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PROCEEDINGS

MR. JOHN SHULER: If you can find a seat,
we’ll be ready to get the proceedings going. It’s
going to be very cozy because we’ve matched the number
of people to the number of seats to build solidarity in
our community.

(Pause)

MR. SHULER: Closing the doors. This is
going to be very serious.

(Pause)

MR. SHULER: All right. I wish to call the
2009 Fall Depository Meeting to order, and I welcome
all of you. I welcome the folks at the table who’ll --
some of whom I’ll introduce shortly, but let me
introduce myself. I am John Shuler from the University
of Illinois at Chicago, and I am the Chair for this
meeting and next spring for the council.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: Thank you. And I hope that was
the most difficult part of my remarks.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: However, there are a few things
before I introduce the Public Printer, Bob Tapella, and
they come under our old traditions of what we do at the
beginning of the conference, which is what we call our Depository calisthenics. However, I would like to do it a bit differently this time, and it was pointed out earlier this year this is actually the 75 meeting of the Depository Library Council. Yes, we have been meeting in one form or another, formally or informally, since ’72, ’73; and we usually do calisthenics along geography and along institutions. I think in honor of this historic event of being the 75 meeting we’re going to do this temporally, so everybody, everybody who was alive --

MR. SHULER: -- but I mean that. That is the only definition you have to worry about now. Everybody who was alive in 1973, ’74 please stand.

MR. SHULER: All right. Okay. Continue standing, continue standing because we’re going to be eliminating you on a different basis.

MR. SHULER: Not those libraries that are east of Eden, mind you, but rather if you attended more than one to five Council meetings in the years 2000 to 2009, continue standing.

MR. SHULER: If you attended Council meetings between 1990 and 2000 1 to 5 times, continue standing.

MR. SHULER: If you attended -- you get the pattern -- between 1980 and 1990, continue standing.

MR. SHULER: If you attended the Council sessions between 1974 and 1980, continue standing.


MR. SHULER: For those of you who were at Woodstock, please stand.
MR. SHULER: Well, I think that was a hell of a lot more fun than talking about where we live in relations to the Mississippi, but I think -- the point being that we are not only a community of institutions and libraries, but we are a community of service with long traditions and expertise that there Council meetings have allowed us to share with ourselves, our experience with various Public Printers over the years, and it is a tradition and a condition that I hope will continue in the future.

In relations to that, I would like to recognize, and again, I hope that this will be an ongoing tradition for the Council meetings here forth, that we have also lost some of the members of our community, and I’d like to recognize at least four of those people. And after I read off their names, I would just like to have a moment of silence.

Amongst the librarians that we have lost this year who have no small impact on what we do in these Council meetings as well as throughout our library professional practice, Marva (ph) T. Lane passed away earlier this year. Judith Krug, ALA intellectual, a freedom leader passed away. From the GPO, we lost two significant people: Virginia Sanders (ph), who worked at the GPO for 65 years. Unbelievable. And Tom McCormick, who was actually the first Public Printer to formalize in ‘73–’74 the ongoing 40 what we are -- the structure that we work with today. So if I could have a moment of silence to recognize those folks.

(Pause)

MR. SHULER: Thank you. I would now like to introduce Bob Tapella, Public Printer of the United States, who will speak about not only the traditions of the Public Printing Office, but also its future. Bob.

(Applause)

MR. BOB TAPELLA: Thank you, John. Let’s see if we can do this the right way. Well, first of all, John, welcome to chairing the Depository Library Council meeting. For those of you that don’t know John well, I thought I’d share just a couple of things about our friend John. Normally, I give him a hard time, but I think since he’s the incoming Chair or the current Chair, I’m going to be nice to him today.
First, John was the first person to work with GPO to create our formal partnership with the FDLP a number of years ago. He has spearheaded our involvement in virtual reference collaboration, and we can thank John for the missing Council.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Oh, come on. That was worth something.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: We actually do have Council here. However, as part of John’s interest in better collaboration, he’s changed the setup of today’s meeting, and so what I’d like to do is I’d like to introduce Council, and I’d like you to stand where you are when I introduce you. And I’m going to begin with the newbies, the newest members of Council, Jim Jacobs from Stanford University.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Jill Moriearty, from the University of Utah.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Who, by the way, was standing until that last group was called.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Dan O'Mahony, from Brown University.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Ann Marie Sanders, from Michigan Department of Education.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: And Camilla Tubbs, from Yale.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: And as long as we’re introducing Council since they’re not sitting up here and you really can’t see who they are, I’m going to introduce the rest of Council, which is the last class.

David Cismowski, Head of --

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: -- Government Publication Section with the California State Library.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Sally Holterhoff, next to him from Valparaiso University.

(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Justin Otto, from Eastern Washington University.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Suzanne Sears, from Willis Library.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Now Suzanne wanted to be Vanna White today. So come on, stand up again, we want to see that beautiful pink and scarf. There we go.
(Laughter)
MR. TAPELLA: I told her at some point we’re going to let her point something out.
(Laughter)
MR. TAPELLA: Chris Greer, who is now with the OSTP, Office of Science and Technology Policy at the White House.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Congratulations on the new job, Chris.
MR. CHRISTOPHER GREER: Thank you.
MR. TAPELLA: Kathy Lawhun, from San Francisco Public Library.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Gwen Sinclair, from the University of Hawaii at Manoa Library.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: And last but not least, Tori Trotta, from Arizona State University.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Now, since I always like to start with good news, we’re going to start with something that’s good for a change, and that’s our budget.
Now I’m going to go back historically just a little bit, and for those of you that were around in fiscal year 2008, we thought we did pretty well with $34,913,000 approved by Congress for the S&E appropriations. In 2009, we did even better, with $38,744,000 for the Program, but I got to tell you for fiscal year ‘010 -- or I guess it’s fiscal year ’10, we are approved at $40,911,000 for the salaries and expenses for the Superintendent of Documents.
(Applause)
MR. TAPELLA: Now I think a lot of that has
to do with the good work the Council did in terms of
making recommendations and also, more importantly, the
work that the staff under Ric’s leadership have done
in making the budget justification to Congress. They
saw what we were doing, they like what we are doing,
and they are funding what we are doing.

Now Ric will be talking about more specifics
on these programs in his remarks, but the one thing I
did want to highlight is that we have received in
addition to what’s in the S&E appropriation nearly $7.8
million for FDsys continued improvement.

(Mr. TAPPELLA: Oh, come on. Give Mike Wash
a clap.

(Applause)

Mr. TAPPELLA: Actually, stand up, Mike.

(Applause)

Mr. TAPPELLA: Thanks to Mike --

(Applause)

Mr. TAPPELLA: -- and what’s going on. And

as you know, we rolled out FDsys this year, and it has
just been a smashing success.

Looking forward, I thought I might share a
little bit on some of my strategic thoughts if they’re
strategic on the future of the Federal Depository
Library Program. Tomorrow we’re going to have some
folks make a presentation, and these are folks from
Ithaca S&R, and they prepared a report that was
commissioned by the Association of Research Libraries
and the chief officers of the state library agencies.

I was interviewed as were a number of folks at GPO, and
I know a number of you in the library community, and I
got a sneak preview of the report a couple of weeks
ago, and we will be releasing it -- have we released it
yet or are we releasing it tomorrow?

Mr. SHULER: ARL is going to release it off
their site.

Mr. TAPPELLA: ARL will release it off their
site I guess, what, Friday. And I like it, and that
got me thinking really about sort of the future of the
FDL and also the Council recommendations last spring.
Council recommended last spring that GPO seek funding
from an outside consultant to deliver a range of models
for the future of the FDLP. We did seek that funding.
We got the funding, and it was approved by Congress.

We’re going to be moving forward on that, but I thought that this report titled “Documents for a Digital Democracy: A model for the Federal Depository Library Program in the 21st Century An Interim Summary” is a good starting point. And the question that I had is I was on a conference call on Friday reviewing the report with the folks who put it together. The big question is what’s next? And I guess that’s the same question that I’m here asking Council: What’s next? And I know we’re going to need to work closely together. It’ll be Council and GPO and, of course, our oversight committee, the Joint Committee on Printing, to decide exactly what are going to be the expected outcomes that we want from this process of looking for the future of the FDLP.

When we bring in the consultant, we have it through a competitive bid process; and for those of you unfamiliar with Federal procurements, it can be a lengthy process. And so I hope that you’ll think about the Ithaca report as a building block and that we use it as we start preparing for what Council has asked us or recommended us to do.

There’s going to be a strategic planning session tomorrow to begin framing the goals and expected outcomes for this consultant, and in doing so, I ask that you consider the following 10 assumptions:

1. First, developments in the larger library world are informing the future of the FDLP.
2. Second, fewer Federal Depository Library professionals will be steeped in the FDLP or in Federal resources.
3. Third, depository libraries must be allowed to adapt to technological change and program changes to perform their role.
4. Fourth, competencies to lead and manage the Federal Depository of the future will be different than those of the traditional depository library.
5. Fifth, collaboration and cooperation are essential.
6. Sixth, Government agencies and the private sector will continue to independently develop tools and resources to locate Government information.
7. Seventh, partnerships between the Government
and the private sector will continue to develop and
increase.

