

Community Collections and National Contributions: Pilot Projects with the Government Publishing Office – Transcript of audio

Welcome back everyone. I'm going to try again to say the name of this program. I can't seem to do it successfully. Welcome to the depository library Council session. Pilot projects with GPO. Please remember to put all your questions, and comments in the chat box. We are monitoring, and at the end we will relay the questions to the presenter. With that I would like to introduce Melissa Fairfield to get us started.

Good afternoon everybody. Can you see me, and hear me?

Yes we can.

Awesome. Welcome to our presentation. Just as an introduction, and overview I'm going to speak a little bit about pilot project one from GPO's perspective. How we planned. How we are implementing the project. Then I will hand it over to Jen Kirk. She will give us information about pilot one from U.S. news perspective. After that Robbie fiddle will be talking about pilot project number two, and what she and her staff are doing for that. And finally Kristina will be discussing the pilot projects in the initiative. After that we will open up for questions. So, preparation for pilot project at GPO. I was assigned as the project lead. Once the applications were all reviewed, and U.S. you was selected. I didn't have any part of the initial review process. My first task was to create a project team. The project involved doing an inventory digitization cataloging preservation. Of course I picked the subject matter experts who were knowledgeable in these areas. You can see our beautiful project team. Starting clockwise from the top left. David walls our presentation librarian. Emmanuel Dennis our digitization expert. I forget his title. I'm so sorry. And David Hutchings. Another cataloger. Once the team was developed we worked closely with Jim Kirk to focus the scope on the project. Initially we had decided we were going to catalog inventory preserve and digitize to the 300 monographs. It was going to include the inventory of course. A preservation plan that they can use for these other documents in the future. And digitize all those documents to ingest into info to make them accessible for everyone. Once that was done we signed a letter of agreement. This is just a legal document between USU, and GPO. Spelling out who was going to do what regarding the project. It was signed by counsel, and all the leadership of the institutions. We developed project documents. Some plans for how we were going to catalog items. How we were going to do the digitization. How we were going to do the presentation, and such. Then in March Manuel, David, and I went to USU for a week to examine the collection. We looked at the shelving. Looked at the condition of the items up all of the materials. What we found was a really cool collection of World War II era civil defense documents. They were all in rather good condition, but there were really 1000 documents bound into various volumes. It was very difficult for us to choose through the 300 items, because somewhere in this book. Somewhere in this book. It really seems to be a collection of people would be interesting in having. While I wouldn't recommend doing this we asked if we could expand the scope to include all of the items. We ran that up the flagpole so to speak, and got approval from GPO's management. We all agreed, and approved this change in scope. Again, something I wouldn't recommend. But also something I don't regret. We ended up having to change all of our plans of course. Especially, our cataloging plans. We worked closely with LTS to come up with a new plan for cataloging. We ended up doing a lot of the condition assessment here at GPO rather than their, because it was going to take a lot more time of course for us to assess 1000 items. As opposed to 2 to 300. We ended up changing a lot of that. That of course extended our timeline. We are looking at next spring for this to be finished instead of this winter. Once we finished everything was unbound at USU and shipped to GPO

where we did a little more in depth of a condition assessment than we did when we were on site. We got everything ready for -- to be digitized so we can ingest everything into golf info. At this point cereals cataloging is completed. We are looking into monograph cataloging. The digitization contract is in process. So, stay tuned. At this point I'm going to be handed over to Jen. I will be monitoring the chat if you have any questions.

