

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

+ + + + +

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY CONFERENCE
AND FALL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY COUNCIL MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,
OCTOBER 22, 2008

+ + + + +

The Council convened at 8:30 a.m. in Salons A and B of the Crystal Ballroom of the Doubletree Hotel Crystal City, 300 Army-Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Tim Byrne, Chair, presiding.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

TIM BYRNE, Chair
CHRISTOPHER GREER
KATHRYN S. LAWHUN
JOHN A. SHULER
GWEN SINCLAIR
KATRINA STIERHOLZ
VICTORIA K. TROTTA
KENDALL F. WIGGIN
DAVID CISMOWSKI
SARAH G. HOLTERHOFF
JUSTIN OTTO
SUZANNE SEARS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

8:36 a.m. - 9:43 a.m.

Council Plenary Session:

FDLP Guidelines
John Shuler, Associate Professor
 Bibliographer for Government
 Information and Urban Planning,
 University of Illinois at Chicago 4

Victoria Trotta, Associate Dean for
 Information Technology and Ross-Blakley Law
 Library, Sandra Day O'Connor College of
 Law, Arizona State University 20

Discussion of the depository library
 guidelines that focuses on user needs and
 services within an environment of distributed
 digital collections.

10:33 a.m. - 12:05 p.m.

Council Session: Authentication on
 GPO Access: A Closer Look.

Lisa Russell, Content Manager,
 Planning & Development, Content Management,
 USGPO 70

Ted Priebe, Director, Library
 Planning and Development 91

This session will provide an overview of GPO's
 current Authentication process, discuss
 assumptions and pose questions on the path
 forward.

1:34 p.m. - 2:46 p.m.

Council Session: Recommendations
 Discussion of the future of the FDLP
 and strategic planning 163

Adjourn

P R O C E E D I N G S

(8:36 a.m.)

CHAIR BYRNE: Good morning. This is Tim Byrne from the Department of Energy. I'd like to welcome you to our final day here.

I do have some breakdown on the registration. We had 488 people who registered and, as of this morning, we had 443 who actually were in attendance. And in the breakdown there were 215 academic, 42 law, 26 public, 48 special, three others and 134 with nothing selected.

But they're leaning towards Obama.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR BYRNE: There 52 from regionals, 50 speakers, 108 first-timers, 14 Council, and only 45 no-shows. So, I think at this point we're ready to move on into our presentation on the guidelines.

So, Tory, are you --

MS. TROTTA: I think that John is going to take the lead on that.

CHAIR BYRNE: All right.

1 MS. TROTTA: Thank you.

2 MR. SHULER: Yes. Good morning,
3 everyone. I've got to tell you, when I got up
4 this morning and I realized that I'm going to
5 be talking about guidelines in about two
6 hours, I was excited.

7 Nothing energizes a documents
8 librarian, a depository documents librarian
9 more than talking about documents
10 librarianship. Right?

11 Talking about those guidelines and
12 energize our lives right? Can I have a
13 Hallelujah, please. Hallelujah.

14 So, Tory and I have been talking,
15 Tory Trotta over here, and we figured, could
16 we last another 90 minutes talking about the
17 guidelines in the way that we always talk
18 about the guidelines.

19 And, frankly, we decided no, we
20 can't. So, we want to offer you the
21 guidelines from an entirely new perspective.
22 Not as limitations, but as enablers to empower
23 you as depository librarians.

1 And the fact that we can do this is
2 because of the good work that the GPO folk
3 have done, that you have done over the years
4 to actually embed the guidelines in the
5 handbook, so we don't have to show you the
6 guidelines. They're already there. They're
7 highlighted in the handbook and we don't have
8 to go over it again.

9 So we're going to talk about them
10 in a new way. So here we go.

11 (Off-mic comments.)

12 MR. SHULER: So, the Legacy. What
13 we are leaving behind. What is in the rear-
14 view mirror or as the old country song goes,
15 "How can you miss you if you won't go away?"

16 The 1996 perspective is largely
17 tangible, is largely based on a particular
18 structure that, over the last two or three
19 days, we've noticed is beginning to shift out
20 of existence.

21 It assumes -- I dare to, hate to
22 say this early in the morning, one size fits
23 all. It assumes -- looks like minimum

1 standards are back, anyway. And I love this
2 part, "Dense process centered handbook." What
3 else is documents librarianship but about
4 dense, complicated handbooks.

5 And finally, all of that has been
6 remaindered, if you will, with the new
7 handbook. Tah-dah! New and improved! It
8 articulates the FDLP responsibilities and
9 requirements in a much more effective way.

10 The new chapters talk about the
11 obligations and the purposes in our new
12 environment in a much more effective way, the
13 reason, the whole reason why Tory and I were
14 invited to the stage is to talk about whether
15 or not the guidelines are necessary in the old
16 1990's kind of fashion.

17 And we would argue, no. Why?
18 Because, it is a Council document, and the
19 Council can do whatever the hell it wants to.

20 But, more importantly, we get a
21 sense from you that you don't want to be
22 talked to in this fashion by Council. You
23 want to be more active. You want to be more

1 enabled, and not talked down to or told what
2 or not to do.

3 So, with this spirit in mind, Tory
4 and I have a suggestion of power slides on how
5 you could think about these guidelines in a
6 new light. And it is something that we want
7 to encourage discussion around, so we're going
8 to go through them, talk about them briefly,
9 but what we're really looking for, and I know
10 it's early in the morning, but this
11 relationship is important to us, so we want to
12 be able to expect that you can contribute, and
13 we want you to talk back to us. Seriously.

14 We'll see how this works. I'm
15 getting a sense that this isn't going right.

16 MS. TROTTA: It will work.

17 MR. SHULER: It will work. Okay.

18 MS. TROTTA: Trust the process.

19 MR. SHULER: I love them so much.

20 Do they show the love back? No, they don't.

21 Wither the guidelines.

22 MS. TROTTA: Or wither.

23 MR. SHULER: Or wither. Or

1 whether.

2 We want to shift the discussion
3 from a point of process. We have these
4 guidelines and we're going to use these as a
5 checkpoint and then punish you endlessly.

6 And we want to shift them to the
7 idea of principles. We want you to embody
8 these guidelines in your document souls as
9 guiding principles so that you become
10 internalized.

11 And then we want you to acknowledge
12 the profound challenges -- I think you already
13 get this -- that we are facing as a result of
14 the changes in our institutions, changes in
15 how government information is distributed, and
16 even with the mother ship changing. I'm not
17 going to leave that alone.

18 And finally, we want you to
19 understand that these guidelines are a point
20 of opportunity to think about being depository
21 librarians in interesting and new ways.

22 MS. TROTTA: Can I add something?

23 MR. SHULER: You sure can.

1 MS. TROTTA: The other important
2 question is to who the guidelines are
3 directed. Are they directed to the depository
4 community, are they directed to the directors.

5 And, as I recall from my limited
6 experience, that the guidelines were supposed
7 to be sort of a helpmate for directors who
8 didn't want to plough through the huge guide
9 books or the handbooks.

10 So, that's one question: Is it
11 still -- who's it for? Is it for the
12 community or is it for directors or some other
13 bodies.

14 MR. SHULER: So, we're placing a
15 bet that the directors care about us in
16 different ways, but they really don't care
17 about us through the handbook.

18 So, we're placing the bet that it
19 is us who cares about the handbook and the
20 guidelines, and that's how we want you to
21 think about it.

22 But, then, you could tell us
23 differently.

1 So, here are the three ways, the
2 three options that we're going to talk about
3 the guidelines. The guidelines as a purely
4 marketing device, as a way to talk to people
5 amongst yourselves about what the program
6 does, both through its obligations and its
7 opportunities.

8 The guidelines is a vision
9 document. Now, there's a scary thought.
10 They're actually -- if you read the guidelines
11 in their separateness from the rest of the
12 handbook, they are actually quite visionary
13 statements, if you think about it deeply.

14 And finally, how to use the
15 guidelines in order to encourage the
16 discussion of strategic planning that's been
17 going on at least for the last two days if not
18 for the last two years concerning the system,
19 because the guidelines do embody the basic
20 obligations we have as depository librarians.

21 Option number one. Or, rather --
22 one extra step. Whichever focus is selected,
23 Tory and I argue that we do not need to

1 reinvent the wheel. The good work that the
2 ancient government document librarians did,
3 lo! those many decades ago still stands as a
4 worthy progress. And also, that the
5 guidelines are fully invested and appear in
6 other documents that the depository system
7 uses.

8 So, though we began this journey a
9 year ago with the idea we were going to
10 reinvent the guidelines, we've decided if it
11 ain't fixed it, don't broke it. No. If it --
12 no, what is it?

13 MS. TROTTA: If it ain't broke,
14 don't fix it.

15 MR. SHULER: Absolutely.

16 MS. TROTTA: But, John, we're
17 arguing that they are broke.

18 MR. SHULER: Oh, really?

19 MS. TROTTA: And we are going to
20 fix it.

21 MR. SHULER: Oh, is that right?

22 MS. TROTTA: Yes.

23 MR. SHULER: I didn't get that

1 memo.

2 MS. TROTTA: And we don't want to
3 reinvent the wheel. There are plenty of
4 documents that reflect the new realities of
5 the depository program, and what I remember
6 from the last Council meeting is they directed
7 the guidelines to be short.

8 MR. SHULER: And embedded in the
9 big document they are short.

10 As we move into that new century of
11 ours, here are the points that we wish to
12 consider about the guidelines.

13 At this point, anybody on Council
14 want to comment on these points?

15 MS. HOLTERHOFF: John.

16 MR. SHULER: Yes.

17 MS. HOLTERHOFF: I'm Sally
18 Holterhoff, Valpo Law. I just have a
19 question, maybe GPO people can answer.

20 Weren't -- I mean, back in the
21 rustic days of long ago, weren't the
22 guidelines what inspectors used to rate the
23 libraries? Wasn't there some reference to

1 these, like, you know, you were not in
2 compliance with the 8.2 or whatever?

3 Is that correct, Robin?

4 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun, GPO.

5 There was a piece that -- not the 1996, but
6 before that, that gave teeth to the inspection
7 process and in the revision of the -- done
8 along the way, including the '96, allowed the
9 electronic world requirements brought the
10 depository so long, so in a lot of ways the
11 guidelines have been that future vision in a
12 succinct spot, it allowed people to know what
13 -- what was expected.

14 So, the inspection report, after
15 '96 did move on, but they were based in a
16 large organizational part of those guidelines.

17 MS. HOLTERHOFF: My question was
18 just do we -- are we getting rid of something
19 we need, but I guess we don't need them for
20 that purpose anymore, because there's another
21 assessment tools, whatever.

22 MS. TROTTA: Well, that is one of
23 the questions: Do we need it, and who the

1 audience is. So, do we?

2 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
3 University of North Texas. From a public
4 library perspective, I think that the
5 guidelines are important and when you go talk
6 to your director, just as the inspections were
7 always important, because it does help.

8 You know, maybe the focus isn't --
9 the directors' not going to read them on their
10 own, but when you go to the director say, you
11 know, "I'm supposed to be providing free
12 service," or "I'm supposed to be putting a
13 sticker on my door that says I'm a
14 depository," if you have something.

15 And it may be that it's already in
16 the handbook and we can get that from there,
17 but there do need to be some set standards
18 that you can take as a depository librarian to
19 your director and say, "We're a part of this
20 program and these are the things we have to
21 do."

22 MR. SHULER: Anybody else on
23 Council?

1 MR. BARKLEY: Let the gentlemen
2 from the government speak first.

3 MR. SHULER: The gentlemen from the
4 government.

5 MR. DAVIS: Gentleman from the
6 Government, Ric Davis, GPO. I was at an ARL
7 director's meeting last week, and I asked the
8 directors if they knew that the handbook was
9 and I got a lot of blank stares.

10 So, I would encourage something
11 like this written at a level that they would
12 be able to read and take with them.

13 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
14 University of New Mexico. Without trying to
15 reveal my age, I was the one, along with
16 Ridley Kessler that developed these guidelines
17 back in '96.

18 And so let me dispel one myth.
19 These things were not aimed at directors.
20 They were aimed at the depository community,
21 trying to deal with the variety of electronic
22 information that was being disseminated at the
23 time.

1 If you recall, we still had CD
2 ROMS, diskettes, what, five and a quarter,
3 three and a half, or three and a half and five
4 and a quarter, whatever those things were.
5 And it was -- it also dealt with, believe it
6 or not, issues of access.

7 We were trying to figure out how to
8 provide the public access to this electronic
9 information that many of us were, at the time,
10 didn't quite understand or how to deal with.

11 So, we developed these guidelines
12 as a set of suggestions that depository
13 librarians, along with their directors, could
14 use to try to figure out we were going to deal
15 with this new source of information.

16 So, I realize that these things
17 sorely need revised, and I'm sure that some of
18 them are antiquated, much like I am. But,
19 let's keep in mind that even though we have a
20 lot more electronic information, we're still
21 dealing with issues of access.

22 We're still dealing with issues of
23 capturing and all the other things that we

1 talked about throughout the course of the last
2 five Council meetings.

3 So, I hope that kind of clarifies
4 the myth that this wasn't developed just for
5 directors. Thanks.

6 MR. SHULER: You're welcome.

7 MS. TROTTA: As a follow-up, Dan,
8 or anybody, does the new handbook with its
9 clearly-delineated chapters that cover these
10 help at all in terms of having the handbook be
11 easier to use or easier to access that kind of
12 information? Does it need to be repeated in
13 the guidelines?

14 MR. SHULER: Because, what we'll be
15 talking about is separating out the guidelines
16 from the handbook again. The guidelines are
17 clearly embedded in a contextualized way in
18 the handbook.

19 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
20 University of New Mexico. I can't speak for
21 everyone in this room. And, looking around,
22 I'm sure most of them don't want me to.

23 I would suggest -- I would like to

1 follow up with what the gentleman from the
2 government just proposed. I understand that
3 they need to be in the handbook, but as Ric
4 mentioned a moment ago, many of the ARL
5 directors don't know about the handbook, and
6 that's probably more our fault than it is
7 theirs. You know, we should be pointing it
8 out.

9 I think if you're going to do this,
10 a good place to keep it is in the handbook, I
11 agree, but I also think that these need to be
12 at least promoted individually, by whatever
13 means you think are necessary to do so.

14 Now, having worked on the handbook
15 as well, I've read it and I look at it
16 occasionally because I still have to do
17 process and all that, wonderful things. I
18 don't think there are a lot of people that are
19 fully-aware or may only focus on one aspect of
20 the handbook.

21 So I think it's a twofold
22 operational issue that, yes, you revise these
23 and put them in the handbook, but I also think

1 you promote them enough so that everybody in
2 the community can hug the bear in this issue,
3 including the library directors.

4 That's me. I don't know how
5 anybody else feels.

6 MS. TROTTA: Thanks, Dan. When I
7 went through all these documents, I mean,
8 there's an appendix for library directors in
9 the handbook. So, again, you know, we were
10 thinking of it more as a targeted piece at a
11 little bit of a -- more of a marketing or
12 vision level.

13 But, what I'm hearing is that there
14 needs to be maybe some of that targeted
15 information that's in the appendix, entitled
16 for library directors out into the guidelines.

17 Is that what I'm hearing? So, it
18 would be duplication.

19 MR. SHULER: I don't know exactly
20 what we're hearing. From the reaction I see
21 stares. I don't know if it's stares of
22 agreement or stares of "What the hell are they
23 talking about?"

1 MS. TULIS: Okay. I'll bite.

2 MR. SHULER: Okay.

3 MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis -- where am
4 I from? -- Southern Illinois University,
5 Carbondale.

6 Speaking as an associate dean who
7 no longer is actively involved in this, I do
8 think it would be to your benefit to have
9 either an appendix, a separate chapter, I
10 don't care what, something that can be pulled
11 out by your documents librarian and given to
12 the director and say, "Okay. This is what you
13 need to read, and if you have additional
14 questions, come talk to me."

15 Does that answer your question?

16 MR. SHULER: Yes. Thank you,
17 Susan.

18 So, other than those tools that are
19 designed to be pulled out that are aimed
20 directly at the director to talk about the
21 importance of the depositories in the library
22 system, I'm hearing somewhat a notion you want
23 something else. Is that right?

1 MS. TROTTA: Why don't we --

2 MR. SHULER: Move on?

3 MS. TROTTA: -- talk about the
4 three options.

5 MR. SHULER: Oh, okay.

6 MS. TROTTA: Maybe that will --
7 they'll have some things --

8 MR. SHULER: Okay. Three options
9 of how one could talk about the guidelines as
10 they are presently embedded in the handbook.

11 The Joshua version of the marketing
12 focus, as you can tell -- and I actually wrote
13 these bullet points with the idea that this is
14 the documents librarian talking to his or her
15 community on the importance of the -- what it
16 means to be a depository, and using the
17 guidelines to back up these statements.

18 I'll give you a moment to digest.
19 Any thoughts of Council?

20 MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San
21 Francisco Public. This is recreating to me
22 the -- what exists. You're just putting it in
23 a different format to make it a little more

1 pizzazzy.

2 MR. SHULER: Yes.

3 MS. LAWHUN: It's still too long.
4 I mean, I thought a lot of our discussions
5 last spring were on trying to make it, you
6 know, quick, bullet points that somebody could
7 digest very fast, but get the essence of the
8 program.

9 MR. SHULER: Well, I think
10 actually, rather than thinking of these as the
11 guidelines themselves, this is a way of
12 explaining how the guidelines can be used to
13 talk about them and whether -- and certainly
14 your own guidelines could be much shorter and
15 briefer than this.

16 MS. LAWHUN: Okay

17 MR. SHULER: Another perspective?

18 MS. TROTTA: The short one. My
19 view on the marketing idea would be directed
20 towards directors and it would focus on why
21 it's a good thing to be a depository.

22 It would speak to that kind of --
23 the values, a little bit about the -- the

1 basic responsibilities, but how being a
2 depository library can be used and be
3 responsive to the pressures that libraries are
4 facing, both in terms of resource allocation
5 and space and as an answer to why, you know,
6 if everything's electronic, why we need to
7 have this function in the library.

8 I think you could do that, but
9 that's a different kind of document than
10 pulling out -- my basic philosophy is, we have
11 a really good handbook.

12 There are discreet pieces that can
13 be pulled out and discussed with your director
14 and that my view would be we might not
15 reinvent the wheel. We might take a chance
16 and talk at a little higher order about the
17 values that would be good.

18 And so, that's the conversation the
19 two of us have had and what we'd like to get
20 some comment on which way we should go. And
21 we're starting to get that, I think. So,
22 thank you.

23 MR. SHULER: Anybody from the

1 audience?

2 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
3 Valpo Law. I like Tory's approach, just I
4 don't know that you want to call it guidelines
5 anymore, but I think that the guidelines from
6 '96, looking at them, I mean, that was focused
7 on everything that you had to do was a lot of,
8 you know, just the requirements which is
9 already in the handbook.

10 I think now what Tory's talking
11 about of why, even though it isn't the, you
12 know, get a bunch of paper stuff, free program
13 anymore, why it's still important and
14 valuable, but it seems like we need a
15 different name than guidelines.

16 I don't know what, but I mean, I
17 think what Tory's talking about is a document
18 or a thing that would be really good to have
19 for those directors that might be wavering or
20 might be talking among themselves and thinking
21 why don't we just all drop this, what's the
22 point of it.

23 I think it might be good, but a

1 different name. And I don't have an idea, but
2 --

3 MR. SHULER: Okay.

4 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
5 Connecticut. First, in response to Sally,
6 maybe we won't have a checklist, and those are
7 simple when you're managing a program that you
8 don't know a lot about, here are the things
9 that I need to do.

10 But maybe we should totally change
11 the focus. I mean, you asked earlier who's
12 this for, and I was thinking yesterday as
13 well, we were trying to be more customer-
14 focused and user-focused, and maybe we need
15 more of a customer bill of rights.

16 I mean, what -- what should people
17 expect when they go to a depository library,
18 and if you approach it that way, the other
19 things fit in.

20 I mean, should they find -- what
21 should they find and what should their
22 expectation be when they get there. We are
23 arguing a lot about justifying your program to

1 your director, and that's a very important, we
2 need to do some FAQ sheets on that.

3 But, it doesn't really get to -- so
4 when the person walks in the door -- and can
5 they walk in the door, what should they be
6 getting for service.

7 MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair,
8 University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.

9 At breakfast we were talking about
10 how maybe we should be having library
11 directors sign off on a document that includes
12 the FDLP mission, but this could be something
13 else that they sign off on.

14 It's a set of expectations as Ken
15 was saying, so that they actually know what's
16 expected of a depository library because I
17 think many of them don't know, and it also
18 would force them to really think about what it
19 is that they have to do in order to be a
20 depository and can they actually commit to it,
21 and it would also stretch that commitment
22 beyond the tenure of a particular director.

23 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,

1 California State Library.

2 Ken, I think you're really on to
3 something there. If it was part of the
4 purpose of this is to inform directors of -- I
5 don't know, the basic responsibilities of the
6 program, approaching it from a bottom-up point
7 of view instead of the top down, that that is
8 the customer is driving these expectations,
9 not GPO or the federal government.

10 I think that could be a very
11 effective way of weathering whatever
12 guidelines we come up with because, you know,
13 at every level a director's basically
14 concerned about the customer.

15 MS. TROTTA: Thanks, David, and
16 that's also Option 2. That's the focus of
17 Option 2. Why don't you put that up.

18 MR. SHULER: Okay. Any comments
19 from the audience?

20 MS. TULIS: Susan Tulis, Southern
21 Illinois University at Carbondale. I'm a
22 little confused by the discussion that's going
23 on. It's unclear to me whether these

1 guidelines that you're talking about are for
2 the directors, the practicing librarian,
3 documents librarian or for the public.