Eighth, GPO needs to continue to promote
depositories, its resources, and tools outside of the
FDLP.

Ninth, an enhanced system is needed to ensure
dependent identification and description of Government
information products available via Government
electronic information services.

And finally, the tenth assumption I’d like you
to hold true, a primary electronic FDLP offers
opportunities to make more information locally
available to the public with enhanced functionality.

As the Depository Library Council works with
GPO and the community throughout this conference, I’m
asking that you continue to be guided by these
assumptions.

Earlier this year, I wrote President Obama and
laid out how GPO could help support his vision for
transparency and open government as well as digital

Specifically, I proposed five goals and accompanying
actions that GPO was prepared to undertake. The goals
are, first, position GPO’s Federal digital system as
the official repository for Federal Government
publications; second, enable and support Web 2.0
functionality through FDsys to support comments on
pending legislation; third, establish a demonstration
project to apply Web 2.0 features to rule-making
document; fourth, participate in and lead efforts to
standardized electronic publishing formats; and
finally, fifth, to link the White House’s web site to
FDsys for public searches of Government documents.

As part of GPO’s response to these goals, we
work closely with the National Archives’ Office of the
Federal Register to convert the text of the Federal
Register from year 2000 to 2009 into XML, which is the
extensible markup language, and placed it online in
numerous Federal Government portals including GPO’s
Federal Digital System, the Federal Register web site,
and the Government’s new portal for Government data
data.gov.

We’ve also recently been called upon by
Congress in joint explanatory statement on HR1105,
which was the Lynch Branch Appropriations Bill, to work with the Library of Congress including the Congressional Resource Service and the Law Library of Congress to discuss access to bulk data. I’m going to read you the report language, and it specifically says: “Public access to legislative data. There is support for enhancing public access to legislative documents, bill status, summary information, and other legislative data through more direct methods such as bulk data downloads and other means of no-charge digital access to legislative databases. The Library of Congress, the Congressional Resource Service, and the Government Printing Office, and the appropriate entities of the House of Representatives are directed to prepare a report on the feasibility of providing advanced search capabilities. This report is to be provided to the committees on appropriations of the House and Senate within 120 days of the release of Legislative Information System 2.0.”

As soon as the occurred, I called together all the principals at the Library of Congress as well as the House of Representatives, and we’ve started a task force. This task force is working jointly to develop a position on bulk data, but in parallel with this effort, GPO is also starting to talk with groups about applications programming interfaces, or API, with the goals of developing a specification what will help enable other systems to access our data, or, for those of you who are in the electronic world, so folks can do mashup with all this great information that we have available.

We would like to work with the Depository Library Council to further define requirements that may enable future digital deposit of authentic files in depository libraries through FDsys. This will enable GPO to serve as both an official repository of Federal Government publications through FDsys and also a distribution channel for these publications. This will continue to support the geographically dispersed collections of contents in the digital world in a manner that they have been supported in the traditional print environment for libraries. I believe that the Federal Government has an obligation to provide complete legal and regulatory information on
line in an electronic format that is fully usable by
the American people free of charge. We should start
with the Constitution annotated showing how Supreme
Court decisions have affected Federal statutes all the
way through public law, slip decisions, Code of Federal
Regulations, and proposed laws and regulations. We
need a citation standard that is media neutral. This
citation standard needs to be in the public domain and
support permanent links so that the fidelity and
integrity of documents will be maintained indefinitely.
We also need to create smart systems that
realize the value that XML and Web 2.0 can provide. As
one example, the Federal Register is a daily
publication and on a regulation published in the
Federal Register is incorporated on an annual basis
into the appropriate Code of Federal Regulations
volume. GPO working with our partner, the Office of
the Federal Register, is looking at how we can create a
so-called point-in-time system. With such a system,
you could dial in a specific date and see what
regulations were in effect on that date.
What if we could create a point-in-time
capability for the entire legal and regulatory
framework of the United States? It’s an ambitious
goal, but one that I think is worthwhile and one that
we are pursuing at the Government Printing Office.
I mentioned FDsys earlier and the fact that
we’ve received additional funding, but I’d like to talk
a little bit about what we have recently released the
new collections into FDsys: The Congressional Record,
105 Congress to present; The Congressional Record
bound, 1999 to 2001; The Congressional Record
index, 1996 to present; GAO reports and Comptroller General
decisions, 1994 to 2008; history of bills, 1983 to
present; the United States Government Manual, the 1995-
96 edition to present; the United States Statutes at
Large, 2003 to 2006. Those are the newest collections.
In addition, the Congressional Directory, the
Congressional Record bound, the United States
Government Manual, and the United States Statutes at
Large are available with authenticated digital
signatures. Additionally, the list of CFR sections
affected, the Weekly Compilation of Presidential
Documents, and the Daily Compilation of Presidential
Documents Collections have been authenticated with digital signatures and are also currently available. GPO is in the process of digitally signing the Federal Register collection, which will occur in a year-by-year basis.

In continuing the migration from GPO access, the next set of collections that will be made available include: the United States Code, the Code of Federal Regulations, the Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, House Precedents, Hinds, Deschler, and Cannon.

Now that I’ve showered you with some good news and I hope I have a happy audience --

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: -- I’d like to discuss the problems we experienced recently with access to our Persistent Uniform Resource Locators, or PURLs. Yes, I was aware of the failure.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: And as you know, we had a significant hardware failure on August 24, 2009. The hardware was restored, but then we encountered problems with the application script used to operate this service related to systems configurations and Uniform Resource Locator, URL, Resolution. While we did have a problem, I want to emphasize that although access to the system posed an issue no data was lost. The script was executed and run at a rate of 10,000 PURLs every 12 hours, and PURLs were made accessible on September 8, 2009. And I can tell you, it was a rough period, and I did hear from a number of you.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: And we’re paying attention. GPO’s Information and Technology Services have conducted testing of new procedures for the backup of the PURL application and server, and the testing has been successful. I do know Ric and I were talking -- we were down just last week for a brief period of time.

I think, what, an hour or two?

MR. RIC DAVIS: Probably an hour.

MR. TAPELLA: About an hour. We are paying very close attention to this.

We recognize how critical these systems are and the importance of having stable and redundant
systems to access online content. An off-site redundant backup of all critical hardware and software systems is and will continue to be a priority for GPO, and we’re moving as quickly and as prudently as possible. We’re exploring hosted services, an expansion of real-time fail-over capability as well as other options to build a bridge of stability for this service until FDsys is fully enabled.

After the PURL failure, Ric and I got together and realized that we have other legacy computer systems and applications at GPO that also are vulnerable. I’ve got a list of five of them that are still vulnerable and we’re working on. The first: The Depository Distribution Information System, DDIS, manages information including item number and SuDoc class stems, item-selection information, and basic information on the FDLP library such as addresses.

Second: ACSIS, the Acquisition Classification and Shipment Information Systems, maintains application classification, bibliographic acquisitions and shipment processing information for all the titles in the FDLP and cataloging and indexing program.

The Automated Depository Distribution Systems, ADDS, fulfills the distribution of Government materials to depository libraries nationwide and within U.S. territories.

Fourth: The Item Lister system allows Federal depositories to review their current item number selection information.

And finally, Shipper Lister enables the Federal depositories to retrieve an official version of a depository shipping list in a PDF format from FY 2001 forward with microfiche shipping list added starting with FY 2009 shipping list.

Ric and his folks are developing documentation on requirements for each one of these legacy systems so that we can work on the migration and Mike Wash’s Information Technology and Services organization will be responsible for migrating the legacy hardware and software application to more current and stable solutions that will follow industry best practices and the agency’s enterprise architecture.

These activities and their progression in time
are all contingent on the approval of funding for implementation, but it is a priority, and we are working hard on it.

Next I’d like to talk about digitization. In 2004, GPO proposed digitizing all retrospective Federal publications back to the earliest days of the Federal Government. We conducted a pilot project in 2006. We evaluated it in 2007, and then in 2008 we issued and RFP for cooperative relationship with a public or private sector participant or participants where the uncompressed, unaltered files created as a result of the conversion process would be delivered to GPO at no cost to the Government for ingest into GPO’s Federal digital system.

Since this was a Federal procurement, we originally posted the requirements on the Federal Business Opportunities, FedBizOpps, web site. As a result of the posting, we received only one offer. Although a decision was made by GPO to make an award, it had to be approved by our oversight committee.

Committee staffs were briefed on the process, and additional questions were provided to GPO to answer with regard to the RFP and the digitization process. The offer’s bid acceptance period was set to expire before GPO could aware the contract. The vendor extended their offer more than once, but at the end of the day, the contract did not come to fruition, and I’m disappointed.

