have any questions, thanks for your attention. I will turn it over to Marty.

Hi, everybody. My name is Marty and I am a librarian specializing in authority control. I have been with GPO and library technical services for exactly 2 weeks shy of 21 years, now. I'm going to give you a glimpse of the authority work that we do in library technical services. Authorities are the authorized access points in bibliographic records. They are usually underlined and/or hyperlinked. They can hyperlink to their corresponding authority record, and specifically to the authorized access point in the one something field. 100 for persons, 110 for corporate bodies, 150 for topical subjects, 151 for places, et cetera. Most of the time that we spend on authority work, here, in LTS is spent on names. Especially the names of U.S. government units. We also spend time researching and proposing new Library of Congress subject headings, or changes to existing ones. These are also called essay CO proposals. All of these are generated when a cataloger is cataloging a government document publication and they see the need for a new subject access point. They propose a new Library of Congress subject heading. The top example for the capital riot, that was generated by a congressional hearing before the House committee on oversight and reform. Which, of course, was dealing with the advance of January 6th, 2021. The bottom two examples, national monuments, these were generated by their respective National Park Service brochures. Inspectors general, generated by a few Congressional research service reports. For example, legislative proposals related to the removal of inspectors general in the 116th Congress. Most subject proposals are more mundane. The top example was generated by national strategy to secure 5G, and other government documents that you might imagine deal with this particular topic. You might notice the top one is a little different. It is a string. It is a combination of a heading followed by a topical subdivision. The top example is a long story, but I'm not going to bore you with the details. If you are interested in that, you can email me at -- or you can ask about it at the end of this LTS update. The middle example was generated by hydrogeology in the area of a freshwater lens in the Floridian aquifer system. The bottom, Rodda's Lake North Carolina, that was generated by a USGS report. This is just an example of a typical subject proposal. Contains the heading, cross-references, the work catalogued. You will notice that the term itself is the actual title. At the bottom, any relevant information found in the sources. I am changing topics now. We performed a global update in the catalog of government publications. 747 records, which contained a miss assigned subject heading in the 650 field, environmental impact statements. These publications are not about environmental impact statements, they are draft or final environmental impact statements. We changed the 650 L CSH, environmental impact statements, to a 655 Library of Congress John reform term. All the while, ensuring that no geographic subdivisions or headings were removed. Here is one example of the type of name authority work that we are constantly doing behind-the-scenes in library technical services. What you see, hear, as part of the authority record for this new name, the depository library counsel U.S. Getting

date, approximately 2015. In the middle, you see a couple of cross-references or variant names. It has a predecessor, the depository library counsel to the public printer, U.S. This was generated from cataloging the FDLP's title , to better serve and support public libraries, published in 2017. In addition, we consulted GPO's charter for the depository library counsel, published in 2020. It said, the name of this advisory committee shall be the depository library counsel, DLC. We confirmed this change in usage, or name change, from the office of the Superintendent of documents. They told us, to the public printer was likely dropped after December 2014, when GPO no longer had a public printer . You see, that change occurred in December of 2014. That is why we recorded 2015 as the approximate beginning date for this new name. Based on this name change, there is a parallel name change for the meeting of the depository library counsel, U.S. This succeeds the meeting of the depository library counsel to the public printer, U.S.. This is the type of thing that catalogers like. We like everything to co-locate and line up very nicely. This was justified on the FDLP website where you can click on events and depository library counsel meetings. There, you see the agenda of the depository library counsel meeting. You can see that, to the public printer was dropped by October 2015. These were just two examples of the 1008 name authority records that we created or updated in fiscal year 2021. You see, on the left side, we do a lot more name authority records than on the right side, subject authority records, which are rarer and they require more research time. For a grand total of 1041 authority records. Thanks, very much, and I will turn it over to Oaks Anna.

Thank you, Marty. I am just going to turn my camera on briefly to say hi to everybody. I think it is going to go. I just wanted to say hello, my name is Oksana Osborne, I am a data interpreting library and here at GPO, David background and cataloging as well. I am here, today, to talk to you about the RDA/3 our project. The project, let's see here. I'm getting my slides discombobulated. If you attended last year's LTS update, you are already familiar with the project. I'm just going to start with a brief recap, today, for everybody who is hearing about it for the first time. LTS utilizes RDA resource description and access. It is a cataloging model to create and update bibliographic and authority records. In a bout a year, or so, we will begin using a new iteration of RDA. This represents the biggest change in cataloging since RDA was initially implemented in 2013. The two major facets of the new RDA, first as a restructuring of the model itself. RDA now implements the library reference model or LRM. Second is a redesigned RDA toolkit. The toolkit contains the RDA guidelines in a user-friendly format and LTS catalogers utilize it on a daily basis. This is a screenshot from the original RDA toolkit. This is what LTS is still using for the time being. Here is a screenshot of, roughly, the same page in the official redesigned toolkit. You will notice there is no longer a table of contents, there are no longer chapter numbers. LTS plans to update the GPO cataloging guidelines, replacing references to original toolkit chapters with the citation numbers and hyperlinks that are now available for the official toolkit. The pop-up window in this screenshot shows the citation number for the highlighted text. You may recall mention of a beta RDA toolkit from last year. The toolkit was elevated out of beta status on December 15, 2020. The new iteration of RDA became the official version at that time. The original RDA, which LTS is still using, is sometimes referred to as classic. It is still a valid cataloging model at present. It has not been deprecated yet. Why is LTS still using the original version? The new RDA has not yet been adopted by PCC, which GPO is a member of. PCC is developing additional documentation and training to support member institutions, and will take a look at those in a minute. LTS will utilize the completed documentation, and make the switch to the new RDA along with PCC. The switch will happen no earlier than July 2022. LTS established the RDA three our project team in May of 2019. There are five of us on the team, and our primary mission is to help LTS staff learn and eventually apply the new RDA in a way that is efficient and appropriate for government documents. As part of our preparations, we are taking advantage of every training opportunity available. The official RDA toolkit warm-up is an event we recently attended. I'm going to share some highlights from it, because they form the foundation of how LTS will be cataloging , in the near future. The