4 And I think until you figure that
5 out, it's going to continue to be muddled.

6 MS. TROTTA: What I'm getting from
7 the conversation is that it needs to be a
8 document that is targeted towards directors
9 whether or not the depository librarian is the
10 one using it as a tool for them, but also that
11 we could craft it so that it emphasizes the
12 customer, because that is also, to me, could
13 be persuasive in terms of couching these
14 requirements or these responsibilities.

15 So, I agree there's still a little
16 confusion, but it doesn't seem as confusing to
17 me.

18 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
19 University of New Mexico. Just as a follow-up
20 with Susan, I kind of wondered what is your
21 goal here. I'm not trying to -- I'm not
22 trying to be sarcastic here.

23 MS. TROTTA: I understand. The

1 goal -- when we were trying to do this, we got
2 this assignment, it was clear that there were
3 -- it needed -- we needed to decide whether we
4 needed a guidelines in light of the new
5 handbook, which is basically how this came up.

6 And then we said, okay, do we need
7 -- that's a threshold question. In light of
8 the new handbook in its approach, its
9 flexibility, able to be easily determined and
10 communicated, do we need a guideline.

11 Secondly, who is the audience for
12 the guidelines, and thirdly, is there a way to
13 couch the discussion that's slightly different
14 than what came before, because we do go on the
15 premise that the information in the guidelines
16 is out of date and most of it is in the
17 handbook.

18 So, do we need to repeat ourselves?

19 That's our focus.

20 MR. SHULER: And I think I should
21 point out, we're actually talking about two
22 versions of the guidelines. There's a 1996
23 version, okay, which in a sense is out of --

1 out of commission now.

2 It was superseded in a lot of ways
3 by the new handbook, and many of the old ways
4 of looking at the technology were updated and
5 integrated into the new handbook.

6 So, the original job of the
7 guidelines to address those technological
8 shifts in the mid-1990's have been integrated
9 and updated in the handbook.

10 So, the purpose of the old 1996,
11 that job is done. So, the question before us
12 is: Do we revivify the approach that the 1996
13 handbook guidelines took, or do we just simply
14 say the game was won, the guidelines exist
15 within the handbook and if we want a separate
16 document, what do we want that document to be.

17 That's what began as this dialogue
18 -- and if you ask for a goal, it is seeking
19 guidance from your esteemed wisdoms of where
20 you want us to go.

21 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sanders,
22 University of North Texas.

23 John, from what I'm hearing, I

1 think, you know, the guidelines were huge, and
2 the reason we did the handbook was to combine
3 that stuff so the depository librarian had one
4 place to go.

5 So, I think for the depository
6 librarian, the handbook is very good and I
7 don't know that we need something for the
8 depository librarian more than that.

9 But what I would like to see, I
10 mean, what Ken was saying is a really good
11 idea. I mean, you need FAQ sheets for people
12 who are not depository librarians who don't
13 want to go through the whole handbook.

14 A library director wants a one-page
15 summary of what they need to do. The customer
16 bill of rights is just a fantastic idea. I
17 would love to see that, and maybe even, in a
18 poster or laminated for us to hang in our
19 depositories.

20 MR. SHULER: Over here.

21 MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library
22 of Michigan. I think the short answer to your
23 question do you still need guidelines, is no.

1 Do you need -- could we use something else,
2 is a very good starting point for discussion,
3 and I think Ken and David have started
4 something here.

5 I just want to share that in
6 Michigan we have a state plan. All library
7 directors in our state sign off on each
8 edition of the state plan and in signing off
9 they are agreeing that even if they don't meet
10 all of the criteria that are laid out in the
11 state plan, they can at least agree that they
12 are standards to which we can all aspire.
13 Okay.

14 And so that's what their signature
15 means. And it is proven to be useful in
16 situations where a selective library has
17 wanted -- as their larger governmental entity
18 has wanted to pull out of the program, and
19 that's allowed the state library to send them
20 a letter with a copy of ballot and that says
21 your institution agreed to this and we
22 consider it a contractual obligation that
23 you'll follow the standards in this plan,

1 whether you want to stay in the program or
2 leave it.

3 And it's been very useful. So,
4 when you're talking about something that might
5 be geared towards directors, that directors
6 might sign off on, you may be into something
7 that's already proven useful for us.

8 MR. SHULER: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University
10 of Notre Dame. I'm a business librarian. I
11 don't do documents anymore, either. In the
12 business school we talk elevator pitches.

13 Directors are busy people. They
14 all want to know in great detail everything
15 about everything, you know. You need to craft
16 short informational messages that get your
17 point across succinctly.

18 Yes, you're giving them very well
19 their responsibilities. That's not a
20 motivational one, but benefit is what you need
21 to be delivering to your director in a short
22 sound bite.

23 Susan only has an attention span of

1 X amount of time because -- because directors
2 have a lot of things to do. You want to have
3 that short elevator message as to why it's
4 important to them from their customers.

5 We're not their customers. We're
6 just their minions. You know that, you know,
7 there's real faculty and real citizen opinion,
8 and then there's the staff's opinion.

9 And who carries the biggest weight,
10 we're on that. Team faculty carries the
11 biggest weight. I'm just another one of her
12 minions that is trying to make her and the
13 faculty happy.

14 Short sound bites, positive
15 benefits, and then deliver, and here's the
16 responsibilities you have to get those
17 benefits.

18 MS. BAEZ ORTEGA: I'm Gilda Baez
19 Ortega, Western New Mexico University, and I
20 am a library director. I was just struck by
21 the -- a lot of what I know about government
22 documents -- by the way, I'm here because I
23 have a vacancy in government documents.

1 This is the first time I realized
2 there was even something in the handbook
3 directed at library directors, and I think
4 that just speaks a lot of a lack of
5 communication.

6 I think direct communication to the
7 library carries a lot of weight, otherwise
8 we're dependant on our government documents
9 telling us what we need to know.

10 I've been fortunate that I've had
11 passionate library document lovers under me
12 that have been communicative, but I didn't
13 realize these documents were already
14 available, so please direct them to library
15 directors as well as to the government
16 documents.

17 MR. SHULER: Thank you, and welcome
18 to our tribal meeting.

19 MS. FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley
20 College. And I may have a slightly different
21 perspective. The letter to library directors
22 that was recently in the boxes of mail that
23 came out that's been referred to a few times

1 this session, and it came to me, and I
2 dutifully gave it to my library director and
3 then I got an email.

4 And it said, "Betty, let's talk
5 about what is the value of us being a
6 depository library. I'd like you to convene a
7 group that talks about the value of us being a
8 depository."

9 And after my heart calmed down a
10 little bit I truly am not looking at this as a
11 threat. I really do not think that we are in
12 danger at all.

13 In fact, you all now know before my
14 regional library because I haven't even told
15 her because I don't look at it as a threat. I
16 look at it more as an academic exercise.

17 So, I've been thinking about how
18 I'm going to craft a response and what I'm
19 going to say and what I'm going to focus on
20 and I feel like what she wants from me is not
21 a bulleted list of the value.

22 She's been our library director for
23 as long as I've been at the library which is

1 over 20 years. I feel like she -- she knows
2 the main purpose and mission of the depository
3 library.

4 What she wants to know from me is
5 what is the value of Wellesley College being a
6 depository. Looking at our situation and what
7 our staffing, our financing, our
8 responsibility to the public, who uses our
9 library.

10 So, I feel like she's looking for
11 me to take -- to look at these main points and
12 cull out points that are germane to us. So, I
13 guess I wonder at trying to craft another
14 document that just sort of pulls out the main
15 points that I feel like she knows.

16 I feel like it's my responsibility
17 as documents librarian to -- to look at those
18 main points and then to make them relevant for
19 our situation at Wellesley, knowing the
20 collection we have and the direction we want
21 to go.

22 I do -- when Ken talked about the
23 document from the point of the user, I think

1 that has some possibilities, because I think
2 that's where maybe some of the concern of
3 being a depository is, who does that mean we
4 have to let in and what does -- what is our
5 responsibility for the user, the public user,
6 and can we meet that responsibility.

7 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

8 MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn
9 State. I do like the idea -- and I'm not
10 surprised that this conversation is going so
11 far and wide into various concepts and ideas,
12 but the concept of having a director sign a
13 contract, I have some cautions about that.

14 I would -- if you guys craft
15 something like that, I would really -- our --
16 our administration takes seriously contracts
17 that they sign, obviously. And the kinds of
18 things that you just might up and sort of
19 flippantly write into a contract, you might
20 end up finding that they're going to react
21 back to you, because they're going to send it
22 to their lawyers and send it back to you and
23 say, "We can't" -- "You can't say it this

1 way."

2 I just think you should have
3 somebody that's involved in those kinds of
4 discussions. That said, there are many
5 programs -- the Library of Michigan gave an
6 example, but we're a state -- we're a state
7 data center affiliate, and every five years my
8 director is -- has to sign off a contract with
9 the state data affiliation program.

10 And so they get a contract, but it
11 does -- I think it's really valuable, because
12 it does bring up this is the value you're
13 getting, but likewise, I think in terms of
14 being able to step out as a federal
15 depository, I think they don't really
16 understand the ramifications of what they're
17 going to lose by stepping out of the program,
18 and how much work that's going to be in terms
19 of stepping out of the program.

20 And so, being able to communicate
21 these kinds of things somehow in a positive
22 fashion could be really effective, but I would
23 caution, if you guys are going to go down that

1 road, bring some people in who understand
2 contract writing.

3 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

4 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
5 University of New Mexico. I think, having
6 listened to the gist of this conversation here
7 if, indeed, Council's thoughts are to try to
8 use this as a marketing tool or a marketing
9 focus then, yes, like Steve said, you need to
10 make short bullet points to the library
11 directors, and use it as such as a marketing
12 tool to remain in the program.

13 If Council's idea is to develop
14 these guidelines -- or reinvent these
15 guidelines -- I'm sorry, realign these
16 guidelines to today's environment and you're
17 using it as sort of a document for those of us
18 still practicing, then orient it towards us so
19 we know how to provide access, how to provide
20 service, and along the same lines, talk to our
21 library directors.

22 If you're just doing this for a
23 pedagogical exercise, then I think you should

1 stop and we should all go have coffee right
2 now.

3 So, my point being that figure out
4 what you want to do and then orient this
5 document to the audience you want to orient it
6 towards, whether it's directors, us, people
7 who use our depositories, because in some ways
8 I'm smelling some fear in this room, like all
9 of a sudden we're all afraid that things are
10 going to slip away from us, and we've got to
11 develop this one tidy document that everybody
12 can go by and promote ourselves.

13 And I'm a little concerned with
14 that kind of approach. Thanks.

15 MR. SHULER: All those in favor of
16 going out and getting some coffee. I thought
17 it was coffee I was smelling, not fear.

18 Well, actually, Dan, we are pushing
19 back because I think what we heard in the
20 comments, if I could have an editorial moment
21 here, is we're getting pushed two different
22 directions.

23 Talk to the directors, market the

1 program. Totally two different purposes from
2 the original guidelines, if you understand the
3 drift, so it is a conversation we need to have
4 even if it doesn't seem to have an overarching
5 direct goal at the end of it.

6 So the pedagogy is actually the
7 conversation, if you will, that needs to take
8 place to figure out what Council, one, needs
9 to do on you all's behalf, if you will.

10 Okay. I mean, Council could come
11 up with a document, yes, but if it's a
12 document that doesn't listen to what you guys
13 have to say, then what's the purpose?

14 Any other thoughts, comments?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. SHULER: The next set of slides
17 is going to be much in the same vein, and from
18 the next one is a vision focus.

19 The document talks about the
20 program in this way: Again, it has an idea
21 that it speaks of the higher purposes of the
22 program, and certainly can be incorporated as
23 a marketing device, or a letter to the

1 director or a letter to ourselves of why we're
2 doing this. Not specifically these phrases,
3 but speaking to the ideas that could be
4 included in that particular document.

5 Any responses from the Council?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. SHULER: From the audience?

8 I see Dan went out and got coffee,
9 but he's back.

10 MS. TROTTA: There are some aspects
11 of what -- the conversation we just had, I
12 think, embedded in this particular option, so
13 there may not be anything else to say about
14 it, except that it is a slightly -- it has a
15 slightly more -- in my view it has slightly
16 more substantive bent than the marketing
17 approach.

18 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
19 Connecticut State Library.

20 I guess, you know, sitting here as
21 Council Member, but also as a director of a
22 library that has a depository and other
23 federal programs, it's kind of like, you know,

1 do we need guidelines, yes or no; what do you
2 want; and who's the audience.

3 But, it seems to me there's a whole
4 bunch of communication issues that we're
5 trying to address. I mean, you all go home
6 from here and what are you going to hand your
7 director to tell him about what's happening
8 here.

9 I mean, you know, you're hopefully
10 not hand them this book, because they aren't
11 going to make it through it. I'm going to
12 hand mine back to my documents librarians and
13 say, "Here."

14 But, it's like, you know, how do
15 they know -- how does a library director know
16 where the discussion is going about the future
17 of the program. You know, I'm often asked,
18 you know, "So, why do we need all the paper?
19 You know, what are you doing about electronic
20 access?"

21 We have a lot of conversation here.

22 In a totally different hat, I'm often asked
23 by school superintendents: Why do I need a

1 school library? Everything is on the
2 internet."

3 Well, you could ask the same
4 question about, you know, the depository
5 program, lots of things. So, what's your
6 response?

7 So, I guess I'm back to maybe a
8 series of FAQ sheets that are updated
9 periodically that address different audiences,
10 may be more useful and a better summation of
11 the current thinking or direction.

12 Without getting too technical, I
13 don't have a lot of time to digest all of
14 this, but I do need to know what the
15 expectations are of me to provide a service.

16 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
17 Dame. Would you bounce back one slide?

18 MR. SHULER: Sure, if I could
19 figure that out.

20 MR. HAYES: Page up.

21 MR. SHULER: I know. Just be
22 patient.

23 MR. HAYES: You slept through that?

1 MR. SHULER: Yes, I know.

2 MR. HAYES: Library PowerPoint 101,
3 didn't you?

4 MR. SHULER: Yes, I did.

5 MR. HAYES: Right. When you read
6 these, again, you notice that there's no
7 balance in here. Okay. Start A, B, C, D, E,
8 F --

9 MR. SHULER: Yes, I know. All
10 right, already.

11 MR. HAYES: Oh, I missed it. All
12 right.

13 MR. SHULER: As Jay Leno would say,
14 "Shut up. Shut up."

15 MR. HAYES: There's no balance, I
16 understand. He'll get to it.

17 MR. SHULER: Oh, is that right?
18 Okay. Brilliant. So there.

19 MS. TROTTA: Thank you, Lance.

20 MR. HAYES: Thank you, John.

21 MR. SHULER: Thank you, Mother
22 Ship.

23 MR. HAYES: Now you know why he's a

1 department head and not doing documents
2 anymore.

3 Notice that, again, the -- it
4 appears to be one-sided. You are doing
5 expectations and obligations. And the vision
6 that you're focusing on is Councils and GPO's.
7 You need to plug in the vision of the
8 director.

9 This is not our vision, you know,
10 you ask whether you're contributing to our
11 vision and where the program's going, and our
12 vision can contribute to your vision in these
13 particular ways.

14 Here are the obligations and
15 expectations that derive these benefits for
16 you and for your population that you serve and
17 all the altruistic you do.

18 It's a good start, but you still
19 need to add the other half of the coin in
20 there in terms of whose vision are you
21 supporting. You know, my director is going
22 great, Steve, you do that vision all you want
23 so long as you do my vision, too. But the

1 benefit.

2 So, it's a good start, but you
3 still need another half to put in there, and
4 now I'm going to get some coffee.

5 MS. SINCLAIR: John, this is Gwen
6 Sinclair, University of Hawaii.

7 Following up on what Steve just
8 said, I wonder if the could incorporate in the
9 material that Cindy collected in, you know,
10 all the comments from the directors that were
11 solicited and compiled, and I don't believe
12 we've actually seen, but I'm wondering if that
13 could be used to perform the function that
14 Steve is talking about.

15 MS. DeDECKER: Sherry DeDecker,
16 University of California, Santa Barbara.

17 This is made for tall people.
18 Okay. To speak to what Kenneth was saying,
19 what do you going to take back from this
20 conference -- oh, that's so much better.
21 Thank you.

22 Okay. What I've heard all through
23 the conference, I've seen programs on how to

1 collaborate. I've heard space issues. I've
2 heard "We're being asked to reduce our
3 collections."

4 You know, that's not a bad thing.
5 I'm a documents librarian and I'm also an
6 associate director for public services, and
7 I'm looking at my document space. There will
8 be renovation coming. I need to reduce it.

9 Is that bad? No. Should we
10 collaborate? Yes. I think it's time for us
11 to look at our collections and see what is it
12 in tangible form that we need to keep and then
13 look around, who's close to us who has
14 something else, and how can we collaborate.

15 And I think that should also be in
16 anything speaking to anything towards the
17 director, in short.

18 MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything?
19 Anything else?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. SHULER: We will go on to the
22 next one now that I have learned my new
23 techniques.

1 This point incorporates the
2 guidelines, principles into a strategic
3 planning focus.

4 MS. TROTTA: This one we talked
5 about -- since, as a director, what I'm trying
6 to figure -- if I don't have endless time to
7 focus on this, I don't have anyone that can
8 feed me information, I would like to know more
9 -- you know, where can I get, what's going on
10 with the program really quickly.

11 I think this sort of harkens back
12 to what Ken was just saying, that this
13 approach would actually incorporate sort of a
14 status report on the strategic planning and
15 where the program is trying to get.

16 As, again, the audience is
17 basically directors, people that are wanting
18 to know. They are under the impression that
19 everything is online and therefore, why do we
20 need to have a depository, that if something
21 could be more strategically crafted on an
22 ongoing basis, this approach would take more
23 interaction of Council to update it.

1 Would this be useful as an
2 approach, and that's what we were thinking of
3 when we crafted this option.

4 MR. SHULER: Council.

5 CHAIR BYRNE: Tim Byrne, Department
6 of Energy.

7 You know, I like all three of the
8 options you're talking about here. I think
9 are all things that we might want to consider
10 doing, but I don't think any of them are
11 really -- have anything to do with the
12 guidelines.

13 The guidelines were originally
14 created during a time when there were a lot of
15 new libraries that joined the program after
16 the '73 law. Now that there are limited
17 opportunities to get into the depository
18 program, it was very prestigious to be a
19 depository.

20 When they opened things up, a lot
21 of libraries jumped at the opportunity to get
22 that prestige, but they didn't want to invest
23 what they needed to to run a depository.

1 So, the guidelines were established
2 to tell libraries how many staff they really
3 should have, because they weren't investing
4 that staff, how many hours should they be --
5 giving them a real guideline of what to do to
6 be a depository.

7 And I think at that time it was
8 really needed very much. Whether it's needed
9 today, I don't know, but those guidelines, the
10 instructions to depository libraries and the
11 federal depository libraries, manuals have all
12 have been incorporated into a handbook.

13 And so, it is all there, but the
14 question that we have is how easy is it to
15 draw out the bottom line. And that, you know,
16 when we talking about what the director wants
17 to know, what's the bottom line, what do they
18 really have to do.

19 And I think a lot of librarians,
20 depository librarians looked at the handbook
21 and that was the thing that they saw, too,
22 that there wasn't an easy way to draw out that
23 bottom line.

1 So, your three options here, as I
2 said, are good things. We should probably do
3 them, but I'm not sure it's even known that
4 that was brought by the depository librarians
5 for being able to find the bottom line easily.

6 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
7 California State Library.

8 I totally agree with Tim that as
9 good as the handbook is, its primary audience,
10 I think, is the depository coordinator, and
11 not the director. Even though there's a
12 section at the end of each chapter that is
13 directed toward the director, it's -- the
14 stuff is spread out over the handbook, and
15 given the yellow highlighted portions are
16 primarily aimed at the depository coordinator.

17 And the directors, let's face it,
18 are not concerned about where the depository
19 stamp is placed on each tangible item. And
20 so, something needs to be crafted that his
21 short, -- that is -- that, as Duke says,
22 emphasizes the benefits of being in the
23 program as well as the responsibilities, and

1 that we are doing this for our customers.

2 CHAIR BYRNE: Anybody from the
3 audience?

4 MS. McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, UK.
5 I'll date myself. And I was involved in the
6 very first edition, not the 1996 version. And
7 if you go back and see that old edition, it
8 really was an attempt to show what all of the
9 partners were responsible for doing, not only
10 libraries, but GPO. There is a section about
11 what GPO will do for us as well.

12 And I agree with David and Tim,
13 that the handbook is very dense, and if you
14 want to communicate any of that information to
15 a director, I think it would be -- and Steve,
16 too -- to have a succinct document that says,
17 here are the benefits and what GPO will do for
18 you if you will do this for GPO and the
19 citizens of the United States.

20 Sorry. The communities around your
21 libraries, which I'm -- but it has to be
22 short. And I guess, from the last spring's
23 meeting, I -- and last fall, that we -- I

1 thought that's kind of where you were going,
2 let's create a new version that reflects our
3 new environment that can be used to educate
4 people.

5 CHAIR BYRNE: Any other thoughts?

6 MR. BARKLEY: I don't want Lance
7 coming to help me out here, so -- Dan Barkley,
8 University of New Mexico.

9 I agree with Sandy and the comments
10 made by Tim and David, as well, and I think
11 one of the things -- let's eliminate some of
12 the confusion. Let's drop the word
13 "guidelines."

14 Okay. Because everyone -- or I
15 shouldn't say "everyone," but when I hear
16 "guidelines," all of a sudden it's kind of
17 rules and regulations that I must follow.