However, we are currently developing new digitization alternatives. In addition to our longstanding goal of serving as one of the repository of electronic files through the submission of material into FDsys, we will be following the Depository Library Council’s recommendation to focus on coordinating projects among institutions, assist in the establishment and implementation of preservation guidelines, maintain a registry of digitized project, and ensure that there is appropriate bibliographic metadata for titles in the collection. We’d like to encourage any of you who are digitizing materials who would like to join GPO in this important effort to digitized historic publication to submit proposals through our partnership page located on the FDLP Desktop.
Another good site to review is the Federal Publications Digitization and Public Access Files Initiative web page. This page links to our registry of U.S. Government publication digitization projects and GPO’s work with others on guidelines and consideration of digitization specifications for still digital images.

Finally, I’d like to give an update on PACER, which is the Public Access to Court Electronic Record. At its September 2007 session, the Judicial Conference endorsed a joint pilot between GPO and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts that was to not exceed two years in length. GPO sought volunteers to participate in the pilot from among the depository libraries; 49 depository libraries responded for the call to volunteer. In consultation with the GPO, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts selected 17 depository libraries to participate in the pilot. The pilot commenced in October 2007, and was suspended after 11 months for an evaluation. The data collected during that time suggest that the target population, a segment of the public that would be unlikely to go to the courthouse or establish a PACER account was not reached as anticipated. Although the pilot was initially well-publicized, the level of ongoing public outreach about the pilot didn’t reach the desired level; and more fundamentally, PACER is a tool and not really a program. Therefore, AALL, American Association of Law Libraries, has been contacted to discuss ways the pilot could be reinvented to make PACER part of a legal research and training program for librarians and end users.

Once a proposal is developed, it will be submitted to the Judiciary’s Advisory Groups, the Court Administration and Case Management Committee of the Judicial Conference, and the Judicial Conference Committee on Court Administration and Case Management for consideration. I am very hopeful that we’ll have a new PACER pilot started or at least approved during this fiscal year.

(Applause)

MR. TAPPELLA: And with that, I’m going to turn on the podium to Acting Superintendent of Documents, Ric Davis. Ric.
MR. RIC DAVIS: Thank you, Bob. First, good morning, and welcome, I want to welcome all of you to the Fall Depository Library Conference and Council Meeting. As I always like to reiterate at the start of these meeting, I encourage you to network with GPO staff, other Federal agency staff, and with each other while you’re here. As you all know, you can also use our customer relations tool, RightNow Technologies, to contact GPO with any questions after the Conference, but I also like hearing from all of you directly. My email address, again, is rdavis@gpo.gov, and I encourage you to contact me with any concerns or issues that come up after the Conference.

I want to join Bob first in welcoming our new Council members as well. James, Jill, Dan, Ann, and Camilla, I’m very happy that you’ve decided to join us on Council. We look forward to your energy and ideas throughout this session and during your tenure. As part of joining Council, one thing that we ask new members to do is to go through a two-day boot camp at the Government Printing Office prior to coming onboard, and I hope that experience was valuable for all of you to see the sort of the inner workings of the Government Printing Office, and I know it was good for us as GPO staffers to have a chance to dialogue with you prior to the conference.

At this year’s Spring Depository Library Council Meeting in Tampa, the Depository Library Council put forth a set of recommendations for GPO, and one the things that John and I talked about doing a little bit differently in addition to the setup that you see is rather than giving an update on all of the various things we’re working on to kind of walk through at a strategic level some of GPO’s responses to these recommendations. This is also going to set the stage for the rest of the Conference. What we’re doing a little bit differently this time is rather than seeing a lot of presentations directly from the Government Printing Office we’re going to have a heavy focus on these recommendations to help them drive a lot of the plenary sessions that will also be supplemented by the Educational Sessions, of course, and we’re setting this up so it can be more of a collaboration to reach
solutions and outcomes.

With that, let me walk through these briefly.

On Recommendation number 1, New Models for the FDLP, the recommendation was to meet the goals of providing no-fee permanent public access to Government information. Council recommended that GPO seek funding to hire an outside consultant to deliver a range of models on how libraries can better provide information in the 21 Century. In your packet, it was noted that funds were not made available as part of the omnibus appropriation; but the good news, as Bob mentioned, is that we did just receive funding as part of our FY 2010 budget submission to support this Council request. We’ve got a lot of work ahead of us now. What GPO and Council are going to need to do immediately after this Conference and based upon feedback that you give us at this Conference is work together on a spend plan that GPO can submit to the Joint Committee on Printing to make use of those funds. Additionally, as Bob mentioned, I think that the Ithaka S+R report that was recently released is a good building block as part of this effort, and we should talk about that in this Conference as building into this consulting process.

The second recommendation was collaborative digitization projects. Council recommended that GPO maintain a list of libraries volunteering to participate in collaborative digitization project according to GPO’s standards and the GPO coordinate these projects.

As Bob has already discussed, GPO has been working with the library community, other Federal agencies, and the public on this national digitization project effort. The objective is to ensure that the digital collection once complete is available in the public domain for no-fee permanent public access. As a result of the Nunn Award of the digitization contract, GPO was seeking to do at no cost to the Government and the fact that the one bid that we were seeking to approve was withdrawn from further consideration at this point, we are developing new alternatives. I think that it’s very important that we continue work on this goal and, most importantly, not give up.

In recent days, something very interesting has
happened as part of the budget process. In our FY 2010 budget, GPO received funding associated with digitization that we did not have before to the tune of about $500,000. When the budget request was submitted months ago, it was our hope that these funds would be approved to complement an award that would be given and to complete the digitization of miscellaneous materials and also associated with the transportation of materials. What we need to do now given the stage that we’re at is, again, work with Council on a spend plan for these funds in FY 2010, take the spend plan back to JCP, and decide how best to get this thing moving.

The third recommendation was state-based grant programs for digitization. Council recommended that to encourage digitization project GPO request funding for a state-based grant program for depository libraries to fulfill the goal of digitizing the legacy collection. Unfortunately, after consultation with our General Counsel’s office, GPO did investigate the possibility of entering into these, but we have no legal authority under such partnerships. The General Counsel recommended that for appropriated funds on digitization process. This is different from what Bob mentioned in regards to partnership with the depository community, which we’re actively encouraging.

Recommendation number 4, related to the disposal process. Council recommended that GPO report at this meeting on best practices for streamlining the disposal process, which all of you know is very challenging. The working group for this is taking a two-pronged approach to the disposition of materials and also the needs and offers process. First, as best practices in education, we were able to collect and compile all of the current discard procedures from regional depository librarians. A presentation on this is going to be made at 4 p.m. today, and I encourage all of you to attend that. The intent is to really clarify any misunderstandings of what is required or not required of depository libraries in the disposition of materials. In doing this, we also hope to spark ideas for discussion about how we can streamline this program. After the Conference, we’re also going to do an online OPAL presentation and have more collaboration
Secondly, we need to develop an automated tool for streamlining this process. Suggestions have already been on the FDLP community site, but we need to hear more information from you here at Conference to go through the process of developing that. Again, this is something we have funding to do in FY 2010, so I need your feedback, and we need to work on it together.

Recommendation 5 was retooling of the item selection system. Bob spoke about DIDAS, and what that drills down to, as all of you know, is increasing granularity of item numbers assigned to different formats, offering up the ability to select EL-only item numbers without the risk of obtaining tangible materials and also being able to receive more specified formats for things like general publications. In order to accomplish this most effectively, we must get off our DIDAS mainframe system that we’re operating on to provide the flexibility to meet your needs. At GPO right now, we’re writing a requirements document to make that happen. Again, we have approval in FY 2010 funds. It’s always good to be able to say that after three years of nonfunding. We do have funds to do this, so we’re going to be basing these requirements as well and modifying them based on what we hear from you here at the Conference.

In the meantime, we’ve been taking steps to provide selectivity of online materials by removing them from tangible product item numbers and creating their own item numbers when possible. Lori’s area has been working on cleanup of the list of classes, and we’ve been changing the workflow of maintaining the list of class so that it’s more systematic and more based on business process efficiencies. There is going to be a session on that tomorrow morning at 10:30, and again, I encourage you to attend and talk to us about what your requirements are for that as we’re developing the document to execute this year.

There was also a recommendation on public access assessments. As you know, in Title 44, GPO is required by law to do a -- the word is inspections when is indicated. Based on prior Council recommendations from many years ago, we reinvented the inspection
program as an assessment program to make it more collaborative in nature. Recent activities in this area include doing assessments based in part on biennial survey data. Additionally, any library can request an assessment at any time. Something you’re going to notice this year, because it is biennial survey time, is a very different biennial survey. We’ve heard loud and clear about how long it takes to complete that survey. We’ve gone through and tested the one this year. I’m estimating 15 to 20 minutes in terms of doing this, and this also will get us baseline data to compare from years past.