Thanks, Melissa. I've got the ball now. It always takes a second. Thank you Melissa for that great overview of the kind of technical side of things. I'm going to talk about the stuff. I'm going to talk about the books, and how I came to conceive of this project in a way that would meet the requirements. Of pilot project one. At least as far as I can tell before we got into the documents. Oh, I'm getting feedback. Melissa you might be unneeded. Thanks. Sorry about that. To talk a little bit about the challenges that required us to expand, or at least consider expanding the scope of the project. At USU libraries here in the Logan, Utah we are a regional collection. We estimate we have about 1.4 million documents. The image you see on the slightest of our compact shelving that holds all of our tangible materials in print. This is what allows us to have a robust collection. It's also a complicating factor in our cataloging, because it is retained as a special collection in the library. It helped me provide our own primary technical services with review by our cataloging department. But, we don't have a dedicated cataloger. We have two professional staff members that copy catalog. But, that has been the case for decades. As a result there are gaps in the cataloging of our materials. Especially, pre-1975. Within the scope of project pilot one I know we wanted to select a discrete collection with no preservation needs. We do have a preservation coordinator here on campus that we share with other colleagues. This particular area that I chose has loophole paper from the 1940s that is high acid content. It has been known to literally look like confetti falling from the shelves in this particular area of the collection. Not great when you have compact shelving. It just moves the confetti around. The way I approach defining collections is I rely on the suit asked him. That's everything before the colon. SuDoc is a wonderful proper noun space system. If you're looking to carve things out by agency, and only by agency it works great for things like that. We rely heavily on that to help designate some collections within the larger government agent collections. I had my eyes on PR 32. Which is everything produced by President Roosevelt. Because so much of his administration's initiatives touched Utah significantly as they did other parts of the country. I knew they were a preservation concern based on the content of the actual physical materials that things were printed on. I was also particularly interested in taking into the origins in SuDoc of some of the agencies that we rely on in other areas of the collection. PR 32 has this weird mix of these temporary -- what were originally created as temporary wartime agencies. But potentially become larger initiatives outside of the presidents of United States. Federal civil defense. The office of Price administration ends up kind of floating between a couple of different areas. I knew that I had stuff in PR 32 that are related to other collection areas that had been described. But this is kind of the genesis of this. I'm not going to go into detail here, because we've got other people to hear from. But I have talked about this collection approach and a publication called what is in those compact shelves? I have a citation here. When the slides are available you will be able to click on that if this is of any interest to you. So, within the application for the pilot project it had a strong emphasis on focus, and theme. I wanted to ensure that I was describing what I wanted to get out of this to the folks at GPO. The whole point of this project was to, one describe and under described area. I don't have a dedicated cataloger. I knew these materials were less likely to be present in the catalog of. In fact I went in and did a search for PR 32 when I was originally defining this collection area. Nothing came back. I knew that other event folks would benefit. I wanted to have a better connection between these temporary wartime agencies, and the contexts they provide to other activities that occurred in our local contexts during the war. The picture on the slide is of a documents that I can't believe I didn't know we had. It's called the minute women in Utah. It is a catalog of all of the efforts that various women did by County in Utah from 1942