18 You know, I have guidelines when I
19 officiate a basketball game that I've got to
20 follow, blow the whistle, things like that.

21 If we're going to have a discussion
22 document -- and we all understand that the
23 handbook is an organic document and it will be

1 revised when it's necessary, but in the
2 ensuing periods things happen.

3 So, if you're going to direct this
4 again to directors as reasons for staying in
5 the program or enlarging or decreasing your
6 participation in the program, point it to
7 them, half a dozen bullet items, telling them
8 why it's great to be here, the "Gee Whiz" that
9 you've developed -- I like that.

10 And if you want guidelines, then
11 let's work on guidelines down the road for
12 electronics or digitization or the retention
13 of tangible products and things like that.
14 Let's not try to create any more confusion
15 than what we have right now.

16 MS. RHODES: I'm Sarah Rhodes, the
17 Georgetown Law Library.

18 I'm -- this is my first Council
19 meeting. My previous career was in marketing
20 and public relations. And it does sound to me
21 like what we need, instead of guidelines is a
22 communications plan, and I think that there's
23 some tools that have already been established

1 that we can use to build it.

2 We have these comments from
3 directors. I saw on Monday during the future
4 of the FDLP session an elegant SWOT analysis.

5 I think maybe that can be revisited from the
6 approach of our audience being law library
7 directors, deans, stakeholders, decisionmakers
8 at our libraries.

9 And like everyone was saying, I'd
10 just like to echo, it seems like everyone has
11 these ideas already kind of solidly thought-
12 out.

13 I think that what we need is
14 probably a one-page FAQ sheet that's based on
15 kind of this analysis that has to be done
16 first in terms of defining the audience,
17 defining, you know, strengths, weaknesses,
18 opportunity sets, you know, creating some --
19 an ethics Q sheet and then creating a list of
20 -- in marketing and PR you call them key
21 messages.

22 And I think we all know what they
23 are. You know, we've heard, you know, Barack

1 Obama is untested. John McCain voted with
2 George Bush 90 percent of the time.

3 These are messages that are short,
4 succinct and that you drive home at every
5 opportunity and repeat over and over again in
6 dealing with your director and dealing with
7 other people in your library.

8 And I thought there were some great
9 ideas in terms of having a poster or a FAQ
10 sheet, something that maybe you post in your
11 break room or your meeting room at your
12 library that has kind of these things laid out
13 very succinctly, very briefly.

14 I know that GPO has created an
15 elegant marketing plan, really aimed at users,
16 I think, and patrons. And so, I think it's
17 really an idea for us to maybe, you know,
18 since we've got this wonderful resource in the
19 handbook, to keep that for us, but in terms of
20 communicating with directors and stakeholders
21 to have kind of a separate document and a
22 separate strategy and kind of take the
23 responsibility on ourselves, since we work

1 directly with our directors to identify what
2 those messages should be.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. SHULER: Thank you.

5 MS. FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley
6 College. As I was sitting here listening, it
7 almost feels like we're back to sort of
8 thinking about one size fits all, and I wonder
9 if we're talking about developing some kind of
10 a FAQ sheet for library directors.

11 If we could have a few bullet
12 points that talk about the program for
13 everyone, and then we have a few points that
14 could perhaps be targeted to public library
15 directors or academic library directors or law
16 library directors, because sometimes their
17 needs and their concerns and their mission and
18 their philosophy even are a little bit
19 different as -- you know, as we think about
20 our users.

21 So, to have a few points targeted
22 to each one of those, perhaps could make them
23 sit up and take notice a little more.

1 MS. RHODES: I'd like to say I
2 think this is something that should definitely
3 be considered. We should consider like
4 defining our audience groups.

5 You know, lay out a plan for the
6 various types of libraries that are involved
7 in the program and communications strategies
8 aimed at each of them.

9 And I also wanted to go back to
10 Option 2, the vision focus. You know, one
11 thing when I worked in public relations and
12 marketing, often for a client, the vision is
13 one of the big selling points for a product or
14 a company.

15 And, in terms of, you know, me
16 being new -- new FDLP from my library, I can
17 say that I've been very inspired by this kind
18 of greater vision of the FDLP as a mechanism
19 for providing government information to the
20 people.

21 It's wonderful and it's inspiring,
22 and I think that we can take kind of these
23 various options that we've explored and

1 integrate them into key messages without
2 listing them too long, but still tapping into
3 the library's function in terms of providing
4 information.

5 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government
6 Printing Office. I really like the approach
7 that you just mentioned as well, about --
8 about segmenting the message a little bit in
9 terms of bulleted points.

10 That's kind of the approach that we
11 took when we sent the value letter out to
12 directors. And, granted, it was a starting
13 point. It was only a couple of pages, but we
14 took the approaching of talking about, you
15 know, the difference about how the FDLP of the
16 future might look to a public library versus a
17 law library versus an academic.

18 One of the things that we're going
19 to do is we are going to share the comments
20 from directors. We were thinking through our
21 community, .FDLP.gov, but also through other
22 means.

23 A lot of good comments came back

1 and a couple of the comments that I found
2 really interesting from the directors were,
3 you know, I'm an academic. I didn't know how
4 this would apply to public libraries.

5 So, I think that the path that you
6 guys are talking about is the right thing. I
7 think it needs to be targeted so it's specific
8 in a communications piece to the library and
9 the type of library they are, but there's also
10 a cross-educational aspect where it helps them
11 understand how this applies to other types of
12 libraries as well.

13 MR. SHULER: So, I think we've been
14 actually wrestling with these questions for
15 the last hour or so. This is how Tory and I
16 imagined it would be before we met you all. I
17 don't think we were far off.

18 MS. TROTTA: No, No.

19 MR. SHULER: Any thoughts from the
20 Council?

21 From sitting up here, or standing
22 up here, rather, listening to this, I get the
23 sense maybe we can come to some consensus on a

1 couple of points.

2 One, the 1996 guidelines are done.

3 You don't have to worry about them anymore.

4 Stop it, Dan. Just stop it.

5 They did their job. They were
6 uplifted into the new handbook. They live
7 properly where they live now, and the handbook
8 is a happy document for us as practitioners.

9 Would that be about right? Okay.

10 So, any future Council discussions about the
11 guidelines in that fashion don't have to
12 happen, correct?

13 All right. Now, second point. The
14 handbook is invested with a lot of information
15 of about the program that is, quote, unquote,
16 "varied," right?

17 And what the community desires are
18 tools or techniques to unbury that measure --
19 to unbury those communications to be delivered
20 to particular audiences, correct? Is that
21 about right?

22 So, instead of Council working on
23 new guidelines, quote, unquote, to update the

1 1996 guidelines, Council should invest its
2 energy in sharpening this, what's been
3 referred to, new marketing messages. Is that
4 right? Did I get that right? Council, about
5 right?

6 (Off-mic comment.)

7 MR. SHULER: Okay. I think that
8 pretty much delivers what we wanted to do
9 here. I think there might be other
10 opportunities.

11 Dan. Speak.

12 MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley,
13 University of New Mexico. Yes, I think you
14 guys are on the right track, and I certainly
15 appreciate the discussion we've had and for
16 allowing all this input into this.

17 Let me suggest that as you develop
18 these guidelines, Council used to form working
19 groups that were comprised of Council Members
20 as well as those from the community.

21 Let me suggest that you pull that
22 wisdom from the community from all aspects,
23 library directors, regionals, selectives, law

1 librarians, you know, the whole gamut that we
2 run of institutions in this program.

3 I don't -- I'm not suggestion you
4 form a committee of twelve or anything like
5 that, and have food and all that stuff, but
6 you know, at least solicit some wisdom from
7 the community so that, as you develop these
8 guiding document, make sure you cover all your
9 bases again so that we don't have to have this
10 discussion again in another year or two, or a
11 decade, for that matter.

12 MR. SHULER: The sense I get, it
13 may be a document and it may be several
14 documents. So -- and I don't think they're
15 going to be guidelines. I think we're pretty
16 much over that. I hope.

17 Okay. Does -- anything else, then,
18 that we need to bring to bear on this?

19 I hate to think of the idea that we
20 would have actually 20 extra minutes. It's
21 such a waste.

22 Well, hell, we did good. Let's go
23 get some coffee. I'm sorry. Sorry, Jim.

1 MS. TROTTA: Thank you, everybody.

2 (Whereupon the above-entitled
3 matter went off the record from 9:43 and
4 resumed at 10:33 a.m.)

5 MR. PRIEBE: Okay. I think we're
6 going to go ahead and get started. My name is
7 Ted Priebe, the director of library planning
8 and development.

9 We've got a good session on
10 authentication for you today and I just wanted
11 to give you a little background on what our
12 objectives are in this session.

13 Lisa Russell, who is the manager of
14 our library -- excuse me -- content management
15 unit, is going to give you an overview, and
16 that's going to consist of talking about where
17 we started, some background in terms of
18 authentication for those of you that haven't
19 had a lot of exposure to it, and then we're
20 going to close out with some assumptions and
21 questions that we're going to start off with
22 Council to get perspectives on, and then open
23 it up to the audience.

1 So, we should have a member from
2 our PMO to talk about FDsys if you've got
3 questions in that regard, as well as one of
4 our technical security folks in terms of how
5 we implemented the PKI technology.

6 So, with that, I'm going to turn it
7 over to Lisa. Thanks, everybody.

8 MS. RUSSELL: Thanks, everybody,
9 for coming this morning.

10 I should start by apologizing. I'm
11 a little congested today, so if anybody asks a
12 question and I have to then sort of take a
13 deep breath in and let it out slowly before I
14 answer. Please don't take that as an
15 editorial remark on your question.

16 GPO is engaged in the major
17 authentication initiative designed to assure
18 users that information made available by GPO
19 is official and authentic and that trust
20 relationships exist between all participants
21 in the electronic transaction.

22 This initiative which employs PKI
23 or Public Key infrastructure technology will

1 allow users to determine that the files are
2 unchanged since GPO authenticated them.

3 For almost 150 years GPO has been
4 the official disseminator of the government
5 publications and has assured their
6 authenticity.

7 In the 21st Century the increasing
8 use of electronic documents poses special
9 challenges in verifying authenticity because
10 digital technology makes such documents easy
11 to alter or copy, leading to multiple
12 nonidentical versions that can be used in
13 unauthorized or illegitimate ways.

14 You can think of this -- if you
15 heard the story of -- you know, in the print
16 world you used to get something in an envelope
17 that you would open and it came from GPO. You
18 could verify that it was authentic and that it
19 hadn't been changed because it has a fixity on
20 the page. It hasn't been altered.

21 GPO's charge is to meet the
22 challenge of the digital age. GPO has begun
23 applying digital signatures to certain

1 electronic documents on GPO access that not
2 only established GPO as the trusted
3 information disseminator, but also provide the
4 assurance that an electronic document has not
5 been altered since GPO has disseminated it.

6 The visible digital signatures on
7 online PDF documents serve the same purpose as
8 a handwritten signature or a traditional wax
9 seal on printed documents.

10 A digital signature with at GPO
11 seal of authenticity verifies document
12 integrity and authenticity on GPO online
13 federal documents at no cost to the user. And
14 here we see a shot of the actual seal.

15 So, how does it all work? GPO uses
16 a digital certificate to apply a digital
17 signature to PDF documents. The digital
18 certificate is issued by a certificate
19 authority or CA upon receiving proof of
20 identity.

21 A certificate path, certification
22 path between the certificate and the CA must
23 be established to validate the signature. You

1 can think of this as sort of a driver's
2 license. You have to prove your identity to
3 get a driver's license, and the same thing
4 happens with the certificate.

5 So, to continue that -- that
6 comparison, John Doe lives in the State of
7 Iowa, he goes to the Iowa Department of
8 Transportation to get his driver's license,
9 and the State of Iowa grants the Department of
10 Transportation the authority to grant a
11 driver's license.

12 In the same way, the Superintendent
13 of Documents gets our certificate from the
14 GeoTrust CA who gets their authority to grant
15 that certificate from Adobe Root CA.

16 Next, I'm going to take you through
17 a few slides that tell you a little bit about
18 the validation process in Adobe Reader Acrobat
19 or Reader Acrobat 7.0.

20 When you open a digitally-signed
21 file in an Adobe Acrobat or Reader 7.0, you'll
22 see this dialogue box. The blue ribbon will
23 let you know that the digital document has not

1 been modified since it was certified, and if
2 the digital signature is valid.

3 You can see that the blue ribbon up
4 on the top of the document at the background.

5 You can also see it in the window that shows
6 the status.

7 If you click on signature
8 properties to see more about the signature.
9 This tells you that the document certification
10 is valid.

11 You probably can't read it very
12 well from where you're sitting, but do you see
13 the blue ribbon up at the top, that tells you
14 it was signed by the Superintendent of
15 Documents, that -- the reason is that GPO
16 attests this document has not been altered
17 since it was disseminated by GPO.

18 It also gives the validity summary
19 that says the document has not been modified
20 since it was certified. The identity is valid
21 and that it's time-stamped.

22 If you'll click on the document
23 tab, that will tell you a little bit more

1 about the certification on the document.

2 Here again, you see the blue
3 ribbon. You see that this is document version
4 1 of 1, some additional versioning
5 information, and it tells you that it has not
6 been modified.

7 If you click on the signer tab to
8 find out more about the signer, here it tells
9 you the identity is valid, signed by the
10 Superintendent of Documents. There's
11 additional information. A lot of the same
12 kind of stuff that you've seen in the previous
13 windows.

14 If you click the show certificate
15 button, it will actually show you the
16 certificate that was used to sign the
17 document.

18 This dialogue box allows you to
19 view the details of the certificate and it
20 also shows you the chain, like we showed in
21 that comparison to a driver's license that
22 shows you it was signed by the Superintendent
23 of Documents who got the certificate from

1 GeoTrust who got their authority from the
2 Adobe Root CA.

3 If you click on okay, it will close
4 all the dialogue boxes. Here you just see the
5 document with a signature on it, see what it
6 looks like.

7 If you right-click on validate
8 signature, you can actually validate the
9 signature to find out if the signature is
10 valid. You can think of this sort of as, you
11 know, if you give someone your driver's
12 license to get into a building to prove your
13 identity, they'll look at it and say, "Okay.
14 It looks good. We'll let you in."

15 If, on the other hand you get
16 stopped by the police, they might take it and
17 run it to find out, you know, if you have any
18 outstanding warrants or anything. That's a
19 little bit extra validation checking on that.

20 So, if you right-click you'll get
21 this box that says the document certification
22 is valid and it was signed by the
23 Superintendent of Documents and has not been

1 modified since it was certified.

2 And the blue ribbon, again, that
3 lets you know that the document has not been
4 modified since it was certified.

5 If you click on the right, the
6 signature tab on the left-hand side you'll see
7 a little bit more about the signature. Again,
8 it shows you that it was signed by the author.

9 It shows you the blue ribbon signed by the
10 Superintendent of Documents, and so forth, and
11 you see the document itself in the right-hand
12 side.

13 And then, again, we're back to just
14 seeing the document itself.

15 I'm not going to go through the
16 whole process with Adobe Acrobat 8.0 because
17 it's pretty much the same process, but it
18 looks a little bit different, so I'm just
19 going to show you the first screen so you can
20 see how it looks different.

21 When you open a digitally-signed
22 file in Adobe Acrobat or Reader 8.0, you'll
23 see this pink box across the top instead of

1 the blue box. And again, you see the blue
2 ribbon and it tells you that it was certified
3 by the Superintendent of Documents and that
4 the signature is valid.

5 So here you can see all of the
6 different validation icons that you can get.
7 Obviously we want you to see the blue ribbon.

8 If you see anything else, that could mean
9 that there's something wrong with the file.

10 One thing you may run into is that
11 if you have a file and you're opening it with
12 -- with Adobe Acrobat 7.0, since -- if you
13 don't have an internet connection it actually
14 checks -- goes over the internet to check your
15 validation in that case.

16 And so, in 7.0 if you don't have an
17 internet connection you'll get this question
18 mark that tells you that the validity is
19 unknown because it hasn't been able to make
20 that validation check.

21 The check mark below it is what
22 you'll see if something has been signed, but
23 not certified. When we certify a document,

1 we're actually locking it down so that no
2 changes can be made.

3 And when we put stuff up on GPO
4 access, we're signing and certifying, but if
5 you had something that was just signed, but
6 not certified and it was valid, you would get
7 this icon.

8 The question mark in the top right-
9 hand column indicates that the signature could
10 not be verified. This is what you'll get
11 again similar to the person with the question
12 mark. If there's no internet connection and
13 you can't validate the signature you'll get
14 that icon.

15 The warning sign below it is where
16 -- is what you'll get if the document has been
17 changed, and then the red icon below that
18 indicates that the certification is not valid
19 and obviously you don't want that.

20 So, that's kind of how it works,
21 and now I'm going to go into some of the --
22 some of the issues and how -- that we've run
23 into than when we're implementing.

1 GPO access currently uses WAIS
2 search technology. The resources on GPO
3 access have a number of different scenarios.
4 Some of them are text only. Some of them are
5 PDF only. Some of them are both, PDF and
6 text.

7 Additionally, some of them have
8 search features. Some of them have browse
9 features. Some are both. And there are also
10 some differences in the data structure.

11 The GPO access resources basically
12 have two sort of major scenarios that affect
13 the search and retrieval. In one situation
14 there's a one-to-one relationship between the
15 file residing on the server and the file
16 that's retrieved by a user.

17 An example of this scenario is the
18 public and private laws application. Each law
19 is stored as a separate file and the whole
20 file is retrieved when the user requests it.

21 The other scenario, the content is
22 stored in large files, and a section of the
23 file is pulled out when the user requests it.

1 An example of this is the Federal Register.

2 Each issue is stored on GPO servers
3 as three to five large files. If a user
4 requests a proposed rule, the pages for that
5 rule will be extracted from the large file and
6 a temporary file is created and retrieved for
7 the user.

8 When content is stored as a large
9 file and the requested content is extracted
10 for retrieval, this extraction breaks the
11 signature. So, if you think about it, you're
12 really changing the file by taking a piece out
13 and making a new file out of it. So, that
14 breaks the signature, so we can't effectively
15 sign those.

16 Some of the resources that are
17 structured in this way in WAIS are also
18 available through a browse table that
19 retrieves the whole files and do not have --
20 do not break the signatures during retrieval.

21 So, in those cases we could sign
22 the files that are available through browse,
23 but not the files that are available through

1 search.

2 Providing digitally-signed content
3 through the browse function and unsigned
4 content through the search function of the
5 same resource could confuse users.

6 In addition, the staff time
7 required to manually break down large files
8 into small files that could be retrieved whole
9 is prohibitive.

10 GPO currently does not have the
11 processes in place to automate that process.
12 So, how have we dealt with these issues? GPO
13 has adopted the approach of implementing
14 authentication first on the applications that
15 are already structured with a one-to-one
16 relationship, because we are able to do those
17 without having to change what's in the
18 database at all.

19 GPO is also talking to content
20 originating agencies to get permission to
21 authenticate their content on GPO access.

22 GPO initially approached Congress
23 and the Office of the Federal Register or OFR

1 about authenticating their content on GPO
2 access.

3 Discussions with OFR originally
4 centered on the Federal Register until the
5 data structure issues caused us to consider
6 the public and private laws to be a better
7 first application to sign.

8 In May 2007, GPO launched a beta
9 110th Congress Authenticated Public and
10 Private Laws Application. And here we've got
11 a screen shot of it. You can see where you
12 can go in and search, and if you scroll down
13 you'd see a browse function, and there's also
14 a big box in the left-hand column that says
15 provide feedback so that people could go take
16 the survey and tell us what they thought about
17 it.

18 The beta Application included
19 unsigned text files and digitally-signed PDF
20 files of public and private laws passed during
21 the 110th Congress.

22 This was a WAIS application with
23 the same look and feel as the previously-

1 existing public and private laws application.

2 The existing public and private laws
3 application contains the text files and the
4 unsigned PDF files and will continue to be
5 available covering the 104th through the 110th
6 Congresses and it was still available on GPO
7 access.

8 In order to enable the beta site,
9 GPO staff manually signed the PDF files before
10 they were ingested into the application. No
11 additional applications or Congresses were to
12 be authenticated until digital signing could
13 be automated by a system that was under
14 development, and you'll hear a little bit more
15 about that in a minute.

16 This approach allowed for testing
17 of the technology and analysis of user
18 feedback before full release. There was a
19 link from the application web page to a survey
20 to collect feedback. That was that big button
21 that we saw down on the left-hand corner.

22 After successful automation of
23 digital signing and a production site for the

1 110th Congress Authenticated Public & Private
2 Laws, GPO would begin signing and
3 implementation of an additional Congresses and
4 applications.

5 GPO plans to sign from the 110th
6 Congress forward or from 2007 forward for all
7 GPO applications with PDF files, and this is
8 just to give a consistent starting date
9 because the 2007 is the first year of the
10 110th Congress.

11 So, now we're up to the automated -
12 - automation of the process. And GPO applied
13 an automated PDF signing system in January of
14 2008.

15 The APS system allows GPO to
16 automate the digital signing of PDF files so
17 that PDF files can be efficiently signed and
18 posted on GPO access.

19 The first application of this
20 system was to digitally sign the PDF files for
21 the FY 2009 E-Budget on GPO access, which was
22 released in February 2008. And for that we
23 signed 389 files with the APS within a matter

1 of minutes.

2 This is a slide that we like to
3 show, you know, the handshake between GPO and
4 OMB on the signing of the budget. You can see
5 Public Printer and the head of OMB shaking
6 hands in front of the cover of the budget.
7 You know, everybody's happy, so we like that.

8 GPO deployed the automated
9 signings. Okay. So, this just shows a screen
10 shot of the budget as it is now. We've got
11 mostly the same text as we had before.