We’re also in the process of adding two additional assessment specialists to our education and outreach staff. What two does is literally double the size of our staff. Kathy Brazee and Ashley Dahlen have been it. We’re getting ready to add two more. We posted a job. The job closed, I understand from our Human Capital Department, that we had a number of interested applicants, and we’re awaiting the certification list to make a selection to double staff size, which will greatly increase our ability to go out and visit libraries.

Additionally, we recently updated the Public Access Assessment page, which may be found on the FDLP Desktop under Education and Outreach. I encourage you to take a look at the approach that we’re taking on that. What we need to do after this Conference is go back and make sure that that maps very clearly to the Depository handbook. I think Chapter 7 deals with assessment, and we want to make sure that’s in sync. We have a session here on assessment, and we also want to hear your feedback on the processes that we’re employing to do assessments; and again, we’re looking for your feedback on how to do it better. But I do want to emphasize, particularly with new funding, we have the ability to travel. If anybody would like us to visit, please fill out the form online. If you don’t get an answer quickly, email me directly.

Finally, we have a recommendation on quality control issues. I don’t believe on the agenda there is a separate plenary session on quality control, but we’re going to address these issues not only here at a high level but also talk about then during the
We’ve developed a large project team under Lori and Robin to address quality control issues in classification, cataloging, and distribution for both paper and microfiche. There are four main goals that we have as part of this process: First, to implement very specific quality control checks; to conduct an assessment of the types of errors that all of you reported through AskGPO; to identify what our staff training needs are, to do it better; and to maintain statistics on the number of questions that we get in the area and look at how those are closed out.

At the end of September 30, the following tasks have been completed. We did an assessment of all of the questions received through AskGPO related to classification, cataloging, and distribution and identified the types of errors coming in. We’ve worked with GPO’s quality assurance staff, which is an organization external to the library unit, to develop an ongoing quality assurance plan. Staff have conducted a hundred percent quality control checks of the classification of tangible pubs from June through September, and we’re looking to go back further. And Depository distribution has implemented new quality control checks as part of their daily workflow.

Again, these are the Council’s recommendations that came from Tampa. Throughout the next couple of days, many of the plenary sessions are going to be devoted to having a dialogue on these issues. You’re not going to really see a lot of formal presentations beyond the presentations that we’re giving today. We’re looking to have opportunities to discuss these beyond what we’ve heard from the Council’s recommendations.

Finally, I want to talk a little bit about budget matters as well, building on what Bob talked about. GPO received appropriations earlier this year through the Omnibus Appropriations Act for 2009 for several items of note. All of the contracts for these items were put in place and awarded between my staff working together with procurement staff a GPO by September 30. First, data storage; there was an expenditure of funds made to provide for more data storage of FDLP content to further our goal of
providing permanent public access and serving as the official repository of information.

Secondly, educational instruction modules for Federal Depository libraries; in addition to going out and doing visits and working with you in person, we’ve gotten good feedback on the OPAL software that we’ve been using. We’re looking to sort of ramp that up to the next level by developing new online modules and training tools to provide additional training to supplement in-person training.

Third, systems modernization; Bob went through the list of legacy systems that still need migration at GPO, and we received additional funding for that. And fourth, cataloging and indexing; an expenditure of funds was made to assist with work in Lori’s area in cataloging and indexing with the goal of increasing the production of cataloging records and significantly growing the catalog of Government publications. I encourage you to attend her session on this where she’s going talk specifically about the plan that we have of how we’re doing that.

Looking ahead, as I previously mentioned, we’ve already received more funding in FY 2010. We’re obviously going to use this for the consultant. We’re going to use it for these legacy systems, and we’re going to use it for more data storage and more cataloging and indexing.

I want to encourage the members of Council, as I mentioned earlier, when we go back home and break from this Conference starting next week to work with GPO on the spend plans for how we’re going to use this money specifically. We have language in our Blue book submission at a general level in terms of how we want to use it. We know we have a lot of specific challenges, and we now have the funds to address the challenges that we really haven’t for about three years. So I’m going to need your help doing that to make sure we’re going in the right direction.

Additionally, it’s never too early to plan for the FY 2011 budget. In fact we started working on the narrative for that just last week, and I need to have a draft completed by mid-November. So the other challenge to Council is to work with GPO on what we need to ask for as part of our FY 2011 budget.
submission to not only complement the things that we’ve received funding for FY 2010 but to build upon things that come out of this Conference to further the goals of the FDLP.

Last but not least, it’s never too early to talk about the next event. If you haven’t heard, the GPO Spring 2010 Depository Library Council Meeting will be April 26 through 28, and we’re going to be in Buffalo, New York.

(Applause)

MR. DAVIS: So if you had challenges packing for this event, I’d have no advice on how to pack for the next one.

(Laughter)

MR. DAVIS: As always, I want to thank all of you for your dedication, for your hard work, and for your collaboration with each other and with the Government Printing Office. We couldn’t do this without you, and your work help makes us stronger and make this program better. Thank you for your time.

I’m available throughout the Conference, and I’d now let to turn the program over to Bob Tapella, who’s going to announce our Library of the Year. I also want to mention that we’re going to celebrate during our 3:30 break today. Thank you all for your time.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, Ric. Before I announce Library of the Year, I realized there are a few new faces in here from GPO that you folks may not know that are not part of Ric’s team, Library Services and Content Management, and are not part of the FDsys team that you guys know and love so well.

So first off, in the very back of the room is the Deputy Public Printer of the United States Paul Erickson. Paul, stand.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: If anything happens to me, he runs the place.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: And actually I guess everyday he does run the place because he’s the Chief Operating Officer. I also saw Herb Jackson, our Chief Acquisitions Officer earlier. There we go. Herb is in the front row.
(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Got Gary Somerset, Manager of Public Relations.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Trenholm Boggs, who is my right hand man.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: I see all your FDsys people. Is there anyone else from GPO that is not part of FDsys or Library Service and Content Management?

Okay. Just wanted to do my housekeeping. Now it’s time to celebrate the Library of the Year Award.

Now I know that all of you are dedicated to the job, and I do know that it is a lot of hard work in the Government information space. You really are the first line or the front line in helping we the people access the documents of our democracy, but each year we recognize one library that goes above and beyond, and I know that the staff of GPO struggles to try to make the pick and suggest who should win this award. So, a drum roll, please.

This year’s Federal Depository Library of the Year Award goes to the Oklahoma Department of Libraries.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: And accepting the award will be Steve Beleu. Come on, Steve.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: We’ll wait for them to come up so that they’re standing up here when I talk about why they were selected.

(Pause)

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: So now with me is Steve Beleu, the regional depository librarian and Director of the Oklahoma State Data Center, coordinating agency of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, and Clif --

MR. CLIF BROADWORTH: Broadworth.

MR. TAPELLA: -- Broadworth -- Thank you -- who is the reference librarian. So I’d like to share some to the activities and accomplishments -- Pardon? Do I have all that?

Oh, okay. Okay. Now I’d like to share some of the activities and accomplishments going on in
Oklahoma. So ODL provides education and training for libraries in their regions that has significantly increased awareness of U.S. Government resources and, more importantly, how to use them. ODL has focused its energies and resources on educating librarians through workshops and other training sessions. This practical training enables staff at those libraries to better serve their constituents and the public with information from Federal resources.

In the past six years, they have presented over 170 workshop reaching more than a thousand participants at both the local and national level. ODL developed a national web conference offering instructions for the U.S. Department of Energy web sites in conjunction with the Oak Ridge National Laboratory staff. ODL has continuous efforts to add other libraries to the FDLP including tribal libraries and tribal college libraries. ODL works with the National Institutes of Health to learn about NIH information resources and develop a training session for librarians using PubMed Central. ODL developed instructional modules for use with the American Memory Program for the Library of Congress, which makes materials available from its vast archives. ODL is very proactive and supportive of selective libraries in Oklahoma as part of its regional depository responsibilities. They visit every library in their purview plus other request annual for consultation and training. And finally, ODL engages in substantial cooperative efforts with other depository, nondepository libraries including hosting the annual meeting for the Oklahoma depository libraries alternatively with Oklahoma State University, participating in annual conferences for the Oklahoma Library Association and coordinating the Central Oklahoma Metrodocs Biannual Meetings and Training Sessions.

And with that, we have an award for Steve and Clif. It says: Federal Depository Library Program; Federal Depository Library of the Year 2009; Oklahoma Department of Libraries; from the Government Printing Office.

(MR. TAPELLA: I just don’t want that)
crystal crashing to the floor.

(MR. TAPELLA) And with that, I’m going to turn it over to Stephen Beleu. Stephen.

(Applause)

(MR. STEVE BELEU) My staff and Clif Broadworth, who is the regional reference librarian, and the people who are back home, Mike Cameron, administrative assistant, and Cynthia Black, library technician, and I thank the Government Printing Office for this award; but even more than that, we need to thank first our customers without whom nothing is possible; our host libraries and their librarians, who sponsored our workshops; our library administrators, who allowed us to travel throughout our state of Oklahoma with occasional forays into Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Texas, and here at the Federal Depository Library conferences to deliver workshops about thorough online Government information sources.