to 1945 in salvage operations. So, Tim can collection. It has wonderful tables at the front of how many pounds of tin and rubber, and household fats they were able to reclaim for the salvage efforts. Then it has a list of every woman's name by County. And select images of the leaders of those counties. We know that women are not well documented in government documents. This is a government document. Not just of names, but of the faces of women that helps Utah's war effort on the home front. This document is a true treasure that I cannot believe I didn't know we had. It wasn't catalog. It wasn't inventoried. It was just sitting on a shelf. From my perspective this is the project timeline in September of 2021. The application was released. It looks like I forgot to write September. It just says month. I then spent the next four weeks identifying the collection preparing my application. GPO reviewed the application in October of 2021, and announced it in December. We have the project kickoff in January 2022. That is this year. GPO came out pretty much right away which is awesome to do their site visit. It took us another four weeks to pack up the materials, and knew what we were sending them. We had an hour delay was mostly on our end. We had materials that were bound with. Right? So, pamphlets that had been panned bound together with string that we wanted to send to GPO. To do our part to help expedite the process. So, the complication there was that panned binding really helped keep the documents in as good condition as they could be. But it complicated the inventory significantly. In April, and may our GPO catalogers started their work. We are very appreciative of that. We have put out the digitization request right now, and are waiting for that to be approved. And to go forward. This now we are projecting out. We are anticipating digitization this fall, and into the winter. At which point the materials will be returned to me at USU. We already received some of our catalog records, but we will be receiving the rest in the spring of 2023. Then after that is done everything will be ready to go into GOV info. I made that part sounds really simple, because it has nothing to do with me. Here you can see a picture of why these materials really need to be preserved. This is what they looked like before we took them off the shelves. They require long-term preservation. Especially, now that we've taken them out of these panned bindings. It looks like paper just sitting there with some black tape on it. That's actually where we've written the numbers. Everything is kind of past that point probably. But, they will need to be re-housed. And they will need to talk about what we need to do. But we received our preservation plan. We will be implemented that as the materials are returned to us. Here is kind of why I think these pilot projects matter. That is that we are contributing to the national collection. If anybody was able to attend Cindy, and Kate's talk on the national collection yesterday. You will know what I'm talking about. If you haven't I would recommend revisiting that when the videos are available. These are materials that we were able to acquire in real time in the 1940s. And that we have been able to maintain in the last 70 years. We know that they are not in the catalog of government publications. Soon the rest of the monographs will be as well. I find that it is important to not only provide the digital versions on en vogue of.com. But, to provide the concept of these things existing nationally. I didn't know it was on the shelf when we started pulling them off. Now at least some people will have a list of what could possibly be there. There is a handful of images of some of the documents. Just to show you the diversity of what we had. Of what we found. The bottom right has what I believe production statistics, and stats. The top has my favorite thing to talk about is the transition from World War II. Everybody is like the war is over. Everything went back to normal. They forgot that took 4 to 5 years for that to happen. So that at the top lays out the federal government's view of some portions of that. Then on the left is a shout out to cultural resources. This document talks about protection the cultural resources from the hazards of war. Something that definitely took place quite a bit in Europe during the war. I'm going to hand off now to Robbie to talk about pilot project two.

Thanks, Jen.

Okay. You have the ball.

All right. I am Robbie. If you don't know about you and he we are a selective depository. We have been collecting broadly since we joined the program in 1948, and we do have a dedicated staff. We are cohousing a branch library, but we do have some dedicated staff. Including both a part-time, and full-time cataloger. We are working to retrospectively catalog our collections. If you are not aware we have an additional library in the. Which hosts a number of digital collections which we both converted from tangible, and harvested additional farm collections. Check those out if you haven't already. We decided to scope for our pilot project submission a collection of military technical manuals. These are a list of known series that instruct all branches of the military on a variety of tasks, or topics. I wanted to mention that when GPO released the announcement that was selected as the pilot two site. I did receive a number of emails from my colleagues and trails asking if these materials would be a fit for that collection. Although, they do have technical manual in the name they are not really the same type of thing. Hopefully, you can tell by the images on the screen. These are more like how to guides for enlisted people that may give instruction on how to clean a rifle, or repair AG. Or, even how to set up an army or hospital library. Or, how to speak a language. They are a really unique collection I think that hopefully has value to many people. We currently do have some digital images for these materials in the UNT digital library. And we have done some minimal cataloging of our collection. Although, the series encompasses a variety. Not a variety. But a multitude of Sioux docks. We are only focusing on the W1 .35. So why did we choose this collection? In some ways our decision models are based on the archives, or special collections ideas that were presented in yesterday's session. I hope y'all attended that one as well. We are hoping here at UNT to bring sort of a special light to some of our government information collections, and provide a new perspective of how these materials can be considered in the research. Or, other applications. We've also adopted this approach in scoping collections as a preservation's to our partner. We are a preservation tower partner, and have committed to keep a number of collections that we see as particularly special, and unique. We also want to attract researchers to this, and other F DLP collections. To do that we thought were always better to look then the research centers, and institutes on our own campus. So, trends UNT's Department of history which hosts faculties. Who conduct in-depth military research. They also host a annual symposium. It just seemed a natural fit to start highlighting our military collection. Although this collection may not be considered scholarly in nature it does offer a peek into the life, work, and leisure of an enlisted person. And could appeal to a special kind of researcher. We also believe that making this collection more accessible, and visible will provide an opening for other conversations, and collaborations with the military history center. And other partners across campus. We just generally promote our government collections across our campus, and beyond. I also thought that this would be kind of a nice fit to what Jen was doing at Utah State. Since she was also focusing on World War II collections. Selfishly I just love this collection, and think it is super cool. And more people should know about it. Our goals for the pilot project are to increase access, and discoverability. Like I mentioned we have some of these already in our digital library just minimally in our category records. We are really early in our process, but I did put together a brief timeline. I wanted to give a shout out to our partners, and our staff here. We submitted our application I think in July, or early in the spring actually. Then received the announcement that we were selected in July, and our campus is super excited about it. Since then we have worked with the GPO project manager Abby McDormand as well as our own UNT team . To just sort of begin scoping plans for the project. We don't have firm plans yet, but the general plan is that we will have greater access to these materials through the CGP, and also through the UNT digital library when it's all said and done. Last week we did complete an initial inventory of our collection here comparing our holdings to what is currently available in the CGP. More is yet to come. I hope that we will be able to provide additional updates as we move through this project, and towards the end. With that I'm going to pass it back to Kelly.