12 We added a paragraph that says, you
13 know, starting with 2008, we're
14 authenticating. If you scroll down you'd see
15 that the 2009 is available there and the 2008
16 foreword is also available, but not -- not
17 authenticated.

18 GPO's second use of the APS system
19 was to integrate it into the workflow for the
20 beta release of the authenticated public and
21 private laws for the 110th Congress on GPO
22 access.

23 Once that was up and running

1 successfully, and we had all of the --
2 everything worked out with that, that database
3 was integrated into the existing application.

4 And here you just see a screen shot
5 of the public and private laws. And again,
6 you see that little paragraph that says,
7 "Starting with the 110th Congress, we're
8 authenticating the files here."

9 So, what are the next steps? We're
10 working through the resources with the one-to-
11 one data structure first. We're also planning
12 to sign for the 110th Congress or from 2007
13 forward for all GPO access applications with
14 PDF files.

15 GPO is -- this is a little bit
16 outdated. It was -- it was true when we
17 signed it, but we've got an update on it.
18 GPO's in discussions with the House and Senate
19 regarding signing of the bills and if you
20 heard Ric speak earlier, we have an agreement
21 with them to go ahead and sign the bills
22 starting -- yes.

23 And we're going to do a soft launch

1 probably in November where we're going to set
2 up a beta. We're going to do it a little bit
3 different than what we did with the public and
4 private laws because of the number of files
5 that are available.

6 With the public and private laws we
7 were able to do the beta so that we're
8 automatically updating as new laws came in.
9 But the bills have a much larger number of
10 files out there, so that doesn't work as
11 effectively.

12 As of -- just to give you an idea,
13 as of six o'clock last night, there were 329
14 public and private laws from the 110th
15 Congress, as opposed to 19,502 bills. So,
16 that would be double work on our productions
17 staff, so we decided not to take quite the
18 same approach.

19 What we're going to do, instead, is
20 to have a test database that has roughly 100
21 to 250 sample files out there that will be
22 representative of all the different versions
23 of the bills that people can use and take a

1 look at and give us some feedback on it. And,
2 again, we'll have a link to a survey with
3 that.

4 And then the plan is to have a hard
5 launch in January with the beginning of the
6 new Congress, and at that time, in order to be
7 consistent, we'll also put out signed versions
8 of the 110th Congress and then work forward in
9 the 111th Congress.

10 So, this slide just shows that
11 we've got an authenticated webpage, gives you
12 the URL, it's [www.gpoaccess.gov/](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/authentication/)
13 [authentication/](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/authentication/).

14 That has links to the E-Budget and
15 the public and private laws. When we get the
16 bills signed, that will also be out of there.

17 It also has slide presentations describing
18 the validation process and Adobe Acrobat
19 Reader Version 7.0 and 8.0. A lot of that is
20 the stuff that I covered earlier.

21 And there's also some general
22 information on authentication, including
23 definitions and many terms.

1 And with that, I'll turn it over
2 for the assumptions.

3 MR. PRIEBE: And -- this is Ted
4 Priebe, GPO. Before I introduce Dr. Chris
5 Greer who, from Council, will be running those
6 assumptions and questions for Council and the
7 audience.

8 I just wanted to take a brief
9 break. We've covered a lot of ground there,
10 but we wanted to be a little more pragmatic in
11 showing you just some examples of what we did,
12 where we started and where we're at now and
13 then where we're going.

14 So, before we jump into those
15 assumptions or questions I wanted to give at
16 least Council and then the audience an
17 opportunity if you wanted to clarify or have
18 any confirmations from GPO on a lot of what we
19 showed there.

20 David.

21 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
22 California State Library.

23 Lisa, I believe that you said that

1 if you don't have an internet connection and
2 you attempt to display an authenticated
3 document, that the icon will change. Now,
4 does this also apply to documents that have
5 been saved, say, to one's hard drive, if you
6 open that document again, will --

7 MS. RUSSELL: It depends on what
8 version of Adobe Acrobat that you're using.
9 If you're using 7.0 and it's been saved on
10 your hard drive, if you have a live internet
11 connection, when you open it up, you're going
12 to get the blue ribbon.

13 If you don't have the live internet
14 connection, you're going to get that person
15 with the question mark.

16 MR. CISMOWSKI: And if you have a
17 later version, what --

18 MS. RUSSELL: If you have Adobe 8.0
19 or later, you don't need the internet
20 connection. Actually, when we were testing
21 this, at one point I unplugged my laptop from
22 the wall and was running around the office
23 going, "See, it works. It works."

1 So, I can verify that you can --
2 you actually can validate without an internet
3 connection in 8.0.

4 MR. PRIEBE: Katrina.

5 MS. STIERHOLZ: Two quick
6 questions. One, how far -- so if you have
7 something, an older version of Adobe before
8 7.0, will this appear, like 5.5?

9 MS. RUSSELL: You can -- it works
10 in 6.0. 5.0, I'm not sure about. The problem
11 with 6.0 is that we'd recommend 7.0 or 8.0
12 because there are some additional steps in 6.0
13 that you have to take to go in and say, yes, I
14 trust the certificate, which we thought would
15 confuse users.

16 So, if you use 7.0 or 8.0 you won't
17 have to go through those additional steps.

18 MS. STIERHOLZ: But the files do
19 open and they --

20 MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

21 MS. STIERHOLZ: -- do function.
22 The second question, just remembering the old
23 days when we would get these little sheets of

1 errata. When you have to make a change in a
2 document, do you make the change in the
3 document and note that there's been a change,
4 or do you issue an errata?

5 You know, your thing said it had
6 never been changed. I just thought a --

7 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.
8 Depending on a specific example that you might
9 have, that's really dependent on the
10 publishing agency and how they choose to
11 disseminate that update.

12 For GPO, if it's an application
13 that we're posting, whether it's that entire
14 document that's updated, it's really not our
15 choice on how an agency would update their
16 content.

17 So, it could be, I think, a couple
18 different scenarios.

19 MS. RUSSELL: Yes. I think a
20 couple of examples of that are there are --
21 Congress has star prints which let you know
22 that it's been modified. I know there are
23 some cases with some Department of Justice

1 publications where they've got PDF files where
2 they've put a little post-it stickie note on
3 there that says, you know, we've changed --
4 we've done some recalculation and figured out
5 that this -- the year isn't quite right, and
6 this is the new figure or whatever.

7 So, different agencies will do it a
8 little bit differently.

9 MR. PRIEBE: Lisa.

10 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
11 University of Illinois at Chicago. Maybe this
12 is better approached under the assumptions,
13 but I'm going to throw it out anyway.

14 Is authentication through the GPO
15 system, both present and future, an option for
16 the user?

17 Because, as a practicing librarian,
18 I understand the importance of authentication
19 in certain moments of our interactions with
20 our public, but the ad hoc nature that you
21 just described with Adobe Acrobat and
22 everything else, downloading and opening, a
23 lot of our users are going to be very

1 confounded by that.

2 And if all the documents that are
3 going to be embedded in the GPO system are
4 going to be infested with that kind of
5 opportunity, let's say, I see it as a step
6 backwards, embracing fully the idea of
7 authentication and trust and validation.

8 But, given the -- the somewhat
9 still we're making -- we're forming this as we
10 go along, I can see that there is going to be
11 a point of conflict between what our users
12 want.

13 And I may point out, in light of
14 our conversation this morning, another level
15 of authentication, as indicated by Denise
16 yesterday, is using a government documents
17 librarian in a depository, and sometimes that
18 form of authentication is enough for 80
19 percent of our traffic.

20 So, I want to just raise that as an
21 issue.

22 MS. RUSSELL: I think Ric wanted to
23 say something on this.

1 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Yes,
2 the goal in this process is to think of it in
3 terms of the Good Housekeeping Seal of
4 Approval, you know, when you get something and
5 you see the Good Housekeeping Seal, it's
6 there, but you want it to sort of fade into
7 the background.

8 The trick in this is to make sure
9 that for persons who need to cite this
10 information for legal purposes or historical
11 reference purposes, particularly, you want to
12 make sure that it's there and the integrity
13 mark is available, but at the same time, you
14 don't want it to be in any way obtrusive.

15 You have the ability right now,
16 when you first encounter this to click a check
17 box and check off so it's not as obtrusive
18 when you open it in the future.

19 So, I think that's -- we're kind of
20 doing a delicate balancing act there. I also
21 want to make a point that Lisa made this sound
22 pretty dog-gone easy but, you know, as you've
23 heard about waste, and we all know and love it

1 so well, we've essentially taken a 21st
2 Century technology and applied it to an 18th
3 Century -- maybe 19th Century search engine.

4 And I think it's going to be a lot
5 easier when we do launch under FDsys and you
6 have the fast capability. I think we'll have
7 more options to make it less obtrusive for
8 those who don't want to be bothered with it in
9 the future.

10 MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona
11 State University. I'd like to go back to the
12 nomenclature of who the author is. Am I
13 understanding that the author in this
14 application is GPO, which is really the
15 publisher.

16 But what I'm getting at is, the
17 author in the case of the bills and the public
18 laws would be the Legislature, the Congress.
19 So, at what point do they weigh in and say
20 "This is the document that is the true
21 manifestation of the information in the
22 document we want to transmit"?

23 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. What

1 we did as part of this first effort is to
2 authenticate the information as coming from
3 the Government Printing Office as being
4 authentic.

5 We're basically saying from the
6 time it left the Government Printing Office,
7 the Superintendent of Documents is certifying
8 the fact that you can trust the information.

9 When Mary Alice stood up and talked
10 about some of the things during the opening
11 session about what our long-term strategy is
12 and what we're going to do under FDSys, we're
13 going to establish full chain of custody full
14 provenance, so what we want to do is reflect
15 essentially in the equivalent of the metadata
16 of the PKI signature, that full chain of
17 custody, a recognition that the content is
18 digitally signed and certified from the point
19 that it's created by the content originator,
20 passed to GPO, GPO is validating it from the
21 point it left GPO to you as the end user.

22 We didn't really publicize this
23 that much, but that entire chain of custody

1 and provenance actually happened with the
2 budget this year. OMB digitally took our PKI
3 and digitally signed the files, submitted them
4 to us in a secure fashion over a network, and
5 then revalidated them.

6 So, we've had, in addition to our
7 authentication effort, our first full chain of
8 custody effort with the budget.

9 MS. TROTTA: And, Ric, Tory again.

10 And is that the model for the future?

11 MR. DAVIS: Absolutely. When Lisa
12 LaPlant gave the presentation yesterday on
13 FDsys and she talked about digital deposit and
14 being able to digitally sign a document when
15 it's ingested into FDsys, associated it with
16 the unique ID. That's the plan for the
17 future. We want that full chain of custody
18 throughout the information lifecycle.

19 DR. GREER: Ric, while -- Chris
20 Greer, National Coordination Office. As many
21 of the agencies began doing their own
22 authentication process and had their own PKI
23 structures, is it the intention as you cite

1 that they would continue when things are
2 coded, for GPO to use your PKI authority or
3 their own?

4 MR. DAVIS: With PKI you have --
5 Ric Davis, GPO. With PKI you have a lot of
6 options. You don't necessarily have to use
7 our PKI that we have physically in place at
8 GPO.

9 As a certification authority we
10 offer the capability to provide digital
11 certificates to other agencies, but we're part
12 of the federal bridge, which I know you know
13 about, Chris, as part of the PKI effort, so
14 we're collaborating with other partners.

15 So, if you choose to use, you know,
16 the PKI incidents program through GSA or
17 something through a private sector vendor like
18 MicroSoft, we have cross functionality with
19 our PKI.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen
21 Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I'm not sure,
22 maybe I misunderstood what John was saying,
23 but I don't think I agree that this is in any

1 way obtrusive or confusing to users.

2 I think -- I agree with what Ric
3 said, that it's unobtrusive, it's just a
4 little blue ribbon, and I'll wager that most
5 people who are not looking for a certificate
6 of authenticity wouldn't even notice it.

7 MR. SHULER: I meant -- John
8 Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. I
9 meant the description, the discussion over the
10 Adobe Acrobat versions as an introduction to
11 problems with formatting that I have -- as a
12 librarian practicing for 25 years, it's a very
13 difficult moment with the user when they can't
14 open up the format, for any number of reasons,
15 but if this process is still in formation and
16 it introduces another complexity in the format
17 issues, I would want it not as an option at
18 this point until they've worked out those
19 issues.

20 I'm not saying it's a bad idea, in
21 general, for authentication or that
22 authentication gets in the way, I'm talking
23 about the mechanism that was just described to

1 us as being a problem, and that's what I was
2 asking for, an option out if that is still an
3 issue, technologically, until we work it out.

4 That's what my point was.

5 MR. PRIEBE: Is the audience --
6 nothing more from Council --

7 MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake
8 Forest Law. I've got two or three small
9 questions. And the first one is really
10 simple. Why did you go from a blue ribbon in
11 Adobe 7 to a pink ribbon?

12 I mean, if you're branding it as
13 the blue ribbon, you know, certification --
14 are you going to change colors every time we
15 have new version of Adobe?

16 MS. RUSSELL: That's actually part
17 of the Adobe software, so it's not anything we
18 had any input.

19 MS. PARKER: I'm sorry.

20 MS. RUSSELL: The ribbon itself
21 actually isn't changing color, it's just the
22 box that tells you about the -- about it.

23 MS. PARKER: Well, yes. It's just

1 not --

2 MS. RUSSELL: And you can -- as Ric
3 said, there's an option when you go into it
4 that you can click a box that says "I don't
5 want to see this pop-up box anymore."

6 MS. PARKER: Okay. And following
7 up on Katrina's question: And you're not two
8 things yet, that are like this, but we -- I
9 think what we need to understand is: If you
10 have a document -- and we'll use a Supreme
11 Court case as an example.

12 In print, the first issuance was a
13 slip opinion. Then they pulled those together
14 into a pamphlet and they might have made some
15 changes. But the real final official version
16 wasn't till it was in the bound volume.

17 Well, if you went to a library you
18 could put your hands on each one of those
19 pieces and see if there had been any changes,
20 but you knew that that bound volume was what
21 you got to rely on.

22 Now, if you have a document that's
23 going to be ingested into the system, and it

1 starts, and then they make a change and they
2 send you, you know, the second version of that
3 document, then they send you that third
4 version.

5 Many legal researchers and
6 historical researchers are going to want to
7 see all those three. And I understand, if an
8 agency says you have to match them all
9 together, don't leave any of the old pieces
10 out there, you have to do that.

11 But if you're allowed to leave
12 version one, version two, version three,
13 number one, are you going to identify those in
14 some way and, two, are you going to then tie
15 them together so that somebody who, you know,
16 today goes and picks up a document and what
17 they got was piece one and what they needed
18 was piece three, that they're not just hanging
19 out there.

20 MS. RUSSELL: I believe -- I don't
21 know if Lisa LaPlant wants to address this,
22 but there are requirements in FDsys to sort of
23 link those --

1 MS. PARKER: Okay.

2 MS. RUSSELL: -- different
3 documents together. There's also in Adobe
4 Acrobat, if you do have all three of those
5 versions, you can pull them up and see what
6 the differences are.

7 MS. PARKER: Okay. Okay. Because
8 that will be really critical. And that's what
9 you were trying to get to, more or less? Yes.
10 Okay. Thanks.

11 MS. LaPLANT: Hi, Lisa LaPlant,
12 GPO.

13 The intention is to -- that all of
14 those documents would be ingested into FDsys
15 and they're all separate packages so, you
16 know, as the slip opinion comes out, all the
17 way up to when it becomes in the bound record,
18 that those would be made available if that's
19 the policy decision that GPO chooses to go
20 with.

21 Technologywise, we could make all
22 of those available and we can have the
23 document relationships between them to say,

1 "This one became this one, became this one."

2 MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson,
3 University of Delaware.

4 Recognizing that GPO access, as
5 currently standing, contains, I think, many
6 versions of Adobe files. Many different Adobe
7 versions, I mean, that have been in use over
8 the years.

9 And I remember some years ago the
10 implicit promise was these will be migrated
11 forward as need, you know, arises. You know,
12 we're now on Acrobat 8. I think there's some
13 people that may have a beta version of nine.
14 I'm not sure.

15 But, as we move forward, some
16 things are less readable, and at some point
17 you all will probably have to migrate some of
18 your earlier files forward, and I would like
19 to know if you will somehow have to
20 revalidate, since if you migrated forward, it
21 strikes me that this will have to warn you
22 that the file's been changed, and I wondered
23 if you could discuss that a little bit.

1 MR. PRIEBE: We have, actually --
2 Ted Priebe, GPO. We have certainly had that
3 discussion internally, particularly with older
4 PDF files and our current APS signing system
5 in terms of version X, Y, Z or older that we
6 would need to bring that up into a common
7 level before it would be digitally signed and
8 authenticated.

9 So, in terms of that transition of
10 -- sorry. Okay. I got thrown off there.

11 So, is your question more in terms
12 of when we make that migration before
13 digitally signing? Is that associated in the
14 metadata so that there is a mechanism to
15 record that that action occurred, if I'm
16 understanding your question correctly?

17 MR. STEVENSON: Well, it actually
18 is two different things. You know, the ones
19 that weren't digitally signed I imagine that
20 you'll want to say this is a legacy file, but
21 we say it's authentic.

22 But, I guess my biggest concern is
23 that something that you create now with this

1 Congress and it's valid today and everybody
2 can see the blue seal of approval, if you
3 migrate that one forward at some point, Adobe
4 will probably want to warn people that this
5 has been altered since it was originally
6 signed, and I wondered if you have any
7 thoughts as to you will double-sign it?
8 You'll have one thing that says it's been
9 altered and then another signature that says,
10 but it's okay, it was done by us.

11 MR. PRIEBE: Got you. Do you want
12 me to take it or --

13 MR. DAVIS: Let me try. Okay. All
14 right. That's a good question. Ric Davis,
15 GPO.

16 Let me back up for just a second.
17 One of the things that we are going to do
18 going forward as well, recognizing that
19 technology changes and the Adobe of today may
20 also be the something else of 20 years from
21 now, is we are also going to keep in our
22 archived collection an unaltered, unsigned
23 version.

1 You know, our plan is, as
2 technology changes over time, and digital
3 signature technology becomes replaced by
4 something else, we're going to need to be able
5 to migrate that forward as well.

6 I think one of the things that we
7 need to do as well is, we've got -- we do have
8 a lot of older, you know, PDF files on GPO
9 access that we're looking at as part of this
10 migration to FDsys.

11 A lot of files were created that
12 you and I have talked about, John, as press
13 optimized or print optimized files, not screen
14 optimized files, so we need to look at those
15 as well.

16 But I think that is our game plan
17 for the future. We want to keep an unsigned
18 copy that we'll be able to migrate into the
19 future if technology changes and causes us
20 problems in migrating the already signed
21 version.

22 I think the one thing we don't want
23 to do, though, is we're not going to have

1 multiple screen displays and multiple types of
2 signatures over time.

3 I think what we can do to get at
4 your second point is, is as technology changes
5 reflect those changes in the metadata
6 associated with the file, but the key to the
7 future is going to be the seal of
8 authentication and we want the technology to
9 fade behind the scenes as we take care of
10 migration and refresh.

11 Does that help?

12 MR. STEVENSON: Yes. Thank you
13 very much.

14 MS. PARKER: Marian Parker. One
15 more from your earliest example. You said
16 that you'd put off doing something like the
17 Federal Register because it's a lot of files,
18 instead of one.

19 But I would like to understand
20 where we're headed with that because, as I
21 heard what you said, you can authenticate the
22 entire day's Federal Register, but if all I
23 need is the one regulation that's relevant to

1 what I'm dealing with out of that, I can't
2 print it off and have it show that it's
3 authentic.

4 I'd have to print off the entire
5 day's issue to be able to take it in to court
6 and say, "I've got an authentic version of
7 this regulation."

8 And, clearly, that's not what we
9 want to do in the long run. So, am I correct
10 in assuming that that's the problem you're
11 having to work with, how you can digitally
12 sign a piece that's been pulled out of a
13 larger file?

14 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The
15 challenge that we have right now is we're able
16 to authenticate at the full document level.
17 So, you take an issue of the Federal Register
18 or an 800-page congressional hearing, you have
19 that authentication for the full document.

20 MS. PARKER: Right.

21 MR. DAVIS: But, as you mentioned,
22 the key is being able to take a piece or a
23 part out and that's what -- when Lisa was

1 giving her presentation yesterday, she talked
2 about granular authentication that we're
3 looking to enable through FDSys.

4 We want to be able in the future to
5 not have to take the entire document, but to
6 take down to a paragraph, a sentence level, a
7 section level, to take that, have the
8 authentication come out and carry forward, and
9 that is our plan for the future.

10 MS. PARKER: Okay. And that's just
11 further down the road. Okay.

12 MS. RUSSELL: Just to add to that -
13 - Lisa Russell, Government Printing Office.

14 To add to that a little bit, we --
15 actually for the -- for the budget is set up
16 where we can pull out smaller files in the
17 earlier versions.

18 This year, in order to make the
19 authentication work, my staff and I went
20 through and manually separated out the files.

21 It took the three of us two and a half days
22 to do that. So, it's not feasible to do it on
23 a day-by-day basis.

1 MS. LaPLANT: This is Lisa LaPlant
2 from GPO. And actually going forward, one of
3 the things that we're planning in the
4 workflows for the first public release is
5 taking those files and actually physically
6 breaking up of the granule file so you'll
7 actually have the individual Federal Register
8 notice in PDF and also in text in preparation
9 to be able to put those digital signatures on
10 it.

11 And, actually, breaking up those
12 files is something that's part of the
13 automated process within the workflow so we
14 won't have somebody having to sit and chop up
15 the files for X number of hours.