The Oklahoma Department of Libraries began to formally receive Federal Government publications in December of 1890, and the state library, then the territorial library, of course, joined the FDLP in 1893. Some of the things we’ve done, he’s mentioned them, I’ll throw a little bit more flesh on the bones here. Together with OSU we started organizing and hosting an annual meeting of Oklahoma’s Federal Depository libraries each fall in Oklahoma. This particular year it’s going to be at ODL. It’s actually November 17. We also invite FDLP librarians from other states, contiguous states, to join us. So we use a couple of listservs that get Arkansas -- Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, north Texas. Together with the Tulsa City-County Library we hosted and presented two national web workshops in 2009. Maybe your library is one of those who were a web portal for that, and I’ve already got the first one planned for the fall of 2010. So Tulsa City-County Library there was our partner and will continue to be, and we actually do it at Tulsa City-County Library, not at ODL.

We are the coordinating agency of the Oklahoma State Data Center, so we do a lot of census training and other census work in Oklahoma. Essentially, there’s -- we’ve actually been to all the 77 counties
in Oklahoma. We’ve trained someone, whether it’s librarians or being a state library we also train city and county government employees as well as people from 501(c)(3)’s and the business sector. We’ve trained people from all 77 counties of our state.

Once a year or more we actually do visit our selected depositories. We always offer optional, informal training modules, usually two or three. They can -- we tell them they can choose as many as they want. Some of them they want us to give them all two or three. There’s only one depository library who doesn’t want any of the optional training modules -- (Laughter)

MR. BELEU: -- because they already know it all.

(Laughter)

MR. BELEU: We’ve been working with Janet Scheitle, who’s GPO’s informal tribal library initiative lead officer; and after Janet retires, we’ll continue to work with her successor Ashley Dahlen to get tribal libraries and tribal college libraries to join the FDLP. And starting November 12 we’re going to start offering training in our state, primarily of tribal librarians and tribal government staff. It’s a little bit different types of workshops there than we’ll be presenting just to all other types librarians and to nontribal library government staff.

Of course, we do thing at the Oklahoma Library Association Annual Conference. Metrodocs is a thing that exists because if you belong to the Oklahoma Library Association you have to pay money to join, and if you work at a Federal depository library in Oklahoma, you’re a member of Metrodocs automatically. Now, workshops, which may be the main reason we’re up here. In 2001, I was sitting around with my reference librarian named Karen Fite (ph), and we decided that after the Internet had become widespread in our nation’s libraries everything changed then, whether we realized it yet or not, for our industry subsector here. So we decided what we have to do is transition to being a service-oriented Federal Government information service center. So I spent the years of 2001 to 2003 researching and developing our current Federal information workshops. Now what that
usually consisted of -- as I came here to D.C. I spent
a week at the Library of Congress learning how to teach
-- learning about American Memory; went through the
fellowship program at the National Center for Education
Statistics, a week over at NCES. I have attended two
biennial data workshop in the National Center for
Health Statistics. Every year I come I go over to the
National Library of Medicine to get trained, but you
get the idea. I’m working with people in the Federal
agencies to present the workshops that want taught they
way they want it taught. And we communicate via email
with usually one person in those agencies to keep our
workshops updated, and if there is anything they want
us to particularly stress, we’ll mention that next time
we give the workshop.
We currently offer 18-, 22-, 3-, and 5-hour
workshops. If you came in by the backdoor and saw a
bunch of handouts, I took over one table this morning
to put our current workshops flyers on it.

(Laughter)

MR. BELEU: And some of the workshops titles
are “Get Ready for the 2010 Census,” “Using the Census
for Economic Development,” “American Memory for
Oklahomans, or “American Memory for Arkansans,” “Or
American Memory for New Hampshirans,” E-Government
Service in Libraries,” Making Informed Health Care
Decisions,” “Online Consumer Resources from the Agency
for Health care Research and Quality.” Two Clif
teaches here: “Forecast Your Own Weather,” “National
Weather Service and the Oklahoma Mason (ph) Net.” And
he also teaches one on Internet GIS sources called
“Geodata.gov and other Federal and State of Oklahoma
Internet GIS Resources.”

We started offering workshops in September of
2003. As of today, among the ones that are 2-, 3-, and
5-hours, we’ve delivered 175 of these and have indeed
trained over 1,000 librarians, city, county, and tribal
government staff, small business owners and their
employees, the employees of nonprofit organizations,
and the public in general.
I look upon this also as being a training --
as being a marketing opportunity with you. If you
haven’t picked up one of our workshop flyers off the
back table, please do so.
MR. BELEU: And there is also a flyer there about requirements, since we’re a state agency, for our delivering out-of-state workshops for you. I’ve brought something, since we are the coordinating agencies of the Oklahoma State Data Center, about how to use the new American Community Survey, a multiyear population estimate, because if you haven’t realized it yet multiyear population estimates are our new paradigm and how we do data just as much as the multirace category was on the 2000 census.

The last thing I have to say here is don’t forget to attend the Tribal Depository Interest Group lunch tomorrow, Tuesday, 12:15 to 1:45 in the Jackson Room, where we’re going to be talking about our efforts to get more tribal libraries and particular tribal college libraries to join FDLP. So thanks to the GPO, and thanks to all of you our colleagues.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. I would now like to ask the Council to come to the Council table. I’d like to thank GPO for joining everyone up here on the high table, and let this manifest the new way the Council is doing. This may be the last time you’ll see the high table used in the Conference. From now on, we’re going to have a conversation and an interaction with GPO staff members, and I hope the Public Printer will join us for a short 20 minutes at the lower podium for a conversation. And while they’re gathering together, I would like to read from the Book of SuDoc --

MR. SHULER: -- Chapter 13, verse 4: “Though I walk through the valley of digitization, I will fear no evil.”

MR. SHULER: And just give us a moment to organize ourselves. Bye-bye high table.

MR. TAPELLA: So how are we doing this, John?

MR. SHULER: We’re turning it over to the Council members. I’ll step back up there for a moment. What we had talked about as you -- that we would like
to ask you a few questions or have a conversation with you about issues you’ve raised in your remarks as well as other things that have been going on with you.

MR. TAPELLA: Okay. Ric is staying as well.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: So, Council members, ask your questions.

MR. TAPELLA: Well, that was easy.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: Anybody?

MR. TAPELLA: Actually, Jill. Or Justin.

MS. JILL MORIEARTY: First --

MR. TAPELLA: Ladies first.

MS. MORIEARTY: What can we do to help you -- what can we do to help you get more money for 11?

MR. TAPELLA: It’s --

FEMALE SPEAKER: What was the question, please?

MS. MORIEARTY: What can we do to help you get more money for 11?

MALE SPEAKER: You have to push the button.

MR. TAPELLA: By the way, for Council, you have to push the button and it turns red, and that means your microphone’s on.

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, but they could hear me without it.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: I’ll tell you, we were thrilled with this year’s budget process, and I think Ric made a call to action to you all in his talks about working collaboratively with the GPO staff so that we can do proper budget justifications. If what we are requesting makes sense, Congress will listen and if we do the proper justification. What also helps, and I know there are many people in this room that contact the authorizers and appropriators during the budget process to support specific requests, and that does help. So rather than just saying “Support GPO’s budget request,” talk about the specific items and why and how they are relevant to your organization.

So the first process is deciding what we’re going to ask for, then making sure that we have a good justification, and then being very specific when we go
forward to request that Congress approve our request
with that --

MR. DAVIS: May I add to that? Yes, what I
want to add to that -- it’s a good question. What we
need to do immediately after this meeting is create
spend plans, and the Omnibus Appropriations Act that I
had mentioned earlier provided funds to GPO several
months ago. We created spend plans for those. They
were all approved. Working with procurement, we got
all the contracts awarded. We need to do the same
thing with what was approved in the FY 2010 funds, and
we have a bit of latitude about how we craft that
language. Obviously, we’re very happy we got funding
for the consultant. What we really need to figure out
is with half a million dollars associated with
digitization where we are, what do we want to do. And
I’m looking very forward to working with Council on
that, but FY 2011 I think what we need to do as well is
look at any gaps that cannot be completed as a result
of this Conference from FY 2010 funds. Think about

where we need to continue those activities but what new
initiatives have we not received funding for in the
last three or four years that we knew were major
initiatives that we now have an opportunity to try to
get that funding for.

MR. SHULER: Justin.
MR. JUSTIN OTTO: Thanks. I’m Justin Otto
from Eastern Washington University. Well, I think you
may have answered my second question. But my first
question was since we’re going to be in Buffalo this
next spring, do you think that we could have the spring
2011 Conference in Hawai‘i perhaps?