Hello, everyone. The pilot projects really started with the appropriation of funds. Specifically to work with the customers in areas including aspects like catalogs, preservation, and more. I think preservation is the operative word here. Libraries have historic collections. The expertise. The experience. The deep knowledge of the range of their collections, and of their community. LSCM does not have the X historic collections. But we have experience, and knowledge. And we have dedicated funding to carry out these pilot projects. When you combine those two as you can see today you have something really incredible. Which we are seeing in the pilot project with Utah State University. The funds are not unlimited though. These pilots are selected. They are smaller in scale, and scope. Unlike the conventional approach of maybe trying to catalog, or digitize the entire purpose of an agency. Pilots are limited in time. We estimate that we should take around a year for completion. A year, or more for a typical pilot project. The pilots can also explore alternative processes. Due to the smaller scale there is lower risk involved. But if the project is successful than those processes that are developed can be scaled up. And to kick off the initiative we announced two opportunities that you've seen described today. Pilot project one which was more narrowly scoped. In pilot project two which was more broader. Next slide please. Before we can announce any opportunities there was an internal process that needed to be developed. Since appropriated funds are being used there had to be tracking, and accountability to show responsible of funds. One observation we heard, and maybe this is because the questions asked in the application. There is some confusion about the pilot project. I think there's a myth that whatever library is selected reading the application that they would have to do everything. Again, they are collaborative. Your library has to consider the topic. You have to think about your collection from the perspective of that topic, and determine if the portion of it would be a good fit for the given opportunity. You have to draft the application. Discuss it with your colleagues, and administration. Get administrative approval, and submitted by the deadline. When the library is selected LSCM works with that library to catalog, and digitize. Whatever the scope of the individual project may be. We contribute our resources as well to carry out the project. As our staff work with a selective library we apply these project management processes that we developed, and we communicate regularly with the library. We draft a participant agreement that is approved by General Counsel at GPO. We draft a project plan, and other related documentation. As well as report regularly on the progress of the project. We want to document the various steps that are involved, because we end up working across LSCM to carry out that cataloging preservation, and digitization. While keeping internal, and external stakeholders informed along the way. We also want to keep track of which of the processes are successful, and which ones might need improvement. We are taking a closer look at our own processes. The next slide please. So, what makes a good application? I would say details. Specifics. Like you've seen described here by Jen, and Robbie. Tell us as much as you can when thinking about your collection. Your staff who might be involved. Your workspaces. How your collection came to be, and so on. You are the expert on your collection. You know more about your staff, and institution than we ever will. If you don't include something we don't necessarily know about it. If you're interested in applying for a future pilot I highly recommend that you view a webinar that I presented earlier this year on LSCM pilot projects. The application process. That goes into detail about the application. It covers answering the questions about the focus, and the workloads. I would also encourage you to reach out to Jen, and Robbie to learn more from them about the details that they supplied in their application. I would encourage anyone who has questions about the pilot project. Whether it is the topic, the scope, the timeline. Anything you are unsure about. To contact us, or contact me directly before you apply. Put pilot projects in the subject line. There is also some more information on the poster. If you go to the poster presentations. We understand that you put a lot of thought, and effort into filling out an application. At the end of the day however it is a selective process. Jen, and Robbie can speak to the experience from the point of a depository library that was selected. From the perspective of GPO the applications we received has been really compelling. Not being selected is not necessarily a reflection of the strength of any single application. It has more to