16 DR. GREER: Lisa, before you go,
17 Chris Greer, National Coordination Office.

18 That granularity you proposed for
19 DFsys is the article level, not the sentence
20 or paragraph levels. Do you intend, with the
21 initial FDsys implementation to provide finer
22 granularity authentication?

23 MS. LaPLANT: That is -- it's not

1 the intention with the first release. With
2 the first release we have the requirements to
3 provide at more of that article or document
4 type level.

5 And, really, the enabling
6 technology to be able to get down to a lower
7 level of granularity, both for the
8 authentication and also for access is really
9 making sure that we can have the documents in
10 a format like XML where we can pull out at
11 that lower level of granularity.

12 So, we do have those requirements
13 in later FDsys releases, but for this one,
14 we're sticking with the same level of
15 granularity that's available on GPO access
16 today.

17 MS. McANINCH: Sandy McAninch, UK.

18 Ric's comment about the archive having an
19 unsigned copy reminded me that I've not heard
20 much about a back-up site for GPO's archive.

21 Is there a second copy somewhere?
22 I think that's an authentication issue as
23 well, if you've only got the one, corruption

1 and disaster can occur.

2 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. In
3 current state for GPO access, there is
4 redundancy on multiple fronts. In terms of
5 FDSys, when we get into that structure and
6 disaster recovery, you know, I can't speak to
7 that.

8 There are requirements for all of
9 those things, so to answer your question, yes,
10 today and as we move forward, redundancy is a
11 key for us as well from the public access.
12 It's not a one-stop archive, if you will.

13 MS. McANINCH: On different
14 machines in different places, geographically
15 speaking?

16 MR. PRIEBE: Yes.

17 MS. McANINCH: Okay.

18 MR. PRIEBE: Okay. Without any
19 other questions, I'd like to introduce Dr.
20 Chris Greer to go over some assumptions and
21 questions that we've got.

22 DR. GREER: Okay. Thank you, Ted.

23 This process, as you've seen, is

1 challenging. So, GPO is to be commended for
2 taking this on. It's a tough workflow and
3 data management challenge. There's a lot to
4 it, and so they're showing real leadership at
5 the government level, and I appreciate all
6 that your team is doing to make this possible.

7 In the process of implementing this
8 kind of capability, there are many, many
9 choices that have to be made. There are lots
10 of options, lots of ways in which this can be
11 done. And so they're sort of working their
12 way through this trying to figure what works,
13 what's appropriate.

14 And so, this session is really
15 important for them to make some fundamental
16 decisions about how to proceed in this very
17 early phase.

18 So, these assumptions or the
19 assumptions that they have made so far that
20 they need some feedback from you on, and so
21 we'll go through them and get some input from
22 Council and from the audience about how they
23 work.

1 So, this first one is a very basic
2 assumption that the authentication mark should
3 be visible in the printable image area of the
4 document on the very first page.

5 So, can we get some input from
6 Council on this basic assumption? I would
7 point out that this isn't a simple -- it seems
8 like a no-brainer, but it actually isn't quite
9 that simple.

10 For example, the -- what's being
11 authenticated is the digital file. All right.

12 So, if you print out a copy, a hard copy of
13 that file and it has this little blue mark on
14 the top, that hard copy is not authenticated.

15 It can be altered in lots of different ways.

16 So, I think a concern is avoiding
17 the impression that when I print this out and
18 it has this little blue seal on it that that
19 is authenticating the hard copy that somebody
20 is holding.

21 And so, I would be concerned that
22 that seal provide an indication that this is
23 an authentication of the digital object.

1 MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern
2 Washington University. So, I was thinking
3 just now, well, why not, you know, put the
4 seal on every page so that if someone was to,
5 you know, what they really wanted to do is
6 show someone page three of ten in a, you know,
7 a 10-page PDF, that they could still have that
8 seal.

9 But I suppose -- maybe that doesn't
10 -- maybe that's not the issue after all, if
11 what we are talking about is what's really
12 being authenticated that, you know, the actual
13 digital document, in which case, you know,
14 you're not -- not going to be pulling pages
15 out of that -- you know, extracting pages from
16 that document.

17 So, as long as it -- the intention
18 is, you know, that it's that one thing is
19 what's being authenticated, then page one is
20 there with the authentication seal and
21 everything. It shouldn't be an issue, right?

22 DR. GREER: Yes. It's important to
23 remember that what's being authenticated is

1 the whole file, and not a page-by-page or
2 item-by-item.

3 MS. STIERHOLZ: Chris, I just think
4 this may not be the perfect answer, but it
5 seems like a reasonable assumption.

6 DR. GREER: As a starting place to
7 -- for them to make this choice. I think,
8 from my perspective, if that object on the
9 printable page indicates that this is an
10 authentication of the digital file, then I
11 don't have concerns about that.

12 An alternative, of course, is to
13 have it appear on the -- on the screen image
14 and not on the hard copy when you print it
15 out. Is that something that is worth thinking
16 about?

17 MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. I
18 want clarification on that. When you print
19 the file, it will print the GPO seal with the
20 eagle and all of that, but it actually does
21 not print the blue ribbon?

22 DR. GREER: I don't remember the
23 text that goes with the GOP seal -- says what?

1 MS. RUSSELL: The text in the --
2 this message appeared. The text was actually
3 part of the seal says "Authenticated, U.S.
4 Government Information."

5 But if you open up the information
6 on it there's a statement on there that says
7 "This file has not been altered since it was
8 signed by GPO" or words to that effect.

9 DR. GREER: So I guess my question
10 is whether this text that appears on the seal
11 "Authenticated U.S. Government Information,"
12 should that text be altered to indicate "U.S.
13 Government Digital Information" or something
14 of that sort?

15 MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen
16 Sinclair from the University of Hawaii. I'm
17 thinking of this in terms of what we do for
18 printed documents, and I don't know what
19 others do, but in our library we have a
20 certification that this is a copy of a
21 document that was distributed by the Federal
22 Depository Library Program.

23 So, we don't make any guarantees

1 about, you know, whether it was altered
2 between the time GPO shipped it to us and the
3 time it ended up on our shelf, but we're
4 simply saying this is out -- the best of our
5 knowledge, this is the provenance of this
6 document, and maybe that's what's needed in
7 the -- whatever prints out on the document is
8 here is the provenance of it, but this is the
9 source that you need to go to to verify
10 authenticity.

11 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One of
12 the things that I would encourage us to kind
13 of shy away from is doing any wordsmithing on
14 the logo or the language that appears directly
15 on the logo.

16 It took about six months and 50
17 versions to get approval on that and we've
18 actually trademarked it, so we got it out
19 there and we've used that.

20 What I do think we can do
21 wordsmithing, though, is we have a lot room on
22 that underlying metadata that I talk about
23 associated with the digital signature, and

1 that's a space that we can play with.

2 DR. GREER: Ken.

3 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
4 Connecticut State Library. I guess I go back
5 to, you know, who's this for. I mean, the
6 basic user wants a copy of something to walk
7 away with.

8 If they're concerned about, you
9 know, submitting it in court, I mean, there's
10 some different levels there.

11 As the depository you may need to
12 certify something, then you need to know --
13 you need to see that certification and
14 understand it.

15 Walking out with something printed,
16 I mean, somebody's going to figure out how to
17 do that, you know, make a copy of that little
18 logo as well.

19 So, the logo doesn't mean much on
20 the printed page necessarily, but I think as a
21 depository librarian, being able to say, yes,
22 that is a legitimate document is more --
23 because we don't have it on the shelf, we have

1 it, and how do we know -- what are we
2 certifying to, because we certify a lot of
3 documents.

4 So, I think it's like who's this
5 intended for. The person walking out, they've
6 got a little logo on the page, fine, but --

7 MR. SHULER: I think -- Jim Shuler
8 from the University of Illinois at Chicago.
9 That speaks a little bit to my earlier concern
10 about these levels of authority that we're
11 talking about here.

12 One could imagine a creeping
13 legalality in throughout all our interactions
14 with our public, and already we see this in
15 this first assumption that we seem fairly
16 comfortable with a digital signature assigned
17 to a digital document, but what happens to
18 that document as it migrates through its
19 format environment.

20 Where does our authority
21 authentication responsibility begin and end?
22 I would imagine in a very pragmatic way my
23 responsibilities would end with the digital

1 version saying there it is, what you do with
2 it is up to you.

3 And with the person that walks out
4 of the library with it, it's on its own. I
5 can't control it anymore at many levels.

6 My other question is: Just as
7 we're raising the digital concerns over the
8 authority of the digital documents, what are
9 we doing to raise the bar on the printed
10 documents coming out of GPO? Are they going
11 to have a comparable seal of approval?

12 I know historically we have markers
13 that indicate that it's official publication,
14 but it seems to me that if you raise the bar
15 in one format, you're going to have to raise
16 the bar in all the formats.

17 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I
18 think when Lisa gave her presentation
19 yesterday, she talked about a Phase 4 where
20 FDsys could enable time travel, and somewhere
21 this fits in between at release three and time
22 travel.

23 It's a good point. We've been

1 having discussions with a number of private
2 sector companies about what a digital
3 signature means on a printed document coming
4 from the government in terms of
5 authentication, and we copying and making
6 changes.

7 It's a technology that's still a
8 bit in its infancy as well, but a copy of this
9 seal on a printed document, to me right now
10 doesn't mean the same as what we're making
11 available through a digital copy, but it is
12 something we've got to look at in between
13 release three and time travel to enable the
14 capability so that when you're receiving a
15 copy from the government you can't just go out
16 and, you know, pull up a laser jet with the
17 latest software and manipulate it and make
18 that change as well.

19 It has to have some type of
20 validity going forward.

21 MR. SHULER: I'm just -- I just
22 want to keep coming back to the point that the
23 business of government documents librarians is

1 a very pragmatic one, and if our mission is to
2 get government information to the people,
3 that's what we should do.

4 If authenticity gets in the way of
5 that traffic, then, yes, authenticity is an
6 issue, at least with this practicing documents
7 librarian.

8 And I think we need to keep that in
9 mind as we talk about this.

10 DR. GREER: Ted.

11 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I
12 had one brief add to that. One of the
13 benefits that we have at our disposal in
14 applications that we authenticate via GPO
15 access, FDSys, is we have an about
16 authentication link, and one of the things
17 that we can do is perhaps provide even a bit
18 more detail to further strengthen the topics
19 that you've put forward is the GPO is, you
20 know, digitally signing the digital version
21 and, you know, even add in some additional
22 clarity on this -- on this front.

23 But clearly, the challenge was you

1 pull something down from any internet site,
2 how do you know that it wasn't altered, and
3 this was what we saw as one of GPO's core
4 missions as we move forward, is to be able to
5 give that trust relationship with the
6 government agency to say it has not been
7 altered, but it's only related to that
8 electronic file as Ric has described.

9 So, I think we can really revisit
10 what we have on that authentication page, and
11 maybe add even additional clarity based on
12 what you put forward. So, thank you for that.

13 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
14 Coordination Office. I think this point is
15 critical, and that is that in a distributed
16 information area where I can get files from
17 lots of sources, being able to check myself
18 whether a file has some authority and some
19 validity, empowers me significantly.

20 So, it's -- the individual user who
21 also benefits from this, not just the
22 librarian.

23 David.

1 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
2 California State Library. Going back to what
3 Gwen said about printing out one of these
4 authenticated documents and maybe handing it
5 to somebody, it strikes me that this process
6 is similar to those warnings on band-aids that
7 say "Sterile until opened."

8 That, once you open a band-aid and
9 put it on a kid, you know, it's sterile at
10 that moment. But when the kid goes outside
11 and plays in the dirt for while, it's no
12 longer sterile.

13 And I think that the transitory
14 nature of authentication is important to
15 remember here that, you know, at certain
16 moments the document is authenticated, it's on
17 paper or whether it's fixed in a digital file
18 on somebody's hard drive, but after it's taken
19 off of the internet, you know, maybe it's no
20 longer authentic after a certain period of
21 time, depending on how it's handled, and who
22 wants to alter it.

23 DR. GREER: Tim.

1 CHAIR BYRNE: I think in this
2 assumption where it's asking whether the
3 printable or the authentication should be on
4 the first page of the document, I think if
5 you're going to put it on the first page, it
6 should go on every page.

7 It's kind of meaningless if just
8 it's on the first page of the document whether
9 the document itself is an authentic document,
10 it's authentic from what it was printed from
11 and you should see it on every page.

12 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
13 Coordination Office. I guess I have the
14 question, then, in the current paper realm, is
15 the seal on every page of every document?

16 CHAIR BYRNE: No.

17 DR. GREER: No.

18 CHAIR BYRNE: Basically it's no.

19 DR. GREER: So that would be --

20 MR. WIGGIN: Tim Wiggin from
21 Connecticut again. I mean, in a way this is
22 misleading because I don't think the mark
23 means anything. Really. I mean, it's -- the

1 authentication is in the certificate. That's
2 what I want to see.

3 I mean, I want to -- as Chris said,
4 you want to look and see where it came from.
5 You could get the same document from four
6 different places. Only one may actually have
7 that certificate.

8 Putting something on a piece of
9 paper -- I wouldn't want the user to walk away
10 thinking, "Ah, I have an authentic document."

11 Because, if you slap something on a copy
12 machine out of our print collection, you get
13 the page. You don't get anything else on top
14 of it.

15 So, I mean, this is kind of an
16 interesting feature, but it's not really an
17 authentication mark.

18 DR. GREER: No, it's not.

19 MR. PRIEBE: One last thing, I take
20 responsibility for this discussion because
21 part of this language in terms of what we
22 drafted, our initial intent -- Ted Priebe, GPO
23 -- was where to validate with Council and the

1 community, when we use the term in the printed
2 image area, when you think of on your monitor
3 and a full page screen image if you will, that
4 you would see that logo.

5 Really didn't intend to drive it on
6 that tangible angle of, hey, this is an
7 authentic -- authenticated tangible output, it
8 was more for the community to know when they
9 go to GPO access and FDsys, they're going to
10 pull up that image and they will see it on the
11 image area of the page.

12 I guess the printed was an
13 unintended consequence, although I think it
14 brought forth some good issues that are
15 helping us as well. So, I just wanted to
16 clarify that was at least our intent, and I
17 take responsibility for throwing this one all
18 the way out.

19 DR. GREER: But I think this
20 discussion's been valuable.

21 MR. PRIEBE: Yes. Anything else
22 from Council?

23 MS. TROTTA: Well, I guess -- Tory

1 Trotta, Arizona State University, while the
2 file is what's being authenticated, if there's
3 going to be a mark it should be on the first
4 page, but as the migration is to parts or
5 whatever the discreet parts within a document
6 are, then I would hope that authentication
7 would be available for those parts also within
8 the file.

9 MR. PRIEBE: Yes. Ted Priebe, GPO.

10 Next, that's the plan, is as those granular
11 pieces are made available they'd be on that
12 first page.

13 MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern
14 Washington University. Now that I think about
15 it and, you know, the more we have this
16 discussion, maybe -- maybe the logo should
17 appear on every page so that if for nothing
18 else, you know, let's -- you know, if someone
19 does print -- you know, print the document and
20 take it with them, at least what they have,
21 then, is an indicator that there is an
22 authenticate -- you know, on every page, you
23 know, so even if you just -- all you've got in

1 your hand is page three of ten of this
2 document, at least there is a -- there's a
3 notation on that page that there is an
4 authenticated digital version of this that,
5 you know, that people can go and verify.

6 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
7 Coordination Office. My concern is that it
8 implies that what you're holding in your hand
9 is authenticated. Avoiding that implication
10 is what my concern is, and I don't know the
11 answer. I don't.

12 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
13 Dame. And my question goes to the same thing.
14 What are you trying to do here? Are you
15 trying -- what are you trying to imply by
16 having that image appear on a piece of paper.

17 And I think, one is, you will
18 define that. What it means to me is it was
19 printed -- assumption being, unaltered from
20 the time you pressed the print button till it
21 actually came out from an authenticated
22 source.

23 That's all. Now, if a user asked

1 me what does that mean, I spout back again,
2 "It was printed from an authenticated source."

3 "Well, does that mean it's accurate
4 and everything else?"

5 "It was printed from an
6 authenticated source." That's all you can do.

7 If you go to the paper environment,
8 you know, how did you know it was authentic?
9 Well, it hadn't been taken apart and rebound.

10 You know, the GPO on the very back officially
11 printed what the GPO -- dah, dah, dah, dah,
12 dah.

13 So, what are you trying to imply or
14 communicate to your user when they see this on
15 a paper image? I think once you do that, put
16 it some place because of us will interpret it
17 for anybody anyways.

18 MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.
19 This is a question for GPO. Does the PDF file
20 name appear at the bottom of each page? The
21 URL for the PDF file, does it appear at the
22 bottom of the page?

23 MR. PRIEBE: I don't believe -- Ted

1 Priebe, GPO. I don't believe so. Off of GPO
2 access, if you launch a browseable PDF -- no.

3 It does not.

4 MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis ALA. The
5 reason I'm asking this is, if what we're
6 trying to understand is where this document
7 originated, the only way we know that is by
8 having the URL to the file, once it's been
9 printed.

10 So, having a brand at the top is
11 lovely, but it's really about the source
12 filename.

13 MR. PRIEBE: Let me take that back
14 with me with the suggestion -- Ted Priebe GPO
15 -- was potentially could GPO consider that as
16 providing the filename or URL for the actual
17 document. Okay.

18 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
19 Coordination Office. I would second that. I
20 think Denise's idea is an effort to try to tie
21 the physical artifact to the digital one, that
22 the physical artifact is a representation of a
23 digital object, and by putting that URL at the

1 bottom, it allows the user to fall back to the
2 source.

3 MS. SEARS: Chris. Suzanne Sears,
4 University of North Texas. I'm sorry, but
5 every single -- you know, I want to tie back
6 into what David said and what Steve said.

7 In the current environment and what
8 we've been living in for over a hundred years
9 with the statutes at large and the US Code,
10 there is a bound volume, and on one page
11 there's an authentication, and that's it.

12 And when somebody makes a print
13 copy, it's certified that they made that print
14 copy from a certified source right then, and
15 we cannot guarantee that it's sterile past
16 that.

17 And it doesn't say -- you know, it
18 might say on it -- Denise with the URL, it
19 might say on it "Statutes at large." I mean,
20 it does give you -- say that you know that
21 that's where it came from.

22 But, you know, putting an
23 authentication on every single page, I really

1 just think that we're creating a lot of work.

2 It's never been there before, so why is it
3 now necessary?

4 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
5 Coordination Office. I guess I agree with you
6 in the terms of complexity, but I don't want
7 to add complexity where it's not adding value.

8 On the other hand, this
9 authentication approach adds value in the
10 sense that it allows a user anywhere, anytime
11 to authenticate the digital object. And
12 that's part of the vision of the strategic
13 plan.

14 It's not to provide access
15 anywhere, anytime to the community. This is a
16 new kind of access where you can -- it's as if
17 you could call up Ric Davis and say, you know,
18 I'm a user, I have a copy here. Can you tell
19 me if this is the original? You can do that
20 in a digital sense here.

21 Ric.

22 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I
23 think it's a good discussion. I don't know if

1 we have consensus on it yet. I think it's a
2 good discussion to continue. I will tell you
3 that in conversations we've had with our
4 federal agency partners, keeping in mind that
5 GPO here is the publisher, we kind of operate
6 on this a bit, too, at the wishes of the
7 federal agencies serving as the content
8 originator.

9 They've been a bit reticent thus
10 far about having it appear on every single
11 page. They've been very comfortable -- this
12 is Executive and Legislative Branch
13 conversations thus far, comfortable with it
14 appearing on that first page in terms of the
15 entire document.

16 I'm interested in our collaboration
17 on this as we go forward and it's points I can
18 take back to our federal agency partner for
19 further discussion.

20 DR. GREER: Thank you, Ric.

21 Let's go on -- one more comment?

22 Go on to the second assumption.

23 This has to do with a focus initially on PDF,

1 given the capable of Adobe certification
2 system, however, there are lots of files that
3 have utility in form -- when they are in forms
4 other than PDF, and so this says that,
5 initially, those would be provided but, as I
6 understand it, not for authentication, for
7 certification. Is that correct?

8 MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO.
9 Just to give you one idea of where this is
10 coming from, with the budget, they have --
11 most of their -- most of their files are
12 available with a PDF in a table format, and
13 then there's also a spreadsheet that you can
14 download and manipulate for your own use.

15 But they also had -- I think there
16 were three files in there that were basically
17 data dumps from databases that they had. And
18 when they converted those spreadsheets to PDF
19 in order to sign them and authenticate them,
20 we ended up with something like 60 rows across
21 and 300 rows down, and you end up with your
22 headers across the top and your headers are
23 down the side, but then if you want this page

1 here, you just get a bunch of numbers that
2 don't mean anything because you don't have the
3 headers.

4 So that -- even though, yes, that
5 was authenticated, it wasn't really very
6 useable. That was provided more so that
7 people could use the spreadsheet and, maybe,
8 benefit from that use.

9 DR. GREER: From Council?

10 MS. STIERHOLZ: I hadn't even
11 thought. This is Katrina from the St. Louis
12 Fed. So, the only kinds of files, really, you
13 can authenticate, are text? PDF text
14 documents. And are there no other digital
15 signature vendors out there for other kinds of
16 files?

17 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.
18 Certainly they are working on that, but our
19 assumption was really the validation that
20 today, based on technology and where it
21 stands, it's the PDF files that we can sign,
22 but by no means are we going to constrain
23 FDSys or the ability to sign documents as we

1 move forward as the technology matures.

2 MS. STIERHOLZ: I mean, I would
3 just encourage you to seek out other kinds of
4 certification, because that will be helpful.