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: Nicely put, Justin.
MR. OTTO: Thank you. I try. So since many
of the Council sessions that we’re going to have over
the next couple of day are going to be more of a
discussion of the issues that we brought forth in our
recommendations, what -- after we have this discussion
what’s going to be the mechanism for continuing that?
Because we’re trying to bring -- we’re trying to bring
in ideas not just from the members of the Council but

from everyone here, and then I’m wondering who are we
going to follow-up on that. Shall we continue
MR. SHULER: I think -- and again, I apologize, I think we’re supposed to state our names for the court reporter at the beginning of each one.

Ric Davis, GPO.

MR. DAVIS: I think that we can make good use of the community forum on the Desktop. We can set up locale in that for doing it. I think that we need to take -- something John and I have talked about offline the last week or so is the Depository Library Council page and expanding the use of that, particularly in terms of how we provide recommendations and then provide ongoing updates on recommendations. It shouldn’t be we get a recommendation, we come report on out on it, and then we move on to the next recommendation. The recommendations we have from you guys are very critical, I think, to the future of the FDLP, and I think we need to look at how we can make use of the Desktop to do that. Karen Seeger (ph), who is our web content manager had an unfortunate accident and has a broken leg unfortunately and will be here tomorrow, but she’s not here today. I think at the 4 o’clock business meeting tomorrow she’s going to come in and address some of the ideas about how your guys can make better use of the Desktop, and I think we need to add that to part of the discussion, so we can keep the dialogue continuing other than normal conference calls. We need the ability to share information and get feedback.

MR. TAPELLA: Just in answer to your first question, Gwen -- would Hawai‘i like to talk to -- where’s Lance? Is Lance --

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Lance is at the back. Why don’t the three of you -- you two talk to Lance and see what happens about Hawai‘i.

MS. SARAH HOLTERHOFF: Mr. Tapella, you mentioned that possible goal of creating a point-in-
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guys are very critical, I think, to the future of the FDLP, and I think we need to look at how we can make use of the Desktop to do that. Karen Seeger (ph), who is our web content manager had an unfortunate accident and has a broken leg unfortunately and will be here tomorrow, but she’s not here today. I think at the 4 o’clock business meeting tomorrow she’s going to come in and address some of the ideas about how your guys can make better use of the Desktop, and I think we need to add that to part of the discussion, so we can keep the dialogue continuing other than normal conference calls. We need the ability to share information and get feedback.
question than that, but the ECFR, which is such a great
point-in-time system for the CFR regulations, I
wondered is that going to be migrated to FDsys and when
will it be going off beta, which it’s been for many
years?

MR. TAPELLA: I am going to deflect this
question to Mike Wash, Chief Information Officer of
GPO.

(Mr. Mike Wash: Thank you, Bob.
Mr. TaPELLA: You’re most welcome.
Mr. Wash: I’m awful shorter. This is very
tall. We’re working on the ECFR project now. We have
been working with the Federal Register on the ECFR
since it was put up, and it’s actually their request to
create the point-in-time system for the ECFR, and we
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see that moving into FDsys. We don’t have a timeframe
for that yet. We’re at the very early stages right now
of gathering the requirements and creating a plan, but
we’re probably at least six months away before we would
even have a plan. Maybe it’s something that we can
status at the Spring Meeting in beautiful Buffalo. I
can say that because I lived in Upstate New York a long
time.

(Mr. Mike Wash: The other part of the question was
0100
a general point-in-time or was it just the ECFR?
Ms. Holterhoff: Just when it was going to
be going off beta.
Mr. Wash: Oh.

(Mr. TaPELLA: I think you have your answer,
Sally.

(Mr. Mike Wash: I don’t know. Ric, is that a
shared decision with the Federal Register on the beta?
Mr. Davis: Yes --
Mr. Wash:

Mr. Davis: -- it appears to be
administrative (inaudible: over talking).
MR. TAPELLA: Yes. Actually, Sally, I could probably add a little bit more. That’s actually a decision that needs to go to the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, which is chaired by the Archivist of the United States -- I’m on the committee -- and a representative of the Attorney General’s Office. As you know, we don’t yet have an archivist. He’s not yet been confirmed, but as soon as he is confirmed, we are planning on holding an administrative committee meeting, and I’ll make certain that that gets in the discussion topics with Ray Mosley, who is the Director of the Federal Register, who is the secretary of the committee, to see if we can perhaps make a decision at the next meeting.

MR. DAVIS: And I guess I’d like to add one more thing to what Mike said to answer the question about new systems. Since Mike took over the IT responsibilities at GPO and joined us -- wow, I guess it’s almost, what, five years ago -- any system that we do now have a phases and gates process. It starts with the concept of operations. It then moves into a requirements phase and so on, and so we are very systematic about making changes as we move forth and following a very careful process that is all done very publicly through our program office and up on the web page.

And so as we progress in this everyone will be able to see where we are with any one of these projects from the migration that we were talking about earlier on some of the legacy systems as well as this ECFR migration.

MR. DAVID CISMOWSKI: In Tampa, we were all just very excited about the digitization RFP announcement that it was imminent that an award was going to be given; and now, unfortunately, it’s all come crashing down. My question is has there been any consideration, was there any possibility of issuing a new RFP revised according to what we learned with the failure of the first one to try to interest more than one possible entity in doing a very careful and long-term digitization project at no cost?

MR. DAVIS: That is a good question. I think that what we need to do -- and I might have mentioned it earlier, and if I didn’t I apologize -- I
think we need to go through a good, sound process of how we do this. Sound process meaning I think we need to go back and look at some of the questions that arose after GPO decided that we as an agency were ready to make an award. Issues around personal identifiable information, issues around what role the true funding model and cost be for a national digitization project, what are the long-term cost to the Government Printing Office, how is the information ingested into FDsys and authenticated, and what does authentication perhaps mean for digitized content. In talking to our procurement staff -- and Herb Jackson is here, and he’ll be at our afternoon session, where we can drill into this in more detail. We’ve talked about doing another industry day to have discussions with, obviously, partners who may be interested in doing this again.

Looking back at our requirements that we put forward, there were also some questions about our standards, are our standards too rigid? Should we focus on access first or access and preservation together as we did the last time? I think those are things we need to talk more about this afternoon as well. We also need to look at where potential partnership opportunities from the library community fit into this overall scheme. Since September 30, I’ve been approached by three different library groups about formal partnership and what does that mean in regards to the work that they’re doing, whether that content meets the standards for preservation and access for ingest into FDsys. I think we need to have that dialogue.

And then also the other thing that’s changed, of course, is we have funding, and we didn’t have funding before. How can we use the funding and how can that perhaps be an enticement that didn’t exist when we had no funding.

MR. SHULER: I think we have time for one more question. Anything down this way? Chris.

MR. CHRISTOPHER GREER: I was pleased to hear the direction to pay attention to capabilities for large-scale data download. One of the things that I’ve championed on Council has been application program interface capability, or API capability, for FDsys.
And so I hope that we’ll have a chance during this Council meeting to talk a little bit more about how enhanced API capability is going to be built into that. One assumes that people in the audience are amongst those who are going to download those dataset and create the kinds of mashups that you mentioned using Federal data in combination with local data to meet local interest.

So it seems to me one of the things we ought to talk about terms of FY 2011 funding is what would it take to enable the group to make maximum use of that capability.

MR. TAPELLA: Great question, Chris. And Jim Jacobs, one of our new Council members, is actually holding a session -- Pardon? Oh, James --

MALE SPEAKER: Jim.

MR. TAPELLA: -- Jim -- What?

MALE SPEAKER: The other Jim is holding the session.

MR. TAPELLA: Oh, the other Jim is holding session.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Who’s holding session?

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Oh, two Jims.

FEMALE SPEAKER: There’s a Jim and there’s a James.

MR. SHULER: It confuses us all the time.

MR. TAPELLA: Oh, Jim --

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: The other -- the other one is holding a session.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Just to confuse me.

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: Okay. Whatever. There’s going to be a session later on --

(Laughter)

MR. TAPELLA: -- on this. So maybe I ought to let Ric answer this question.

(Laughter)

MR. DAVIS: We’re having this educational session coming up on the topic of digital deposit and
what that means in terms of the future of the FDLP.

Bob mentioned in his speech our interest in continuing
to serve as an official repository but also looking at
how GPO can be a distribution channel in partnering
with federal depository libraries, keeping with Title
44 mandate about permanent access so we’re not just
having one copy of these materials long-term in a
single location with the Federal Government, that it’s
a distributive model in a digital environment similar
to the digital -- similar to the environment we had in
the print world. So I think in terms of looking at the
agenda that session is probably a good place to have
the discussion about where we go with API as well as
digital deposits.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. We’re about
at the noon hour, which I have learned after 26 years
in academia you never want to get between anybody and
their lunch.

So I want to thank the Public Printer and the
Superintendent of Documents for willing to work with
this, but I have a couple of more announcements, so
don’t jump away yet. So thank you, Bob.

MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Absolutely.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: You can tell that we’ve got this
new routine down like -- but the afternoon session
begins promptly at -- somebody remind me --

MALE SPEAKER: Two.