do with the resource heavy nature of our collaboration. As well as the funds that are dedicated, but limited. And the pilot projects initiative continues to be a learning experience for us. Our workloads are being reviewed as I noted with continuous improvement. This initiative will evolve as we update our workloads. We are in discussions right now regarding when, and what the next opportunities will be. What they will focus on. Those are still in development. Stay tuned for updates. I think we are going to open it up for questions, and discussion. Thank you.

All right. I will be monitoring the chats along with other folks who have been presenting. I don't see anything quite yet. I'm going to scroll back up, and see if I missed anything. Kelly, if anything comes through please bring it to my attention. There are a couple of comments. It looks like they have been resolved in the chart. But to just share them out. Some comments from James. I hope GPO can provide benchmark records . A couple of +ones. James reiterates I think much more work needs to be done by libraries in general. A couple of GPO folks weighed in about their expectations for how this will shake out in the workloads for projects one, and two. Then as part of that Stephen reminded folks. For CGE records. There are currently 12 collections of records that have resources available for downloading. Okay. A question for all. How big does a pilot project have to be? Kristina writes the general scope is determined in the announcement. It is further refined when your library is selected. I can definitely say that happened with ours. Another question. What time commitment is typical for a library applying for a project? Kristina writes again that will depend on the scope. Pilots are expected to last six year months to one year. I can say that when GPO was here I had more time during the site visit than I thought I was going to. For a week I probably spent about two hours a day with the GPO folks. Then as an ongoing process Melissa, and I check in once a week for about 30 minutes. It is a fairly low -- for the amount that I'm getting out of this for the project outcomes it is very low on my end as the librarian. Robbie, do you want to speak to that?

Yes. So, kind of the same at this point. I meet weekly with Abby. We have had so far up to a couple of full team meetings our group, and the GPO group get together. But since we are still finalizing project plans it is kind of yet to be determined. So far not a huge time commitment from us. I think that is sort of the point. GPO is trying to figure out how they can support the needs of the community without being burdensome to the community.

Yeah, I mean at this point Melissa and David have touched those materials more than I have. They have done their part. And they are really helping us out. As far as the application time process commitment that took a little longer just put the time and think about how to meet the requirements. Right? Like how to make my needs work with the application. That probably took between 10, and 20 hours to work on the full complete application. Including back and forth. Another question for the group. What steps did you all take to see if a collection had already been cataloged, or digitized?

That's a great question. I looked more on my end which might have been shortsighted in the beginning. So, I knew that we had done just a little bit of digitization of our materials. And a little bit of cataloging. As I sat down with Abby, and Stephen I learned that some of these materials had been cataloged by GPO already. That might have changed the application. But, as we've gotten into the inventory we completed last week it shows that only half of what we have in our collection is included in the CGP. Clearly there are gaps in what has been cataloged. Although, it may have initially changed my thoughts of what to propose. It may end up being all the better anyway. But you just never know. Even if summer catalogs are digitized. If the national collection is the goal to capture. Every little bit counts.