5 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I
6 think Ted covered this very well. The
7 capability technologically exists right now to
8 digitally sign PDF files and to take other
9 file types and convert them to PDF.

10 It's called encapsulating the
11 native file with a PDF wrapper and digitally
12 signing that PDF format.

13 We've been working with the Program
14 Management Office and others at GPO, and
15 others in government to look for potential
16 technology partners to be able to digitally
17 sign other file formats.

18 I would say it's in its infancy
19 right now, and we haven't found anyone that
20 has stepped up to the plate, but we're
21 continuing to talk to technology companies.

22 I think one way we might want to
23 address it going forward is, you know, putting

1 out an RFI, request for information from the
2 government through Federal Business
3 Opportunities sometimes gets a response, but
4 we've been talking to the National Institute
5 of Standards, companies like Adobe, IBM,
6 MicroSoft and others that sort of play in the
7 space, and it hasn't been on their radar.

8 I think they see it now as being
9 something that should be on their radar.

10 MR. HANNAN: This is John Hannan
11 from GPO. I just want to amplify on what Ric
12 said. The issue really isn't that there
13 aren't techniques, it's that there are too
14 many, and there's not a standardized way.

15 That's really the challenge for us
16 at GPO. I work with Ric and others at GPO on
17 this. So, that's really the issue, is there
18 are too many to choose from right now, but I
19 think we'll see some coalescence and consensus
20 probably over time.

21 We're certainly helpful and looking
22 to exploit that as we can so that it's
23 effective for the community. So, we look

1 forward to continue to do that. I hope that
2 helped amplify it a little bit.

3 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
4 Coordination Office. I guess I would second
5 that. There are lots of custom solutions to
6 this that businesses used out in the
7 commercial realm, and so on, but not a
8 standard reader that would be available to
9 just anybody out there, to your libraries or
10 your patrons as well.

11 And it would be valuable for the
12 Federal Government as a whole to explore the
13 issue of standardized approaches.

14 Ric.

15 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One
16 final comment on that. That was one of the
17 dilemmas that we faced in terms of being able
18 to deal with PDF files. We did not want to
19 put out any type of plug-in that you needed to
20 use external to your browser.

21 We've been putting out stuff in PDF
22 format and Adobe and other types of readers
23 work with PDF files for years, but it's a

1 challenge that we don't want, you know,
2 allowing the people at your libraries or our
3 phones to light up the GPO about having to
4 have some customized proprietary technology
5 that may be here today, gone tomorrow.

6 So, looking at this in terms of
7 dealing with other file formats and having
8 standardization is critical.

9 DR. GREER: Okay. So I think we
10 hear that the PDF approach now is one that is
11 practical and is accessible. There are a lot
12 of questions about how to do this in the
13 future so that Council is going to have to
14 stay engaged on this topic, particularly as
15 FDsys moves forward.

16 The third assumption based on the
17 GPO authentication process, documents will be
18 -- will successfully authenticate using the
19 free Adobe Reader.

20 This is a huge assumption, although
21 I can understand why -- why you made it.

22 Council.

23 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National

1 Coordination Office. I guess the issue of
2 versioning and forward migration we kind of
3 touched on, I'm anxious to see over time GPO
4 develop a systematic approach to forward
5 migration of these technologies, so I think
6 that this is something that, again, has to
7 stay on the Council's radar.

8 John.

9 MR. SHULER: No. No.

10 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
11 Connecticut State Library.

12 I guess I have a concern, though,
13 specifically to this, but the whole migration
14 issue. If an individual or a library
15 downloads a file, and then continues to use
16 that, and let's say they can do it offline
17 with the new version 8, there's no need to go
18 back and to check to see if there's a newer
19 version necessarily.

20 So, how are depositories
21 particularly going know that the copy they
22 have -- unless they've continually checked.
23 So, I think there's some potential issues with

1 downloading these files locally and assuming
2 that, well, it says it's got a certificate,
3 it's okay. It may be four versions old by
4 then.

5 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I
6 guess I'll take a shot. It's not a
7 professional librarian, but I think the
8 dilemma is comparable to what we have in the
9 tangible world when you have a document, it
10 was current at the time that you got it,
11 perhaps from GPO or whatever method, but
12 without referencing that bibliographic
13 information to validate if there's a more
14 recent version, the authentication solution
15 that we have is really only providing you that
16 assurance and it hasn't been altered since GPO
17 authenticated, but it does not, in today's
18 realm, provide that mechanism of a validation
19 that it is also the most current.

20 So, it really is a part of the
21 whole package of what's the value of a
22 depository and having that mechanism with the
23 bibliographic, I think, is still the critical

1 component of is it the most recent, as well.

2 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
3 Connecticut State Library.

4 Then you may want to disable that
5 feature. I mean, to be a pain in the neck of
6 the local library, but if you can't go on line
7 to validate it, you can't validate that
8 version.

9 DR. GREER: Anything from the
10 audience on this assumption? You're the ones
11 who will get the questions when it doesn't
12 successfully authenticate.

13 I look of resignation out there
14 saying, "Yes, that's right."

15 Okay. Fourth assumption. When
16 each new collection is authenticated, the
17 library services and content management folks
18 will review cataloguing and classification
19 practice with that collection, and look into
20 how to adapt to that.

21 And this is the issue, I think,
22 that Ric brought up, and it relates to his
23 focus on PDF files, different kinds of

1 collections will be more or less suitable to
2 that approach, and it's going to have to be
3 something that is solved over time as the
4 technology migrates, would be my sense.

5 So, comments on this from Council?

6 I think this is related to the same
7 issue we had -- we talked about before with
8 respect to the choice of PDF as the way to go
9 here.

10 Here's Microsoft Windows,
11 interrupting, as it often does. Anything from
12 the audience on this?

13 (No response.)

14 DR. GREER: So, some questions
15 here. First, this business of appropriate
16 level of granularity, and this has to do with
17 how the certification process actually works
18 now.

19 It's a file-to-file, object-to-
20 object comparison for authentication and
21 certification, and then in the future, that
22 technology may change, allowing dynamic
23 certification of content that's being

1 exported.

2 The choice at the moment is on the
3 PDF file level, but I think that's technology-
4 driven. Am I mistaken about that?

5 MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I
6 would agree right now it's at the document
7 level and it's technology-driven, and that's
8 probably a good assessment of the current
9 state.

10 And then as we look to the future,
11 this is really the opportunity for additional
12 discussion of where, you know, Council sees
13 how far that should go. What is the
14 appropriate level as the technology enables
15 it.

16 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
17 Connecticut State Library. I'll plead my
18 ignorance of this whole technology, but one
19 would almost think, sort of from a naive
20 standpoint that you could certify things on
21 the fly if they came from a certified
22 repository.

23 So that if you put documents that

1 had been authenticated into a repository and
2 then you're serving those up that the
3 authentication would be based on where they
4 are coming, you know, the URL or whatever
5 they're coming from, so it could be on the fly
6 authentication instead of this certifying each
7 piece and part.

8 So, if I pull up a page, it came
9 from an authenticated version. I mean, that's
10 all I need to know.

11 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
12 University of Illinois, Chicago.

13 That's what I would call contextual
14 authentication, and it's really what
15 depository librarians have been doing for a
16 century, over a century.

17 The relationship with the GPO means
18 they got stuff from GPO, they housed the stuff
19 in GPO, designated it as stuff from GPO, so
20 that was a web of authentication. It wasn't
21 legal authentication, but it was
22 authentication that was good enough for, as I
23 said, 80, 90 percent of the traffic.

1 And as we just talked about the
2 legal authentication material, that has
3 profound implications on the day-to-day
4 practice of our business, and I embrace legal
5 authentication when it is appropriate.

6 But I made the observation that not
7 every single interaction with our public is a
8 legally-bound interaction, and we've got to be
9 able to have the flexibility to decide
10 professionally when we have a legal
11 relationship and when we just have simply a
12 librarian relationship.

13 And I don't want the technology
14 determining that for me. I want the option to
15 choose.

16 DR. GREER: Chris Greer, National
17 Coordination Office. In my mind, this
18 potentially, as the technology matures, the
19 potential for on-the-fly certification is an
20 important thing to keep in mind for FDsys.

21 I think that that's a powerful
22 enough capability that could be deployed in a
23 lot of applications such that a significant

1 amount of the band width and the storage
2 capacity of FDsys in the long run might well
3 be devoted to certification authentication
4 kinds of -- because it's so unique to GPO.

5 You know, it can't be provided any
6 other way. That makes you the focus point if
7 that capability expands and companies want to
8 build a business model around validation of
9 information.

10 MS. LaPLANT: Hi. Lisa LaPlant,
11 GPO. I would encourage Council also to, as
12 we, you know, from the technology standpoint,
13 GPO will definitely continue to look and
14 continue to investigate new technologies, but
15 I would encourage counsel to take a look when
16 you say "certification," what exactly, you
17 know, what do you mean when you say
18 "certification."

19 Are you meaning digital signatures,
20 are you meaning information in metadata, is it
21 some sort of secure transfer? So, just
22 kind of be thinking about, you know, what that
23 certification means and what your needs are

1 and your patrons' needs are for that type of
2 certification going forward. Thanks.

3 DR. GREER: Yes. Thank you, Lisa.

4 Chris Greer again, National
5 Coordination Office. I think, for the
6 purposes of this discussion, we're focused
7 literally on, is the information you have
8 identical to the information that was
9 disseminated, as opposed to security and other
10 issues at this point.

11 But, you're right. Down the road
12 that question expands.

13 From the audience on this question?

14 MS. SINCLAIR: Geoff Swindells,
15 Northwestern University. From the user's
16 perspective, and going to the question of the
17 appropriate level of granularity, I want you
18 to go as low as you can go, because as a large
19 research university, or a medium-sized
20 research university, I can see creating
21 digital products that incorporate materials at
22 Northwestern, materials from our Africana
23 Library and legislation around U.S. foreign

1 policy with Africa.

2 And I want to create new products.

3 And the granule level is great, but in some
4 cases, those granules are too big. So, I'd
5 like to go as small as you can go.

6 Three is an issue of context there,
7 and the user may lose the context, but I think
8 that when we're saying "authentic," we don't
9 mean that you're getting the full context, we
10 mean you're getting the words.

11 And so, if you can get down to the
12 sentence, excellent.

13 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
14 Dame, and I have concerns in the same way.
15 John touched upon it. The library world has
16 always had to spill over between the
17 assumption that my users have that this is an
18 authentic to this is an accurate.

19 And we all know from transcripts as
20 to -- not within Congress, they're always
21 highly-accurate. But what was said in the
22 hearing, not necessarily is what came out in
23 the printed word. What is the official text,

1 et cetera.

2 So, I have some concerns about --
3 about the implied -- again, I'm back to what
4 are you trying to do here? I mean, if you're
5 trying to get it that, indeed, t-h-e between a
6 space and a space in this document is
7 accurate, authentic because that same space-t-
8 h-e-space came from the document, the source
9 document.

10 Okay. It's going to be meaningless
11 to my user. So, I think granularity has to
12 stop some place because it is implied
13 authenticity, also implies accuracy, and I
14 don't think you can -- you're going to split
15 hairs, but lawyers will split hairs.

16 So, I think you do have to draw a
17 certain amount, I mean, in terms of where you
18 want to imply this is an accurate rendition of
19 the letters and spaces and punctuation.

20 Do you go down to three words? You
21 know, do you stop at a capital ending in a
22 period, meaning a sentence? You know, how do
23 you do it?

1 I think you're going to have to
2 fish or cut bait going -- we're not going to
3 go too much further than it's a whole, and
4 that's your problem to decide a whole what,
5 document as defined by blah, blah, blah.

6 MS. PARKER: Marian Parker, Wake
7 Forest Law, and I will speak for the people
8 who actually have to have this stuff in as
9 pristine a condition as it's possible for the
10 government to provide it to us, because it's
11 the primary source of the law that governs the
12 actions of the people.

13 And the lawyers have to have it.
14 We've had it on paper for the whole time that
15 we've been a country. If the only official --
16 big O official, authentic version is going to
17 be digital, unless everybody starts reading
18 everything digitally in the courts, then we're
19 going to be able to -- we're going to need to
20 be able to take in an accurate representation
21 of what that digital document is.

22 And as a general principle,
23 whatever percentage of us are law libraries

1 who are providing this to lawyers to use for
2 legal reasons, you know, we're a small
3 percentage, but it is the coin of the realm in
4 which we work.

5 And we must have it. We have no
6 choice. And we're all working hard with
7 everybody to say, yes, you can actually
8 provide us a digital document, because GPO's
9 figured out how to authenticate it, and make
10 it available to us.

11 Otherwise, we are going to tie part
12 of the documents to be imprinted in paper
13 until the end of the time.

14 DR. GREER: Okay. So you've heard
15 fairly clearly how important that is.

16 I think this is the last question.
17 What does Council expect from GPO upon launch
18 of FDSys related to Legacy documents? Do all
19 Legacy documents for the 110th Congress also
20 need to be authenticated.

21 And I think that last comment goes
22 to this issue.

23 Council.

1 I hear a resounding "Yes" from
2 across the Council.

3 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
4 Connecticut State Library. I mean,
5 particularly, if we get into scanning or
6 digitization projects we're going to have to
7 have a means to know that those were from --
8 first of all, from an original document.

9 So, there is going to be a need, as
10 things go up that we know they're as good as
11 the paper one.

12 DR. GREER: Got a clear message on
13 this question from the audience? I think
14 probably the same message. Okay. Let me turn
15 it back to Tim.

16 CHAIR BYRNE: I love it when they
17 turn it back to me and I have nothing to say
18 other than I think we can go to lunch.

19 I do remind everyone that we will
20 be meeting here at 1:30 and continuing a
21 discussion of the future of the FDLP and
22 strategic planning.

23 (Whereupon, the above-entitled

1 matter went off the record at 12:05 p.m. and
2 resumed at 1:34 p.m.)

3 CHAIR BYRNE: This session, on the
4 agenda, says it's for the Council to make
5 recommendations, but we really have changed
6 the intent of this one.

7 At our working session on Monday,
8 we got into an extensive discussion on the
9 future of the FDLP and strategic plan, and
10 really felt that there needed to be a lot more
11 discussion of that, so we devoted our working
12 session to it last night and so we really
13 don't have any recommendations. We want to
14 continue that discussion.

15 So, I'm going to turn it over to
16 Gwen to start it off.

17 MS. SINCLAIR: I am Gwen Sinclair
18 with the University of Hawaii and I'm thrilled
19 that there are so many people here for this
20 session, because we were predicting that there
21 would be about four.

22 So, I am expecting you all to
23 participate and not just sit there, because

1 that's what we're here for. Counsel really
2 wants to hear from the community about your
3 thoughts on the strategic plan.

4 Just to bring people back who may
5 not have attended the session last night, we
6 continued our discussion from Monday and I
7 think I could fairly characterize last night's
8 session as inconclusive, in that we don't
9 really have anything more that we could point
10 to you that we got consensus on than we had
11 ended up with on Monday.

12 But what I hope that we can do at
13 the end of this session is at least agree on
14 some goals, because it's really important for
15 the Government Printing Office folks to have
16 some goals that they can use to build a
17 strategic plan.

18 Whether that plan is for one year,
19 two years or five years, they need to have
20 something so that when they are going to the
21 JCP, they can point to what the FDLP is all
22 about and what we consider its priorities to
23 be.

1 So, I hope that -- first of all, I
2 guess I'd like to ask Council, is that
3 something we think we can achieve today, or at
4 least try, can we try to agree on some goals.

5 Okay. So, in talking with several
6 of my fellow Council members, we keep going
7 back to the vision and mission of the FDLP
8 from whence the goals that were drafted that
9 are in our packets came, and in case anybody
10 needs to remember what those goals are, here
11 they are.

12 So, when we had talked about them
13 the other day on Monday, we did some -- well,
14 people had things to say about the way these
15 are worded. So, I'm hoping that what we can
16 do is to get some consensus about what we do
17 need to say in our goals, and how many goals
18 are needed.

19 So, with that, I'd like to go back
20 to our vision and mission and then the mission
21 is achieved through and find out if we can at
22 least agree on these, because these are the
23 points out of which those four goals came.

1 So, at first I'd like to ask
2 counsel: Is this something that -- that needs
3 to be tweaked? Or, is it perfect in every
4 way? Ken.

5 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
6 Connecticut. Well, without wordsmithing, I
7 mean, yes, I think some things need to be
8 tweaked, because we've separated -- we're
9 still talking of some old concepts.

10 I mean, collections of publications
11 -- there should be collections, and it could
12 be -- you know, and we talk about online
13 information below, but it could necessarily be
14 part of the whole piece.

15 I mean, just to throw it out, I was
16 looking at three basic goals based on the
17 pyramid that appears somewhere in what we
18 received. And as developed new service
19 models, developed new collection models and
20 developed new communication programs, three
21 kind of big picture things we need to do.

22 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
23 University of Illinois at Chicago. Are you

1 saying, Ken, that we shouldn't focus on these,
2 that you want to jump immediately to
3 discussing those three goals you just stated?

4 MR. WIGGIN: Well, to me, missions
5 are achieved by meeting goals, and if you're
6 going to say these are goals, then we need to
7 look at them. If we want to -- I'd say kind
8 of ignore this -- the mission is achieved
9 through.

10 MR. SHULER: Okay.

11 MR. WIGGIN: Because I think that
12 presupposes we, you know -- and it puts them
13 in place of goals.

14 MR. SHULER: So, we're in agreement
15 -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
16 Chicago -- we're in agreement, then, that the
17 four stated goals that were in the power
18 points for taking those off the table for a
19 moment and we're starting fresh. I just want
20 to make -- give an idea where we're going
21 here.

22 MR. WIGGIN: I was throwing that
23 out. Ken Wiggin, Connecticut. I was throwing

1 that out. You can throw that out as well.

2 MR. SHULER: I'm confused as who's
3 throwing who, but -- if we can agree as a
4 Council that we're starting with a clean slate
5 and that Ken has put new words on the slate,
6 at least that is a start.

7 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
8 University of Texas. The triangle that Ken's
9 talking about is on slide ten, Gwen, and it
10 does say at the top, new shape for the FDLP,
11 so I do think those are words that they are
12 looking at. If that's what they're looking
13 at, then maybe our goals should be based on
14 that.

15 MS. SINCLAIR: Other thoughts from
16 Council about going back to the pyramid?
17 Pyramid Power. You can tell I had too much
18 tea at lunch. Gwen.

19 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff
20 Valpo Law. I would just say that at the
21 bottom of the pyramid it says access to
22 depository materials and I wonder if we don't
23 want to say government information there. I'm

1 not too big on "materials." And then I don't
2 -- I mean, it seems like that would broaden
3 it.

4 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes, I see what
5 you're saying, but I think there's a
6 deliberate method to putting those particular
7 words there because what depositories are
8 about is depository material. It's not
9 government information.

10 You know, depository materials, to
11 me, is a specific set of materials, and as we
12 discussed the other day, there are certain
13 government information products that are
14 outside the scope of the depository program,
15 maybe the word "materials" is what's bothering
16 people, that it implies physical collections,
17 but I don't think of it that way.

18 MS. STIERHOLZ: Gwen, this is
19 Katrina from the St. Louis Fed. That's where
20 I kind of get hung up, is that whole
21 depository concept, because we're not
22 depositing anything anymore.

23 There are no depository materials.

1 There are --

2 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, that's right.

3 MS. STIERHOLZ: There are
4 government access -- I mean, but everybody has
5 access to it, so it's not like only depository
6 libraries have access.

7 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
8 Valpo Law. That's not true. We get a box
9 almost every day at our library. I mean, we
10 are still depositing things. Things

11 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
12 University of Texas. And even in a digital
13 world, we have been discussing depositing
14 digital materials and possibly having digital
15 regionals that are going to archive those
16 materials and keep them and be a depository
17 for the electronic collection as well.

18 So, I don't think the word
19 "depository" is necessary archaic.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. Katrina, I
21 think I understand what you're getting at, but
22 I'm not sure that we can make that decision
23 today. I think, today, we're going to have to

1 go ahead and live with the word "depository."

2 So, I'm -- but I'm not sure if
3 redrawing the pyramid is what we really want
4 to do here. You know, I think -- you know,
5 Ken has put some goals forward, and we should
6 be discussing those.

7 Can you restate them, Ken?

8 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
9 Connecticut State Libraries. Develop new
10 service models to address the service fees,
11 develop new collection models to develop
12 collections, and development of communication
13 programs.

14 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Should we
15 take those one at a time and start off with
16 the developing new service models? You know,
17 there's that word "model" again.

18 So, Council, what -- what about
19 that? David.

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
21 California State Library. I guess I
22 personally don't have a problem with the word
23 "model" because it presupposes that there's no

1 one set way that things are to be done.

2 It's a pattern, and it's up to
3 individual depositories or libraries or
4 whatever you want to call the new thing that
5 we are going to be, to follow that model to
6 develop programs that are locally applicable.

7 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
8 Valpo Law. I think that Ken's got it as
9 plural, and I feel better about that because
10 what was in the goal before was a model for
11 the FDLP which, you know, sounds like one way
12 you have to do it.

13 But he's just taking the three
14 things on the pyramid now and sort of brought,
15 you know, said them a little bit differently,
16 and making the models plural, which would
17 allow for what you just said, David, of, you
18 know, possible alternate models that still fit
19 in the scope of the thing.

20 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
21 University of Chicago. To follow through on
22 Ken's suggestion, but also to look at the idea
23 of the blur that Cindy introduced in her

1 conversation, I think we need to move beyond
2 the fact, if these -- or we're trying to come
3 up with goals.

4 If we leave it at the model stage,
5 then we are saying the goal of the depository
6 is to build models. I think we're moving
7 beyond that. I think we need to move up.