MR. SHULER: -- 2 o’clock. Thank you. And
before we go, the Regional Selectives Lunch is today.
Check the message board. The D.C., Delaware, and
Maryland region members who would like to gather for
lunch Monday should meet with Bill Sleeman near the
hotel’s main desk.

And finally, for the law librarians, dinner
tonight, sign up in the registration area. And I’m
beginning to feel like Garrison Keillor here. Finally,
this is important, the hotel café is doing a lunch
buffet; menu on the message board. So if you’re
heading back to get your lunch, keep that in mind. And
I think that’s it. Thank you very much. We’ll see you
during the afternoon. Oh, wait a minute. Somebody’s
leaving.
FEMALE SPEAKER: New York meets here. Our regional isn’t here we just discovered. The region is going out to lunch. We can gather right here.

MR. SHULER: New York meet there. Anybody else? Any other states that are lost?

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: See everybody after lunch.

(Off the record)

(On the record -- Afternoon Plenary Session)

MR. SHULER: All right. We’ve come together. Find a seat. We’ll continue with the plenary sessions, the ones for this afternoon, and since I got slapped upside the head about my responsibilities by the GPO staff, I will say this once and very clearly. This room is built for wireless. Let’s hear it for that.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: So if you’ve been mucking around on your computer back there, you can get on the Internet courtesy of GPO. Thank you very much.

Also very important and this is even in capital letters; I’ll even read this out very carefully: When speaking, please state your name and your place of origin for the court reporter, and particularly the folks in the back do not be shy, step up to the mics; they’re there for you. We want you to use them. And the people in the front, the same because the people in the back can’t see the people in the front; the people in the front can’t see the people in the back. You get my meaning.

So without further ado, I would like to explain a little bit why we’re in this situation where we find ourselves on the same floor level as you all. And what we have tried to do is to take the recommendations instead of turning them into a series of presentation first by GPO followed by questions from Council and then questions from the audience, we want to turn this into more of a conversation first among Council members and then with members of the audience. We are very, very interested in what you have to say. We have studied on these things for the last six months and have come up with a structure and approach to many of these recommendations. And what we decided during the summer is we selected five of the recommendations that we felt were extremely important to the community,
and we developed these smaller sessions, these plenary sessions, this afternoon around those issues. So the reason why we are closer to you in this fashion with our arms opened up in solidarity to purposes is to invite you to interact with us, to raise questions, to raise points, and return the Council to what was a very long and honorable tradition that still exists where we use these working sessions to get feedback from the community.

So without further ado, the rest of the 90 minutes before the break will be turned over to the group that is looking at the digitization project aspects, and I ask Suzanne Sears to step up to the mic and run the operations. Thank you.

MS. SUZANNE SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas Libraries. I welcome you all here. I’m glad to see a larger turnout. I know we’re not up against anything, so I guess that helps. (Laughter)

MS. SEARS: But for those of you who were not at the Spring Meeting, we did -- Council presented several recommendations to GPO. Some of those were read and responded to this morning. I don’t know if you received in your packets the recommendations or not. Did they get the --

Okay. Today what we’re discussing is Recommendation 2 and Recommendation 3. We’ve combined them for this meeting. So just briefly, Recommendation 2 is that Council further recommends that GPO maintain a list of libraries volunteering to participate in collaborative digitization projects according to GPO’s standard and that GPO take the lead in coordinating these projects. And Recommendation 3 was that Council further recommends that to encourage collaborative digitization projects GPO requests funding for a state-based grant program for depository libraries to fulfill the goal of digitizing the legacy collection. And so those are the two recommendations that we would primarily like to discuss today.

Basically, what we’re looking for is an open discussion. We would like to hear from you things that you’re concerned about, things you would like to see. We also are hoping to get out of this session a possible listing of actual libraries that would like to
work on collaboration with GPO so that we have a
starting point; so if you do feel that, yes, there are
digitization projects that you would be wanting to
collaborate on, we need to get started with a list so
that we have “these are the libraries that we can call
on to help with this.”

Parameters for the discussion, can we -- we
would like to try and keep this as general as possible
and not institution specific if possible. And the
Public Printer this morning asked us to also work --
now that they did get funding this year -- on creating
a spending plan for the digitization money, so we can
expand our discussion to talk about that too because we
will be trying between now and Buffalo to get something
together as far as the money, the $500,000, that Ric
talked about this morning, so we can expand it to that.

So we want to just start first with
Recommendation 2, and we had a couple of questions
outlined in case we needed them to get the discussion
started. We would like to know what libraries are now considering digitization projects. Can we see like a
show of hands? I know my library is.

(Pause)

MS. SEARS: And so I know I would like to
ask that maybe at the end of this session if you could
come forward and at least let us get your name and your
institution down. That would be extremely helpful for
us to get a starting point.

I guess I should also introduce the four of
the Council members who are working on these two recommendations. Chris Greer, who’s down here, and
Victoria Trotta, and James Jacobs and myself are the
four that are working on these two recommendations.

We also had a question from Council as far as
what percentage of library digitization projects are
actually registered. So for those of you who raised
your hand that you are working on digitization
projects, can I see a show of hands of who is not yet
registered with GPO on the digitization registry site?

(Pause)

MS. SEARS: Okay. So you guys we really
need you to come up and get your name because we need
to get those projects registered. They need to be up
so that everybody knows what everybody is doing so that
we can collaborate together.

Do one of you want to take -- we were interested in the steps to get registered and how to get nonGPO digitization projects ingested into FDsys. We talked a little bit about that this morning. One of you want to take it further or are we asking it from GPO?

(Pause)

MS. VICTORIA TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. It was very interested -- really appreciated the remarks that Mr. Tapella and Mr. Davis gave us this morning about these two projects, and I guess I would like to hear a little more from them. One of the things that I thought that came out this morning that was new to me was that GPO was going to go back and rethink about the standards that they had set out in the RFP and whether or not those could be reconfigured, and I thought that might be sort of a way to talk about how to interest libraries in digitization projects. I know from my own library I’m happy to do something, but I don’t know where to start or I don’t want to duplicate effort. I don’t want to do any of those things, so I’m wondering how as a group we can help manage that process or assist GPO in managing that process.

So I guess my first question is, Ric, what did you mean or could you give us a little more information about how you were thinking about the standards that were put forth in the RFP and how they might be liberalized?

MR. DAVIS: What I was looking for on that was I think David asked me the question about what efforts we might want to make to expand interest in this given that there was only one bidder, and what I was proposing and I think we need to talk about this is what our goals are. When we put out our RFP the first time, our goal behind that was to get a preservation-level quality file from which access-level derivates could be created to expand access.

One of the questions that I think I have is, is that being too restrictive, and it’s something we ought to talk about is, is our goal to revisit the standards with the first goal of expanding access or should we continue to focus on a preservation-level
file from which access derivates can be created. And
the reason I bring that up is when I look at a lot of
the projects that are in the registry and also in
conversations that I’ve had with others who are engaged
in digitization projects what I’m often hearing is
focus on access. So that’s what I meant when I brought
that up and maybe a topic or discussion about what our
approach should be.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER GREER: I guess I’d like to
hear from my fellow Council members as well as from GPO
on this particular point. What I didn’t hear was if
you focus on access, relatively low quality, high-speed, low-cost scanning what’s the next step and how
far off is the next step? What’s the community willing
to accept in terms of a timeline? Is access something
that’s okay for the next 24 months? Next 7 years?
What’s really the goal and what’s the community willing
to accept in terms of delaying in some sense the
business of creating preservation-level documents?

Mr. SHULER: I think at this point I should
look at the community and ask -- redirect the question
because, obviously, the Council and GPO have been in
this dialogue for over six months. What we would be --
especially with a dozen or so of you already doing
these digitization projects what do you think and what
would you be interested in how these projects shape up
in terms of standardization?

Ms. MARGARET JOBE: Peggy Jobe, the
University of Colorado at Boulder. And one of my big
fear is original is if we go with an access model as
opposed to a preservation model that a lot of selectors
will be drastically reduced their collections, and we
won’t have preservation-quality copies to do the second
pass. So that’s just my basic fear. And I know that
whenever I see digitization projects I immediately get a rush
of request to downsize.

Ms. MORIEARTY: This led me to wonder how
many of you are digitizing projects as part of a state
plan or a coordinated state effort?