Yeah, and from my perspective I alluded to this. What I actually did is I went into the cataloged public advanced search, and I searched by SuDoc. PR 32. Nothing came up. Right? Part of my concern with my collection is things may have been classed incorrectly. Especially, because some of these agencies became other entities within the SuDoc system. I didn't want to trust world cats. To do any of the larger OCLC researching for copy cataloging. Which is what we have to rely on here. Or, at least what we primarily rely on here. I wanted GPO to see these things, and have some consideration of what the proper SuDoc classification was. I did not look to see if any of them had been digitized. I was looking for preservation quality. Not access quality. I wanted them to go through the gov info.

Another comment/question. Laura writes I would love for our library to be more involved, but we have limited resources. Most applications seem to be from larger libraries. Her reasonable might it be for smaller libraries to participate? Good question. Kristina writes the initial opportunities have been posted, but we will definitely consider that in future opportunities. Okay. The participant generated questions have slowed down a little bit. I'm going to advance the flight for some audience discussion with the remaining time that we have. A question for you all. What services would you like to see GPO provide to better support your digital federal government collections? These questions came out of the collections working group. I want to thank the members of that working group for suggesting these questions. Abigail writes confirming my statement. Just because something is available on Google books does not mean your depository should not apply for digitization focused pilot project for those materials. Other questions for the group. What services would you like to see GPO provide to better support the preservation of and access to your physical/tangible federal government collections? What motivated you to apply for one of the first two pilot projects? If you chose not to apply, why did you choose not to submit an application? We would love to hear from you on any barriers to application.

I'm going to answer since the chat is quiet. I would say as far as better support for preservation of access to cataloging is always an issue. Even though we do have a full-time dedicated catalog. Plus, another person that can give half or more of his time to help. Cataloging is always a barrier. It takes a lot of time, and effort. The fact that GPO is trying to work through that, and get older records. Older records for material in the CGP is a great benefit we have found. A lot more available in the CGP. We still have a card catalog that we work from from our retrospective cataloging. It is great to find those records now in the CGP. I want to give a shout out to GPO, and LTS for making those materials accessible.

Yeah. Janel in the chat writes that she would love to see guidance on recommended digitization, and preservation standards for digital materials. That's a great comment. Thank you Janel. Carolina writes, I've cold called preservation stewards when W/D tangibles, but there must be a better way. Yeah. That is a really good point. We just signed a preservation agreement here at Utah State like three weeks ago. So, we are new to the preservation steward world. It does include the materials that are part of pilot project one. One of the things we are trying to commit to is to post our known needs on exchange to avoid the cold call. So, they will automatically. That also requires folks to use exchange. Sarah writes I believe in response to why would you choose not to apply? Not knowing if I could narrow my scope. Hopefully, now we've clarified that that is an option.

Yeah. I just want to chime in on that. The tech you will technical manuals are huge. The collection is huge. It does go well into the '80s. Our collection we have on our shelves. Another reason we opted for this collection is if we could get GPO's help to start making it accessible, and show the value of it we can make it a priority locally for more comprehensive catalogs. Sometimes it's a toe in the door to greater things. Hopefully.

Jennifer asks what services does GPO provide for preservation support? David has answered. I will hold off on that. I thought he might have been weighing in about preservation support. Melissa, do you want to speak to this? We haven't quite got there yet with my stuff. I know we will get there. But we've talked briefly about potentially purchasing, and having GPO purchase enclosures for some of the more at risk materials. We haven't fully moved to that yet. To be determined.

So, yes. Digitizing everything is going to be sent back to USU. Part of our process when we first returned from Utah was -- by we I mean David Wallace wrote a condition assessment report, and a preservation conservation plan for the materials. That we are digitizing. USU is going to be preserving. As part of that plan any supplies that are needed for the preservation of those materials we are going to provide. The thing with USU is you should have a great preservation department already. You might not need so much. That is part of our budget. Providing the tools that you need to preserve some of these publications once we get the digitization done. Does that make sense?