8 The goal of the FDLP is to sustain
9 services, sustain collections, and to sustain
10 communications that are innovative, and I
11 think we need to move into a much more
12 proactive, rather than a theoretical kind of
13 "We're going to build a model that we can use
14 to energize the rest of the discussion."

15 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
16 Connecticut State Library. I guess, I mean,
17 it's all semantics, and I think models can
18 also be actual -- I mean, when I build a model
19 car, I've actually got something at the end of
20 it. It's not just hypothetical.

21 And I think what I was trying to
22 get at is, however you want to call them, but
23 there should be some different -- I don't have

1 my thesaurus here, so I'm not sure what else
2 to call it, but you know, there could be one
3 way to do a regional -- there could be a
4 different way to do selectives, if that's what
5 we still want to call them.

6 I mean, I think they're sort of the
7 how we're going to deliver services, and I
8 still think "model" can work either way,
9 whether it's hypothetical or this is the model
10 you are going to follow, or the method.

11 And we can wordsmith it, but I was
12 trying to get at, yes, we should, at the end
13 of the day, say this is where we're moving,
14 and "model" had been used in the other
15 documents, so I kind of just stuck with them.

16 MS. SINCLAIR: Well, let me ask
17 this: Council, can you live with that goal as
18 it's stated with that word "models" in it?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER: Yes.

20 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Now, we need
21 to get some comments from our community about
22 that goal. Community, what do you think?
23 We're doing them one at a time.

1 Community, can you live with that
2 goal?

3 COUNCIL MEMBER: Somebody's not
4 going to live.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER: Restate it again.

6 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Ken, can you
7 restate it one more time.

8 MR. WIGGIN: Develop new service
9 models.

10 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Yes.

11 MR. O'MAHONY: Hi. I'm Dan
12 O'Mahony from Brown University, Providence,
13 Rhode Island.

14 Whether it's around that kind of a
15 structure in terms of services, collections,
16 or communications or some other way, I guess I
17 think that the preeminent goal that ties all
18 of those things together, and then some, that
19 the program is about, is about permanent
20 public access to government information
21 content.

22 That's sort of what it's always
23 been about, the geographically dispersed 1250

1 libraries across the country, that's the model
2 that has worked in a tangible world.

3 I think that the biggest challenge
4 for all of us is to figure out how that works
5 in an electronic world.

6 So, whatever goals and whatever
7 structure that we come up with, the ultimate
8 goal I think is to develop models that make
9 that happen, permanent public access to
10 government information content in the digital
11 era.

12 MS. SINCLAIR: Well, I think you're
13 pointing out what our mission is, you know.

14 MR. O'MAHONY: Well, that's not
15 exactly what I'm pointing out. I think the
16 goals -- the mission and vision, I think, are
17 rock solid. But over the next five-year
18 period, which is what I understand the
19 strategic plan to be trying to accomplish, I
20 think specifically steps to move us closer to
21 an era where we're -- an environment in which
22 we are permanently preserving and making
23 accessible electronic government information

1 is what these goals should be focused on.

2 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
3 University of Illinois Chicago.

4 So, what the sentence could read in
5 order to address that, Dan, is a -- whatever
6 Ken said about models of service aimed at
7 achieving the mission of the Federal
8 Depository Library.

9 Would that cover the marker?

10 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
11 Connecticut State Library.

12 I guess when I do goals I've
13 already got a mission, and so I'm assuming
14 that my goals refer back to the mission -- try
15 to keep them short, and I thought -- well,
16 words was pretty good.

17 But -- and if we need to, but I
18 think then after that the strategies will
19 address some of those very specific points
20 about permanence and whatever, but the goals
21 should -- I expect that the goals refer back
22 to the mission.

23 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. Ken, I would -

1 - that was what I was thinking as well, is
2 that your mission is sort of assumed when you
3 develop goals and you don't really have to
4 restate it as part of the goal.

5 Any other comments from the
6 community?

7 (No response.)

8 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. We have one
9 goal down. Yes.

10 Okay. Our second -- maybe I should
11 go back to the pyramid. Okay. The second
12 goal was, if I'm not mistaken, to develop new
13 collection models. Is that correct?

14 MR. SHULER: Yes.

15 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Council.
16 Tory.

17 MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona
18 State. To me, this is the cornerstone of the
19 whole strategic plan. It's the whole purpose,
20 is to position ourselves for a digital
21 environment, so to me this is an important
22 part.

23 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,

1 University of Illinois Chicago.

2 I am not a champion of including
3 the notion of collections within any of the
4 goals of the program. However, as a useful
5 tool, the bridge between, and sustain some
6 kind of ongoing relationship between our
7 legacy collections and our future collections,
8 I can see where collections can serve a
9 purpose if we don't freeze the idea of
10 collections into a particular format, but
11 still respect that we're going to be
12 responsible for both the Legacy formats, the
13 present formats and the future formats.
14 Whatever that is.

15 MR. CISMOWSKI: Gwen.

16 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

17 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
18 California State Library.

19 When I hear that particular goal, I
20 don't just assume tangible collections inside
21 of depositories. What I hear are the entire
22 gamut of collection possibilities, not just
23 what we have now, but what we may have in the

1 future.

2 So, it would encompass the tangible
3 collections that are in depositories. It
4 would encompass the content of the future --
5 of the federal -- excuse me, Federal Digital
6 system, and it would encompass possibly
7 deposit of digital content and depositories.

8 It would be the whole package.

9 MS. SINCLAIR: I guess the thought
10 that went through my mind just now is, if you
11 give this to somebody outside of our group
12 would they understand what was meant by that,
13 develop new collection models.

14 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggins,
15 Connecticut State Library. I guess it would
16 be informed by adding additional action items
17 underneath that.

18 I think what David has said is what
19 I meant, is that we don't want to define it
20 too carefully here, because we don't know what
21 it's all going to be. It should be as
22 inclusive as possible.

23 But I think we, as libraries deal

1 with collections. They may be virtual. They
2 may be tangible, they may be whatever, but I
3 think the concept of libraries and collections
4 still goes together.

5 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
6 California State Library. I'm certainly no
7 glowing expert in the strategic planning
8 process, but my understanding of vision,
9 mission and goals is that they should be short
10 and somewhat ambiguous.

11 What is not ambiguous are the
12 strategies that inform -- that proceed from
13 those goals and even if the goal is ambiguous,
14 when you read the strategies that follow that
15 goal, it becomes clear what that goal means
16 and now, because strategic plans cover a
17 follow-up period of time.

18 So, for five years, these are our
19 strategies to meet this goal. After five
20 years the goal may really be talking about
21 some different set of reality, realities, and
22 then you develop new strategies, maybe keeping
23 the goal the same.

1 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
2 Valpo Law. Actually, we have -- if we use the
3 new model that Ken's suggesting and accept all
4 three of these, we have strategies. The are
5 under the four things that we have in here.
6 We can just move them onto -- I mean, they
7 would fit really well, so yes.

8 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Counsel, any
9 further comments about that goal, or are we --
10 do we like it the way it is?

11 Okay. Any comments from the
12 audience? You're all so sleepy after lunch
13 that you're just struggling to stay awake?

14 Let's hear from Sandy first.

15 Go ahead, Sandy.

16 MS. McANINCH: Sandy McAninch,
17 University of Kentucky.

18 I guess it's more a question than a
19 comment. I -- as you were talking, I kept
20 thinking maybe the words "collaborative,
21 collaboration" or "flexibility" ought to be
22 put in front of services or collections, in
23 particular.

1 I wasn't sure where you were going
2 to factor in those two phrases, but those are
3 critical to our moving forward effectively.
4 That's in my opinion, the crux of the issue
5 right now.

6 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
7 Connecticut State Library.

8 I would say that those should be
9 paramount assumptions in everything that we do
10 at all -- you know, do we want that
11 collaboration and that flexibility, and that's
12 why I started -- it's kind of like -- I like
13 the peer amendment and I think it works well,
14 but I think we should have that in our
15 assumptions very clearly.

16 MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy.

17 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government
18 Printing Office.

19 I just -- oh, man, here we go
20 again. I just want to point out that once the
21 plan is completed, it's not just going to sit
22 on the shelf.

23 It will be reviewed, and extended,

1 revised, however, as new things come up, so
2 that there would be a 2010 to 2015 or some
3 kind of addendum with -- refreshing when new
4 things happen.

5 And it's more -- perhaps as more
6 functionality comes with FDSys, and we may
7 want to change, so there is an opportunity for
8 that, but we need something to get started.

9 MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from
10 the audience or Council?

11 (No response.)

12 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Then we have
13 two goals. One more to go.

14 The third one was developed, New
15 Communication Programs, is that right? Okay.

16 MR. SHULER: What happened to
17 "models"?

18 MS. SINCLAIR: Programs. Okay.

19 MR. SHULER: We deviated.

20 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin. I guess I
21 was seeing as not so much as models of
22 communication, but actual developing some
23 programs, as we move forward with the plan, we

1 need to have at various levels some
2 communication plan or -- it could be
3 communication plans, too, I guess, but -- or
4 tools, but it wasn't just really "model."

5 "Model" fit the other two nicer.

6 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
7 Valpo Law. And that's for maybe the FAQ
8 sheets that Ken thought up this morning, and
9 people seemed to like which fit under
10 communication, tools and programs or whatever,
11 as an example.

12 MS. SINCLAIR: Other comments from
13 Council?

14 (No response.)

15 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Audience.

16 MS. SOLOMON: Judy Solomon, Seattle
17 Public Library.

18 I just wanted to clarify. We're
19 talking about developing these models. I'm
20 assuming a little bit down the line we'll also
21 talk about implementing them.

22 MS. SINCLAIR: Right. These are
23 just overarching goals, and then strategies

1 follow under them.

2 MS. SOLOMON: Right.

3 MS. SINCLAIR: Steve.

4 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
5 Dame. I think that that's a little too fuzzy.

6 I mean, communications is one of those things
7 we like to beat to death that's always, it's
8 never enough, it's never right, it's not
9 always its fault.

10 It may need a little bit more.
11 Communication towards what? I mean, towards
12 end user, internally, between GPO and, you
13 know, I think I would like a more, you know,
14 to what end.

15 It's one of those mom and apple pie
16 ones. It is just so general that anything
17 fits into new models of communication. You
18 know, I'd rather use email. There's a new
19 model.

20 You know, so it's a little too
21 fuzzy. And I may -- I don't know, I have no
22 recommendation how to tighten it up.

23 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Yes, I --

1 when I think about it I think there are kind
2 of two pieces. One is education and one is
3 promotion, so I'm not sure how to weave those
4 two concepts into the goal.

5 Sally.

6 MS. HOLTERHOFF: If you have to
7 have one word to put on the side of the
8 pyramid, though, Steve, can you think of a
9 word that has the same number of letters? I
10 mean, really.

11 I think we probably need to just
12 explain that in the strategies, because I
13 think what you just said, going about the two
14 aspects, education and promotion, they're
15 good, but we can put that in the strategies.

16 But, I mean, it is fuzzy. I agree,
17 but what's going to fit on the side of that
18 pyramid.

19 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
20 University of North Texas. I mean, if we
21 can't live without those two words in the
22 sentence, couldn't we just, in the goal we
23 could say "Develop new communication programs

1 for education and outreach."

2 MS. SINCLAIR: Steve, would that -
3 - would that work? Any other thoughts from
4 Council about that edition?

5 MR. SHULER: I'm not sure what --
6 John Shuler, University of Illinois Chicago.
7 I'm not sure what we did. Somebody
8 -- are we keeping communications?

9 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.
10 Suzanne, can you restate what you
11 just said.

12 MS. SEARS: I didn't write it down.
13 Develop new communication program for
14 education and outreach.

15 MR. SHULER: I would object in the
16 sense that that would be too specific, because
17 communications includes more than just
18 education and outreach. I would be just as
19 happy keeping it wonderfully vague and then
20 being more specific in the strategies as was
21 suggested earlier.

22 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
23 University of North Texas. I agree, John. I

1 mean, I like keeping them short and broad,
2 trying to make sure that everybody buys in.

3 Perhaps if we had objectives
4 underneath the goal, and the objectives as
5 communications or education communications for
6 outreach.

7 MR. SHULER: That would work.

8 MS. SINCLAIR: Stephanie.

9 MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie
10 Braunstein, Louisiana State University.

11 Just put my two cent's worth, since
12 the prior to goals have that broad over-
13 arching concept, I think it's more appropriate
14 to stay with that and keep it, quote, unquote,
15 "a little fuzzy."

16 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So it sounds
17 pretty much like we have consensus, that we
18 want the goal to simply be develop new
19 communication programs, period.

20 Okay. We have three goals. Is
21 that enough?

22 MR. SHULER: It's enough for the
23 pyramid.

1 MS. SINCLAIR: Well,
2 congratulations. It seemed like we were not
3 going to get here. So, now that we have our
4 three goals, shall we move onto the
5 strategies?

6 MR. HAYES: Are you going to ask
7 the audience if that's enough? Steve Hayes,
8 Notre Dame.

9 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Is that
10 enough?

11 MR. HAYES: No. Steve Hayes, Notre
12 Dame.

13 A goal you need to put in front of
14 that right now, in my opinion, and I've
15 expressed to some is: You need to reestablish
16 the balance and the cost benefit of being
17 within the program.

18 I think that's the overriding issue
19 that we have right now before you can even go
20 to the models of service, the models
21 communication, the models of collections.

22 You have to solve the disconnect
23 that I'm hearing from directors, et cetera, as

1 to -- it used to be obvious, you know, we got
2 tangibles, therefore, I'm willing to do the
3 service.

4 Half the balance is now -- does not
5 appear to be readily available to or obvious
6 to and we're still searching for that and
7 we're trying to justify maintaining the
8 program by doing these new models to keep us
9 going.

10 I think there's your first goal, is
11 to really need to think about how do we
12 reestablish and communicate and, you know,
13 identify those that keep the balance so that
14 we no longer have the major issue of "Is there
15 going to be anybody in the program to begin
16 with to do collection or to do service, or
17 even to do communication?"

18 P.P. Ballinger -- our leadership
19 says, "You're out of here. I don't care what
20 wonderful model you have, it's not within the
21 program. I can do that within my library, to
22 have those exact same collections or services
23 to meet, keeping American informed and for

1 permanent public access, but I can do that
2 independent of a program. I can do that goal
3 that Dan, articulated for us."

4 So, there's your first goal, in my
5 opinion.

6 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

7 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
8 Connecticut State Library.

9 Several of my colleagues over the
10 last few days have kept talking about the New
11 Deal, and so maybe we want one that says to
12 articulate the new deal. I mean, what is the
13 deal? How do you sell to whoever that you
14 should be or want to be or want to say a
15 depository.

16 So, I agree that there's probably
17 that. We kind of made an assumption, and
18 maybe we do need to actually articulate that
19 for folks.

20 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
21 Dame, and you can put it in your pattern, you
22 know, develop new models or develop the New
23 Deal Models.

1 MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona
2 State. That might be a major strategy under
3 the develop new communication programs. It
4 speaks to that.

5 I short of hate to elevate that
6 cluster of concepts to a major five-year goal
7 because I'm not sure -- I know that there are
8 pressures throughout the program, but do they
9 rise to the level of it being a strategic goal
10 in and of itself.

11 MS. SINCLAIR: I think one way of
12 looking at it is to look at the top of the
13 pyramid and collaboration is the word that's
14 at the top. If you ignore the word
15 "flexibility" which we don't like, you know, I
16 think what Steve is talking about is
17 strengthening the collaboration between the
18 FDLP and the depositories.

19 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
20 University of Illinois Chicago.

21 I would argue that what Steve is
22 seeking is going to depend on how well we
23 craft the strategies to support services,

1 collections and communications.

2 So, what you are seeking will
3 depend on how well we craft the strategies to
4 achieve those three goals. And to be explicit
5 about it, I don't see necessarily brings any
6 singular strength to our efforts.

7 MS. SINCLAIR: Ric.

8 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. In
9 talking to library directors about this, I see
10 the point where they're approaching it from a
11 business perspective and not just a service
12 perspective.

13 I think we've been looking at it at
14 GPO in terms of incorporating this piece that
15 Steve's talking about as an overall value
16 proposition, you know, not just focused on
17 services, but looking at it from a business
18 standpoint where there is a true cost-benefit
19 analysis as part of creating the New Deal
20 model.

21 MS. SINCLAIR: Steve. Oh, go
22 ahead.

23 MS. REHKOP: Oh, please let Steve -

1 - Steve first.

2 MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre
3 Dame, business librarian.

4 When I look at the graph of
5 participation of individuals within the
6 program to develop the new models, to treat
7 them, to perfect them and everything else, the
8 graph is in a downward trajectory.

9 I do not see it now, and I would
10 have to look at -- to GPO for more data is the
11 downward trajectory leveling off in terms of
12 how we lost the motion and now we're in a
13 steady state of an even line.

14 The data for me is, you know, until
15 I can stop this downward trend, I don't have
16 sufficient resources and individuals and
17 everything else, to truly work on the
18 innovative services, collections and
19 communications that are there.

20 So -- and I don't know, it may very
21 well be where do you put it, and maybe if I'm
22 hearing Ric correctly, the strategic plan
23 automatically, before we can even proceed on a

1 strategic plan, we've got to solve that.

2 That's our first goal of which the
3 strategic plan is contributing to. I don't
4 know, but I'm still concerned in the, you
5 know, the wonderful ideas. I like the goals
6 and everything else, but if you can't stop the
7 hemorrhaging, you know, you've got no patient
8 to do services or anything else.

9 So, I don't know where you want to
10 put it, and it will be interesting for counsel
11 to try and place it in the context, and give
12 it the priority that I think it deserves.
13 That's the first priority I think your actions
14 really have to take towards, is rebalancing.

15 If you don't work for -- you want
16 five years, good idea, but who's left in the
17 program to even implement it.

18 MS. REHKOP: Barbara Rehkop,
19 Washington University in St. Louis. I'm so
20 glad that Steve speaks up and speaks so
21 articulately for me.

22 I say that the thing you need to
23 worry about for the next five years is very

1 much the thing that he said a few moments ago
2 about the FDLP program and where we want to be
3 in five years and how we balance -- I believe
4 your word was "balance," all of these other
5 things.

6 This chart is lovely and beautiful
7 and wonderful, but I could take it back to my
8 librarian and it would mean the same thing. I
9 could take it to my church and it would mean -
10 - you know, it would work there, too.

11 So, we're talking mom and apple
12 pie, as once again, I borrow from Steve, with
13 the sorts of things that we are discussing
14 here, wherein we, in fact, have quite a
15 serious problem with, say, survival.

16 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
17 University of North Texas. If we go back and
18 look at the assumptions, some of what is being
19 said here or there and you could even make --
20 you know, we put the assumptions that we feel
21 are the most important at the top of something
22 like that, but we have collaboration and
23 cooperation are essential in the assumptions.

1 We have partnerships between the
2 government and the private sector will
3 continue to develop and increase, and we have
4 GPO must promote the depositories and their
5 resources outside the FDLP.

6 So, we could even maybe put in
7 another assumption if we feel we need to
8 about, you know, promoting the value of the
9 FDLP or, you know, staying -- why stay in the
10 program.

11 But I do think that some of those
12 assumptions address some of the issues.

13 MS. SINCLAIR: John.

14 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
15 University of Illinois at Chicago.

16 I think what the last two speakers
17 are speaking to is not necessarily a strategy
18 but a tactical issue. Yes, we are bleeding.
19 Yes, our departments are being depopulated,
20 our collections being abandoned.

21 However, if we don't have, quote,
22 unquote, the New Deal, to come back into our
23 organizations and say, "Here is something

1 better. Here is something to stop the
2 bleeding or at least deliver what I thought
3 would be assumptions and the mission and the
4 values of the program we're supposed to be in
5 this new environment, instead of tactical
6 decisions to stop the bleeding, we have a much
7 greater systemic failure of purpose than just
8 what is happening in each of our individual
9 institutions.

10 And I thought the purpose of
11 developing these goals was to reanimate the
12 mission and the values of the program that can
13 then lead into specific strategies to survive
14 and work against the challenges that exist at
15 each of our institutions.

16 I may be wrong about thinking of
17 strategy and tactics in that way, but it's not
18 to say that those tactics and the threat is
19 not very real. It is very real, and I said it
20 before and I'll say it again.

21 I'm living it. I'm living that
22 nightmare right now. No question. I want
23 this as badly as anybody, but I know what's

1 going to turn the trick with my director is
2 not going to be a new band-aid. It's going to
3 be a new form of life, and I think that's what
4 we're shaping here.

5 And for what it's worth, she ain't
6 going to turn her head unless I offer her a
7 totally new deal, and that deal's got to be
8 based on a foundation.

9 I think that Ken is beginning to
10 speak to some basic goals that are common
11 throughout all our institutions.

12 MS. SINCLAIR: Denise.

13 MS. DAVIS: Denise Davis, ALA.
14 Because I'm having a philosophical battle in
15 my brain around this, and we're entering a
16 long and protracted economic decline in this
17 country.

18 And having a fairly strong
19 collection development background myself, I
20 struggle with something that's fairly obvious
21 from a cost value proposition for libraries,
22 and that is that you get free content and lots
23 of it, and what the library hones up is

1 expertise, and not even space anymore.
2 Terabytes is all they have to give now.

3 So, if I were a library
4 administrator I could argue much more
5 effectively for supporting a collection that's
6 paid for taxpayer dollars, than argue for a
7 collection that I have to pay for in real
8 tangible ways.

9 And I guess I want to hear from
10 people about just that basic philosophy of the
11 program, that it's a quid pro quo, if you
12 will, and I don't understand how a director
13 would -- could argue effectively for spending
14 twice for something, rather than simply making
15 resource, labor and terabytes available to
16 sustain this access.