presentation was recorded, and the link is here if you would like to view it. Okay, the presenters provided an update on Library of Congress and PCC preparations to adopt the new RDA. Before PCC and GPO adopt the model, PCC needs to complete three important tools. I wanted to introduce these to you, so that you know, kind of, what we are facing, here. First is the LC-PCC policy statements, which you are probably already familiar with from the original RDA. These are the extra set of guidelines that the library of Congress and PCC institutions have to follow to create records of the highest quality, both bibliographic and authority. Second is the metadata guidance documents. These are a completely new tool created by Elsie and PCC to enhance and expand upon the policy statements. Finally, our application profiles. These are a tool introduced as part of the new RDA toolkit. They can be used to provide more localized instructions. First up is policy statements. Because RDA was restructured, PCC and Elsie needed to make sure the existing statements aligned properly with the new structure. I also needed to write statements to accompany the new RDA concept. All of the policy statements have been loaded into the official toolkit. The screenshot shows the feature on the right side, highlighted, and this particular image it is blank below because there aren't any policy statements needed to clarify the standard RDA information on the left side. These are some actual policy statements, on the right, corresponding to the standard RDA, on the left. I wanted to let you know about a few other things in this screenshot. First is that a couple of new RDA concepts appear on the slide, including entity boundaries and diachronic works. These are the new concepts that LTS staff members have been learning about through webinars and our own internal training, which includes presentations and posters. Second, in the official RDA toolkit instructions are sometimes presented in the form of options under conditions, which is shown here. This is different from the original toolkit, where instructions were presenting as declarations, sometimes with alternatives. The options presented in the official toolkit are equal unless otherwise specified by local practice. As you can see, the local practice, used by LC and PCC is provided in the policy statements. Third, the policy statements are best defining the broadest level of local practice which means local to the entire PCC community. One of the goals of GPO's RDA project team is to identify areas where an additional, more tailored level of local practice is needed for LTS catalogers. Here, the policy statements refers PCC catalogers to the metadata guidance documents for further details. I wanted to show you that real quick. There isn't actually anything to show. The MGD is still in development by LC and PCC. As I said, they are a completely new thing. They have been described as similar to DCM see one or been co-record. The MGD clarifies RDA rules and the LC-PCC policy statements with examples and explanatory text. This is also where MARC coding instructions will be found. MARC is not part of the official RDA environment. Here, I have just some, let's see, some timeline for the MGD. You will be able to read that. I will try to speed up, here. LC and PCC will also begin working on application profiles, but they will do this sometime after completing the MGD's. Application profiles are still a bit of a mystery. They have been conceptualized as a workflow map or template. It can be used to outline a cataloging agency is local practice, and to aid workflows. Once we know what PCC application profiles are like, we can create supplementary profiles as needed for GPO. This is just, kind of, a hypothetical example on the slide. So, what are our next steps? The RDA project team will continue to monitor announcements from PCC regarding the availability of new tools that we need to implement the official RDA. We will also continue in completing training. Once all the PCC tools are available, we will practice creating records. Then we will determine where there are gaps in the existing guidance for which we will develop GPO specific guidelines or application profiles. We will keep you all updated with our progress, and one-way to find updates is via the FDLP website . This is the webpage, here. It looks like this. It was recently updated in August. If you scroll down, there is a link to our freely available training resources. There is a spreadsheet, and it currently has everything we have been able to find that you can use for free to learn about the new RDA. There is currently over three dozen resources, and we hope you find it useful. That is it. Thank you, all. I'm going to turn it back over to Fang.

I believe we have addressed all of the questions in the chat that came up. Are there other questions? Pop them in. We have about three minutes left that we can ask more questions. Okay, Leslie is asking, what is the best way for selective's to keep up with updates to web tech notes? We typically check occasionally or if we believe there is an error on a shipping list. LTS, if somebody is responding your mic is muted.

People can come to the website to search web tech notes, right? Or are you talking about automatically we send web tech notes, push these to you so you don't have to come to search? I think, Donna, do you have a suggestion?

I know that there are instances when we can, actually, our other members of the team can send you files, if that would help you. If you would like to put your contact information into either and ask GPO question, we can look into that for you. I would say that, if that is working for you, that you are checking occasionally to find new web tech notes. If that is working for you, and I don't know why you would deviate from that.

There is a comment from Canada, I would appreciate if you do both MARC records for both print and e-book versions. Those agencies who still mandated to keep the print official records.

Okay, I think we do have the separate print version and the online version. If they are different expressions, different online versions, they will be on one record. We do create a separate record for the print and for the online version.

Okay, I do apologize. We are out of time for our session. Please join us back here at 2: 15 for the DLC session. In the other room, we have government documents in the news. Thank you.