Yep. Thank you. David Wallace had a preservation and has shared the guidance document of how to. Thank you David. That was in response to a previous chat question. Valerie comments I didn't realize that pilot projects could involve cataloging, preservation, and digitization of a collection. She thought it needed to be narrower in scope. I can confirm I thought the same. When I originally applied for pilot project when I only applied for cataloging, and preservation. Laura writes I need a better understanding of what has already been digitized, and how to write a compelling application. I also once asked our dean about letting us participate in digitization efforts, and he asked if GPO would supply money to support it. Yeah. Thank you Laura for sharing those comments. What I would say as long as you're willing to let the materials leave the library GPO is effectively providing the money by doing the work for this pilot project.

And I want to encourage people to reach out to GPO, and ask. Or, have conversations about what you might think would be a good pilot project set of materials. I know that Jen mentioned that she had a back-and-forth with jokes folks at GPO. I think I got David on the phone probably after five on a Friday. I was trying to finish my application to see if I was even in the right realm of the world of possibilities. GPO is a great resource to figure out whether or not you've got it in your mind.

Okay. Turning back to the chat. Kristina reiterates the greatest access is provided by gov info. Jennifer Morgan asks is the preservation support limited two pilot projects?

I'm going to ask David Wallace if he would respond to that in the chat.

Okay. While we wait for David to have a moment to actually type into the chat I'm going to say the next thing -- Kristina clarifies GPO does not grant money. Sarah asks our projects possible? I want to fill gaps between a larger bounds said. That's a good question.

I can enable David's Mike. Not to put them on the spot. But I can if that's helpful.

She wrote in chat. I will read it out. No. Preservation is not currently supported outside of pilot projects. We do collection, and condition assessment. And provide consultation on your own digital imaging projects. There is the scope of the current preservation outside of pilot projects. Thank you David. Abby writes in response. Thank you for the question in determining of what has been digitized. She works on it every day. We will discuss in LSCM, and attempt to determine on how to provide more guidance for potential pilot project applicants. So, thank you. David clarifies what makes it a pilot is the funding set

aside for that activity. Which is what we started with. And Abby thinks Sarah for the suggestion collection comparison as a focus of the future pilot project. Suzanne asks will GPO host digitized materials? Or, is that on the holding library?

All the digitized materials will be ingested into gov info.

We at USU are not asking for any digitized files. As the current part of the project.

I don't know how future pilots will work that out. I will let somebody else speak to that.

Again. We are in the early stages. Anything that is part of pilot two will be home posted in gov info. Hopefully, maybe also at UNT.

Yeah. Here's a great example of institutional context determining what happens with a pilot project. Obviously, it makes sense for UNT. They are already a digital partner with GPO to consider hosting that. Here at USU we don't have those workloads established. It is just not something I can act on immediately. Here's an example of how the pilot projects can differ. David writes the digitally imaged content for all preservation efforts will be preserved and hosted in gov info. Abby writes I think that Melissa is correct in that any materials that are the subject of a digitization pilot project, those digital surrogates would always be ingested into gov info. For example hosted by the depository. Valerie writes services to better support digital federal government collections. Could gov info be a repository for hosting data and content on the floppy disks, CDs, and VHS materials? Great question.

Thank you for the five minute warning Kelly.

Perhaps a future pilot project scope. David writes good question. We are starting to work on CD-ROMs and other media.

I think with that maybe we should start wrapping things up. We only have four minutes until our next presentation. If you have questions feel free to contact us with any of these numbers. You can look at our website, and view the pilots poster. Here are our emails. Thank you so much for joining us this afternoon. Let us know if you have questions, or thoughts, or ideas. Thank you.

Thank you all. Thanks Melissa. Just notes that Kelly has shared all those links on the screen in the chat as well.

Thanks so much to our presenters. We will be back in this room at 3:30 with the regional libraries meeting. Then in the opposite room we will have. Again, we will be back at 3:30 Eastern. Thank you.