17 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
18 Connecticut State Library.

19 I guess, in moving forward with the
20 strategic plan, though, we have to recognize
21 that it's the strategic plan for GPO, but we
22 need to inform it by saying, whatever they do
23 has to present a value statement or a business

1 model that -- that will help libraries, I
2 guess, buy into whatever program we come out
3 there with.

4 So, I mean, we are seeing a loss of
5 some libraries, and I don't know what the
6 percentage is, we still have 1200 or so
7 depositories, but this is not a strategic plan
8 for those institutions.

9 It's a strategic plan -- no, I'm
10 sorry. I'm saying I think all of these
11 comments should greatly inform us and we
12 should make sure the assumptions have that in
13 there, that there are these pressures at
14 libraries.

15 But whatever we do, we've got to
16 make this so that people really are going to
17 want to again be a depository.

18 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
19 University of North Texas.

20 I just want to ask Robin for a
21 point of clarification. I know it's not in
22 the same numbers. I know that we are losing
23 depositories, I'm not denying that situation,

1 but we are gaining some, too.

2 There are libraries that are coming
3 forward and becoming new depositories. I know
4 for a fact in Oklahoma they just added one
5 last year, so, you know, there are some
6 libraries out there that do see the value.

7 So I don't want to have this idea
8 that everybody is dropping and nobody's, you
9 know, staying, or being added.

10 MS. SINCLAIR: Robin.

11 MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-
12 Mohamed, GPO.

13 You're right, Suzanne, we have
14 picked up a couple, and we have one or two
15 that are on a waiting list to move from this
16 designation to this designation, which will
17 open up a congressional designation so that
18 there is still some of that going on, and
19 that's attribute to the folks in the regions,
20 and the regionals that are working to promote
21 the idea of public access and taxpayer
22 expense.

23 On the other hand, we are talking

1 with lots of folks about why I should stay in
2 the program so that cost-benefit analysis or
3 the value of the FDLP at that point,
4 colleagues are lining up behind me to talk
5 about, is so important.

6 We are at -- I think it's actually
7 here, 12:47, so we're down a couple, but we do
8 have a couple waiting in line, too.

9 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. We have a
10 comment from the audience that I'd like to
11 take next.

12 MS. SMITH: I hesitate to comment
13 in front of them, though, but I'll do it
14 anyway.

15 Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana
16 University. Just a sample of what a goal, it
17 sounds like we're talking about, would be to
18 envision and redefine the responsibilities and
19 rewards of all stakeholders in the Federal
20 Depository Library Program.

21 Because, I think we did know the
22 old deal, GPO got something out this, the
23 libraries got something out of this, the

1 public got something out of this.

2 And I think that's what we need to
3 figure out is, who's getting what out of the
4 deal now and, you know, how do we balance out
5 that everybody gets some benefit, everybody
6 has responsibilities, so that it still works
7 for everybody, because I think it is out of
8 balance because we are, you know, having
9 complaints and problems from library
10 directors.

11 And so, I suggest that as the goal.

12 And I think, going ahead to redefine it, I
13 think what we get is this: We get training.

14 The library gets a local expert who
15 can come to Washington and get access to GPO
16 and ask questions, and who knows how to find
17 this stuff that's on line because, yes, it's
18 on line, and people can find it theoretically
19 for themselves, but in actuality, they need
20 help. They need us.

21 So, I think we're the new GPO
22 collection. We need the training and the
23 expertise to send back, and that's what the

1 library gets. They get us.

2 MS. SINCLAIR: Can you repeat your
3 -- could you please repeat your goal that you
4 stated.

5 MS. SMITH: Envision and redefine
6 the responsibilities and rewards of all
7 stakeholders in the FDLP.

8 MS. SINCLAIR: Sally, I think you
9 were waiting to say something.

10 MS. HOLTERHOFF: I was just going
11 to say that I'm not -- I'm still thinking
12 about what Denise said before, but I really --
13 and I don't know quite everything that would
14 back up what she said, but I liked the way you
15 said that, Denise, about -- it's like were you
16 looking at, you know, in these bad economic
17 times, this is the, you know, the government
18 program that works, that does things for
19 libraries, so if we can find a way to make
20 that true, what you said, or to defend it with
21 details, I really like that.

22 I mean, I think that would be a new
23 deal, you know.

1 MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy.

2 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I
3 just wanted to give you some specific numbers,
4 since that was asked.

5 Since we were mandated to move the
6 transition to an online environment, we're
7 down 119 libraries from fiscal year '97, but
8 also during that same time period, we've added
9 30 libraries, 11 of which have been in the
10 last two years.

11 MS. SINCLAIR: Ric.

12 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Cindy
13 and I have been working together too long, so
14 she said what I was going to say.

15 But, you know, going back to the
16 1996 study report that we did, I think the
17 concern at that time was when Congress
18 requested that we look to migrate this program
19 to a predominantly electronic or more
20 electronic-based program.

21 Our concern at the time was that,
22 you know, we may even drop to 500 libraries by
23 now, but we are adding libraries. We added

1 seven tribals. Kent State came on board, Elon
2 College of Law just came on board a week ago,
3 so additional libraries are being added.

4 I think the point that was made
5 over there a second ago about defining the
6 definitional framework about what it means,
7 what is the value of communicating that is the
8 key.

9 There's also been a paradigm shift
10 at the Government Printing Office, you know,
11 sort of an unfunded mandate for us is that
12 permanent access, according to the law says
13 permanent access is for the regionals.

14 Since 1993 we've got this
15 electronic collection and when Congress passed
16 the GPO access legislation they didn't really
17 provide additional money with that collection,
18 so I think part of it is define the framework
19 and continue to communicate roles and
20 responsibilities.

21 In talking with directors, a lot of
22 them are looking at Title 44 and they are
23 still thinking that is not only the here and

1 now with print collections, but the future.
2 And I think we do need these communication
3 pieces to get out there and help define the
4 future for them.

5 MS. SINCLAIR: James.

6 MR. JACOBS: Hi. James Jacobs,
7 Stanford University.

8 In hearing all of these comments,
9 it makes me think that rather than us shifting
10 from a collections-based to a services-based
11 model or concept in our minds, that instead
12 what we should be doing is stressing digital
13 collections, digital infrastructures, because
14 that's where the value is to library
15 administrators.

16 We're the canary in the coal mine
17 in terms of library content. Lots of library
18 content besides government documents is
19 starting to move into the digital realm.

20 So if we provide the prototypes,
21 the pilots for building digital collections,
22 digital infrastructures, that's where library
23 administrators are going to say, "Wow, it's

1 really a great value to be in the FDLP because
2 those infrastructures can be used for other
3 parts of the library."

4 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So we have a
5 couple of different proposals for another
6 goal. Ken.

7 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
8 Connecticut State Library.

9 I guess I would just argue that a
10 lot of what's been suggested is important for
11 us to hear, and articulate somewhere in our
12 documents, but I even think that under simple
13 four words about coming up with new models,
14 service, that we would try to envision and
15 redefine the responsibilities and rewards.

16 I mean, that should be part of
17 whatever these models have to have all of that
18 in them. They have to be able to articulate,
19 you know, okay, here's the model, but here's
20 the benefit to the library, here's the benefit
21 to the public.

22 So, I think those are all
23 important. I'm not sure if we start creating

1 too many additional goal statements. We're
2 going to -- we may get into that overlap issue
3 again where, well, that kind of fits that.

4 I would argue against having too
5 many more.

6 MS. SINCLAIR: Other thoughts from
7 Council?

8 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
9 University of Illinois Chicago.

10 I would agree with Ken for
11 different reasons, but I think, too, keeping
12 the goals simple and bringing life to the
13 goals through specific deliberative clear --
14 clearly-spoke strategies is really what's
15 going to turn the trick in terms of whether or
16 not we're going to pull off the new deal.

17 MS. HOLTERHOFF: And Sally. And
18 I'm not sure how it fits into the
19 communication one, but in the new service
20 models and the new collections models, there
21 need to be responsibilities and rewards.

22 That's the balance. The new model
23 has to have both of those or it's not going to

1 be a new model and it's not going to work.
2 So, maybe that's an assumption or an overall,
3 overarching value.

4 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
5 University of Illinois at Chicago.

6 Let me express to the audience, at
7 least as one Council Member. None of what I
8 am discussing or what I suggest implies that I
9 am -- that what is happening to the depository
10 system is not understood, not easily grasped
11 if not lived every day.

12 And everything that I am suggesting
13 is aiming towards trying to find a way out of
14 that cul-de-sac of trying to fix one
15 institution at a time while the other
16 institutions are collapsing around us.

17 So, I think what the Council, if I
18 could speak on behalf of the Council for a
19 moment, is trying to do is reenergize a vision
20 for the system.

21 And we will -- I think we will
22 confidently say that we can get to the
23 specifics of the situations through the

1 strategies and through the other parts of the
2 strategic documents.

3 If other Members of the Council
4 want to say anything to that, please do, but
5 that -- speaking as one Council Member, I hate
6 to quote a former president, but I feel your
7 pain.

8 It's clearly, I'm experiencing your
9 pain at my institution. It is without a doubt
10 I can match anybody's horror story with my own
11 horror story. I don't like it. It's one
12 reason why I got involved. I want to change
13 it. I'm there with you. It's that simple.

14 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So my sense
15 is that Council is willing to just stick with
16 the three goals, is that right? Do I
17 understand that correctly? Okay. Now that
18 I've flipped away from that page.

19 MS. SEARS: Gwen, can I say
20 something while you're looking for that?
21 Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas.

22 I'm fine with the three goals. I
23 just really like the statement that she read,

1 and I want to make sure that that is somewhere
2 in our assumptions or that -- you know,
3 because it does fit all three of those goals,
4 and it does fit in communications as well,
5 because what Ken had said in a previous
6 meeting about the rewards being on a FAQ sheet
7 for the directors, so I do think it fits all
8 three and should definitely be part of the
9 document somewhere.

10 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. So the three
11 goals are, develop new service models, develop
12 new collection models and develop new
13 communication programs.

14 Maybe we should all chant them
15 together so that -- okay. Now that we've got
16 our three goals, shall we move on to
17 strategies in our last half-hour? Is that
18 agreeable?

19 Okay. So, we have a bunch of
20 strategies in our notebooks. I can't display
21 them all at one time, but maybe what we could
22 do is start with the first goal and look at
23 which strategies either fit under there or new

1 ones that we want to put under there.

2 So, our first goal is to develop
3 new service models.

4 MS. HOLTERHOFF: There's one slide
5 -- could you go back to the slide before.

6 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Yes. So,
7 what strategies should go under "Develop new
8 service models"?

9 MS. SEARS: Suzanne Shears,
10 University of North Texas. On the sheet of
11 paper I have they are actually numbered under
12 Goal A, which is the one you have up, six,
13 "Identify new models for user-centric service,
14 delivery and management of shared digital
15 resources."

16 MS. SINCLAIR: Okay. Sally has
17 suggested that the way we approach this is to
18 go through all of the pages of strategies and
19 just get rid of ones that we don't like first,
20 and then we'll have a subset of them to work
21 with and then we can also, you know, tweak
22 them and add them and so on.

23 And people are leaving now. They

1 saw the goals, they left.

2 Does that work for everybody?

3 Okay. So, we're on the first page --

4 MS. ETKIN: Gwen.

5 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

6 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I
7 was just going to suggest a similar approach
8 that Sally suggested, that as we go through
9 these, since we do have our three goals, for
10 those that we decide to keep, we might
11 identify if they go under service collection
12 or communication at the same time.

13 MS. SINCLAIR: Good idea. Thank
14 you.

15 Okay. So, revamp the disposition
16 of materials process. Keep it, and that's a
17 collection.

18 MR. CISMOWSKI: Gwen.

19 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

20 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
21 California State Library. What does this
22 mean?

23 MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy's going to

1 tell us.

2 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One
3 of the things that was very clear from a lot
4 of the comments that we've received through
5 the strategic planning comments, as well as
6 the regional report that was undertaken, was
7 that -- and we've known this for a long time,
8 I think. -- nobody likes the disposition
9 process as it is.

10 The regionals don't like it. The
11 selectives don't like it. It's all for
12 different reasons, and so we need to just look
13 at this whole process and try to make it as
14 streamlined as possible, but maintaining the
15 purpose for it, just making this process more
16 efficient and effective for regionals and
17 selectives.

18 MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, so
19 what you mean is using -- using another quaint
20 term, just the disposal of unwanted materials,
21 is that what "disposition"
22 means there?

23 MS. ETKIN: Yes, basically. Cindy

1 Etkin, GPO. Yes, basically needs and offers.

2 It's referred to as disposition of materials
3 in Title 44.

4 MS. SINCLAIR: So maybe another
5 word would be "streamline" rather than
6 "revamp," although -- yes, whatever.

7 Yes, Ken.

8 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
9 Connecticut State Library. I guess with some
10 of these, to me they're the cart before the
11 horse. I mean, we want to, I think, first
12 begin to look at what are some new models and
13 maybe the -- you know, the region -- there's a
14 lot we don't know yet.

15 I mean, this goes back through what
16 we know, and I'm not sure that we can answer
17 all of that before we really know what we're
18 putting forward as some new models.

19 I may be mistaken, but I just think
20 some of those, like embark on phase two of an
21 FDL handbook, we don't even know that the
22 model's going to be that the handbook is going
23 to address.

1 I think some of these are just too
2 specific, and whether we should spend the time
3 now to cherry-pick these, or think of some
4 like broader strategies to move us from here
5 to spring, or where does GPO want to go with
6 this.

7 MR. SHULER: John Shuler,
8 University of Illinois at Chicago.

9 The Public Printer laid down the
10 charge at the beginning of this conference
11 that he wanted to devote the spring conference
12 to exactly this kind of issue.

13 May I suggest that, instead of
14 spending the last half-hour beginning the
15 cherry-picking or whatever we want to do, that
16 the Council take it upon itself to organize
17 these goals into these other interconnected
18 strategies before the spring conference and
19 prepare ourselves for a much richer discussion
20 fresh, rather than at the tail end of two and
21 a half very long days.

22 Obviously there's a lot of
23 investment in the purpose and the future of

1 what we're going to do here, and I don't think
2 we could do it justice in the last remaining
3 20, 25 minutes.

4 I think we should congratulate
5 ourselves for getting at least some consensus
6 on the three goals, work together as a Council
7 to populate those goals with clear strategies,
8 and interconnect the issues and come back in
9 the spring ready to engage our community much
10 more productively.

11 That would be my two cents.

12 MR. WIGGIN: I would second that.

13 MS. SINCLAIR: Cindy.

14 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I
15 just also want to mention that this is
16 something, again, that's in Title 44 that
17 nobody likes, and there's -- but it is a
18 process that we need to go through
19 operationally until Title 44 changes, if it
20 does.

21 And so, I think that you all need
22 to think about what we can do operationally at
23 the same time we're building these new models

1 so that there is some near-term relief.

2 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,
3 Connecticut State Library.

4 So, Cindy, what you're saying is
5 that there may be some things in here that
6 need to be addressed no matter what the future
7 brings, and you would like some idea of what
8 those priorities to address are, is that -- or
9 could you just tell us those things that you
10 think have to be changed?

11 MR. SHULER: Yes, save us some
12 time.

13 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I
14 don't -- I didn't really put these in any kind
15 of order. It was just sort of when I was
16 brainstorming when things popped out.

17 And the disposition of materials
18 has been on, I think, everybody's hit list for
19 a long time, so I think that's one that we
20 could look at operationally and start working
21 on because it would benefit the selectives as
22 well as the regionals.

23 Another one of those is embarking

1 on phase two of the handbook and for those of
2 you who don't know what phase two is, phase
3 one was the merging of the instructions manual
4 into what is now the handbook, and now -- and
5 a couple of new chapters were added, but there
6 were no real changes made.

7 So now we need to look at any gaps
8 for procedures or requirements for libraries
9 that aren't there as well as looking at those
10 that are now outmoded, outdated that need to
11 be removed, and maybe that's part of what
12 these new models are going to be.

13 But I think -- I don't really think
14 there are too many operational kinds of things
15 in there, but those -- those are two that
16 stick out in my mind right now.

17 MS. SINCLAIR: Tory.

18 MS. TROTTA: Tory Trotta, Arizona
19 State. I hate to wait for the spring to do
20 this. It seems to me we have a Council
21 structure that we could go back and maybe the
22 subcommittee could work with this document and
23 pull out the operational strategies, just for

1 conversation's sake, and some objectives, and
2 repackage it and let Council take a look at it
3 and talk about it at a conference call and
4 then push it out to the community for comment,
5 using the FDLP desktop community -- whatever,
6 and go -- and just keep working on it.

7 I just hate for it to wait until
8 the spring --

9 MR. SHULER: No, I didn't mean to
10 imply that we wait till spring. I said we
11 would work between now and the spring on it.

12 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. I think John
13 was just suggesting that we -- there's not
14 much we can do today.

15 MR. SHULER: In the last 20 minutes
16 of today.

17 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes. So you were
18 suggesting that we just leave early?

19 MR. SHULER: There's a rainbow
20 through every cloud, but I suppose -- but what
21 I'm suggesting that, as Tory said, that the
22 purpose of the Council is to work between
23 meetings.

1 The Public Printer clearly gave us
2 a charge that he wants us to talk about this
3 sometime during the spring meeting. We have a
4 lot of work to do between now and then.

5 We have the community tools to
6 communicate with the community. Let's do it.

7 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Gwen.

8 MS. SINCLAIR: Yes.

9 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
10 Valpo Law. I would just ask Cindy: Are you
11 looking for a recommendation from Council to
12 revamp the -- to -- we think you should revamp
13 the disposition of materials process and
14 embark on phase two of the handbook, because
15 if you need that -- some okay from us, we
16 could talk about that real quick here and say
17 do it.

18 Some of the other things like allow
19 designation of shared regionals, we can't
20 authorize that today because -- for a variety
21 of reasons, but some -- but those two things
22 are in the others that fit in that category.
23 I guess we could do that.

1 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.
2 Thanks for asking, Sally. Yes, there's some
3 things on the list that we can't authorize,
4 either, and those are things that we think we
5 need, and we're going to be working towards.

6 And there are some things on here,
7 on these strategies that we already are doing,
8 like building partnerships, so some of the
9 plan draft here for discussion is expanding
10 some of those things.

11 So, some of these things we're
12 already going to be working on and we're going
13 to do, anyway. So, maybe you want to look
14 through these and see if there's something
15 glaringly missing that you think we ought to
16 be looking at in ways of a strategy.

17 In the interest of time, you know,
18 and I can go back and take this list and put
19 them into the three categories of whatever,
20 service, collection, communication, whatever
21 is the best use of your time.

22 MS. SINCLAIR: Well -- Ken.

23 MR. WIGGIN: Ken Wiggin,

1 Connecticut State Library.

2 Cindy, this document that we got at
3 the beginning, is that available somewhere so
4 we could -- I think we should start working
5 with it. Is it a Word document somewhere?

6 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. It
7 is on the FDLP desktop in the document
8 repository, and after this conference I'll be
9 working with the web content unit to put a
10 comment form up on the desktop for others to
11 make comments.

12 You all can use that form. You all
13 can contact me directly. Those in the
14 audience can use the form, and particularly
15 for those who didn't have an opportunity to be
16 here in Washington to be part of these
17 discussions that allows them an opportunity.

18 But we'll be -- the document's
19 already there on the desktop. The comment
20 forms, forthcoming.

21 MS. HOLTERHOFF: But, could Council
22 have it as a Word document, too, so we could
23 work on that, add changes and work on it

1 ourselves?

2 MS. ETKIN: Yes.

3 MS. HOLTERHOFF: Thank you.

4 MS. SINCLAIR: Ric.

5 MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I
6 stepped out for a second, and this might have
7 already been stated, but the revamp of the
8 disposition process is something that came up
9 loud and clear from the results that led to
10 the creation of the regional report.

11 So, things like that, in terms of
12 differing from chaired regional models, we
13 have lot of additional action items that came
14 out of that report that we'd like to take back
15 to GPO and work on with counsel that don't
16 require JCP approval and there are things that
17 we can do right now.

18 MS. SINCLAIR: Thanks.

19 My sense is that we are ready to
20 adjourn, and Tim has his gavel out, so -- Any
21 final? Okay.

22 Oh, Cindy.

23 MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I

1 have to make up for not being here this
2 morning. I just want to than Council and
3 everybody in the audience who has participated
4 in this discussion.

5 It's been very, very helpful, and I
6 think that over the last three days we've made
7 lots of progress on this, and lots of things
8 to think about, and look forward to working
9 with Council and receiving comments from the
10 community working on this.

11 MS. SINCLAIR: Thank you all very
12 much.

13 CHAIR BYRNE: I think Council was
14 extremely excited to see the presentation that
15 Karen Sieger did on the FDLP desktop, and
16 especially the FDLP community, and we are very
17 anxious to actually start using the forum for
18 our own discussions and then sharing our
19 thoughts with the whole community.

20 So, that's something we will be
21 going back and starting to work on, and I
22 think that will really help in this whole
23 process of what we're trying to do here.

1 So, it may be a whole new world,
2 come spring. Hopefully.

3 MR. SHULER: At least we'll be in
4 Florida.

5 CHAIR BYRNE: Yes. All right.

6 Anyone have anything else you want
7 to add at this point, last-minute, last
8 chance?

9 I want to thank everyone for
10 sticking it out this long also, and I think
11 it's been really an excellent meeting and
12 we've had a lot of really great discussion.

13 So, I look forward to a lot of
14 interaction on Council between now and spring
15 also. That being said, meeting adjourned.

16 (Whereupon, the meeting was
17 adjourned at 2:46 p.m.)

18

19

20

21