(Pause)

Ms. MORIEARTY: One.
(Pause)
MS. TROTTA: That’s where the selectors were.
Bill.
MR. SLEEMAN: Responding to your question, John. I guess I would
MS. TROTTA: Bill, can you do your name and institution, please.
MR. SLEEMAN: Oh, yes. Bill Sleeman, University of Maryland School of Law. I guess I would urge GPO to keep that standards high and not look at an access model as their response. I find it unlikely that -- from my perspective that the only reason the vendor -- you only got one vendor in response was the standards for digitization I suspect there’s probably other issues like the return on investment that might have been a bigger consideration. But really if you go to an access model, you’re not going to have the long-term project -- long term reliability. I think digitization for access is something that we can do more readily in the community, but we really can’t invest the dollars to do the high-quality preservation. A lot of us cannot do that. We don’t have the funds for that. We can do a pretty, fast, easy-access project. And I guess I’m relying on GPO and NAR (ph) and groups like that to do the high-level preservation access, and I would urge you not to change or reconsider your standards because I think your standards are very good and very high as they should be.
MR. GREER: So that’s the first time I’ve heard that, that the community effort might be viewed as an access-level effort, and presumably each of you would be focusing on those things for which access is most important to you while GPO would for its part be focusing on preservation-level issues, and I’d be interested in hearing from others about how they view that strategy.
MS. TROTTA: Geoffrey.
MR. GEOFFREY SWINDELLS: Geoffrey Swindells, Northwestern University. I agree with everything that’s been said about preservation-level copies, and I think that’s certainly a role for GPO. However, I would like to make sure that access-level copies, and those of us who are doing this from access-level preservation that that material get out there and be
available for folks to use until we get preservation
copies. And I’m not sure how best to do that, but
centralizing discovery tool so this is available
whether this use copy can go into FDsys, etcetera,
etcetera, as an interim measure is something that I
think is very important because those use-copy projects
are going to be much faster than preservation copy
projects although those preservation copy projects do
need to be taking place.

MR. SHULER: Let me ask the question -- Let
me ask the people that raised their hands and said they
were doing digitization projects let’s ask
specifically, are you doing those digitization projects
for preservation purposes, raise your hand if you are?
(Pause)

MR. SHULER: Not as many. So the rest of
you are access only or primarily focused on access?
FEMALE SPEAKER: Both.
MR. SHULER: Both. How many of you are doing
both?

MS. TROTTA: Larry.
MR. LAWRENCE MEYER: Larry Meyer, San
Bernardino County Law Library. And in answer to John’s
first question, I would hope that any standards would
not forget about the authentication of primary
authority and make sure that there is a chain of
custody and authentication because many of these -- our
users and I’m sure many other people’s users here need
that assurance in digital products, and we don’t have
that assurance on a lot of those products now.
MS. SEARS: That does bring up something
that I had a conversation last week about chain of
custody and possible being able to put in metadata
where the original source was from. For instance, at
UNT, we have the cyber cemetery and we have the Office
of Technology Assessment Documents. Some of those
documents that we have in the cyber cemetery came
directly from the OTA and were never distributed to
depository libraries. So being able to view in the
metadata that that material came directly from the
agency as opposed to the depository library copy, as
opposed to gift, I think is something that we need to
be thinking about including into the metadata or in some way making it so that we can see. I do think chain of custody is a large issue.

MR. CHRIS BROWN:

Chris Brown, University of Denver. To me there seems to be a missing piece to all of these standards, and that is metadata creation. We have all these wonderful digitization projects but no mandate or recommendation from Council that if you want to be a partner with the GPO you must also create or clone the corresponding marked records, so it doesn’t do any good to have a digitization project for which libraries cannot load the records. What I’m proposing for Colorado libraries and partnership University of Denver with the University of Colorado at Boulder there will be a SunRise scanner purchased in the next coming months, and we plan to digitize our microform collection. At the same time that we do that, I don’t know that we can create preservation-level copies from that, sad to say, because they are microforms, but we certainly can create access copies.

What I propose to do at the same time as making this collection is that we take the marked records and clone them. We would contribute them to OCLC, but we would also genericize them by stripping out any proprietary marks, and we would genericize them and put them up on a server for the depository community, so that way they could be loaded into FDsys. They could be downloaded by any depository library, and they would be a way in which depository libraries if they should want to selective could eliminate parts of their fiche and eliminate the records but then simultaneously load the marked records in. So I see that as a good model that we should be working toward, not just creation of preservation- or access-level digital copies but also creation of metadata that can be loaded instantly into our catalogs.

MR. GREER: I’m interested in this chain of custody question. And a question for GPO is even for a project that -- digitization project that GPO is conducting, you may need to get some of the documents from outside the agency. Have you decided on a chain-of-custody plan for dealing with those situations and how does it apply to the example we just heard?
Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. We believe, as you do, that the material is not all at GPO, and in fact we have been collecting it for the last several years, and we’ve been keeping track of what we’ve collected and where we’ve collected it from. That information has got to go into the metadata record, and in fact Suzanne and I were having that discussion when I was visiting. I think it’s very important that we’re able to trace as far as we can that chain of custody, and it may be that the information is unknown, but that should also be in the records so that people can make up their minds is this is the best source or not. It also allows us to be able to make that material available but still look for a different copy of a -- a copy that you can trace back.

MS. TROTTA: Okay. So again, I just want to encourage everybody in the audience to participate. We want as much dialogue back from you as possible because, like John said, we’ve talked amongst ourselves and with GPO, so we are needing your feedback.

What specifically would you the community like to see from GPO to help facilitate digitization projects at your own institutions?

MR. SHULER: Let me rephrase the question. For those of you who did not raise your hand, why aren’t you digitizing? Why aren’t you contributing to this greater project?

MS. BETH ROWE: John, I got up before you asked your question. Beth Rowe, UNC-Chapel Hill. I’ve been wanting to hear more from GPO about digital deposits as a regional, slightly different subject, but I’ll tie it in, trust me, for a couple of years now because I had wondered if they’re depositing records with us a regionals would be a mechanism that we could use to deposit back digitization projects with them. So I’m interested in whether or not that is a possibility.

MS. MARY JANE WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University, and I’ll answer John since I inherited his collection.

MR. SHULER: Thanks.

MS. WALSH: You’re welcome. The original
question is those of you who are considering digitization, so I raised my hand. Small, liberal arts, undergraduate college, few resources, many more than many of my colleagues. I freely admit that, and I’ve had a Cold War-era duck-and-cover pamphlet project on the backburner for the past five years because of my boss. Now, I don’t think GPO can help me with that, unfortunately.

So what can we do? I have a couple of fears about digitization is the sort of thing that I’ve been pulling out of my collection to digitize are those things I think are going to be gray materials that are gone. And John, I’ll tell you my said story about the Bureau of Indian Affairs pamphlets, which directed Native Americans into selected careers where I weeded from our collection; and as soon as I did that, I had a senior research student looking for exactly that sort of information. So it’s these sorts of things that GPO is probably not going to put high on their priority list. Yes, I want to see the important legislative materials, which make up the bulk of the use of my collection, digitized, and I want GPO to concentrate on making or accepting for deposit preservation-level scans because what good are the access-level scans -- 50 years from now they’ll be no better than the fiche that’s crumpling in our hands.

So small libraries like me I appreciate the fact that standards are posted on the web site. I had -- I will freely admit I don’t know if we have the quality machinery although we brought two expensive scanners in the last five years as we try to get our acts together. That’s probably why we can’t afford to scan; we’re too busy scanning. So it’s a matter of personnel, and it’s a matter of technical expertise. I think if the standards are there and we what sorts of things we need to do to help we can maybe pull that off. The next few years in this economic climate I don’t think many of us are going to be able to help because anybody who leaves in our institution is not being replaced including a retirement next year. So -- anyway, hope I answered both your questions. And, no, I haven’t registered because I’m still thinking rather than doing.

MS. SEARS: Before you leave. So in April
in Tampa we heard from the community that perhaps one
of the things that they needed was from GPO to approach
the director and say it’s important that you digitized
this set here. Would that help move your director one
way or the other do you think?

MS. WALSH: Probably not. It’s not that
she’s put a roadblock in the way, but there was a time
period that -- there was a window of opportunity to
scan, and, unfortunately, it was at a time period of
turnover, and the new boss has a new way of doing
things, and perhaps, but the concentration now is -- I
don’t know. I don’t know the answer. I will go back
and ask her.

MS. SEARS: And if --

MS. WALSH: We’re concentrating on our
special collections. I think the duck-and-cover
pamphlets are a special collection, but --

MS. SEARS: If you could ask --

MS. WALSH: I will.

MS. SEARS: -- and then let one of us on
Council know the answer --

MS. WALSH: Certainly.

-- that would be very helpful.

MS. WALSH: Okay.

MS. SEARS: Thank you. Arlene.

MS. ARLENE LIDDELL: Arlene Liddell, from
the Oregon State Library. I guess I’m still kind of
trying to understand why we’re talking about libraries
doing all of this work when in fact Google has already
don’t it. And that’s certainly if I think about
talking to my director about digitization projects
that’s his first answer, “Well, isn’t Google doing
this.” And what we need to do is figure out how to get
access to the stuff that’s already been done. And I
know CIC is working on a project with them, but I would
like to know what GPO plans or doesn’t plan to do with
working with Google and what is out there in existing
projects.

MS. TROTTO: James.

MR. JAMES JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
University. I’m not sure how much I can legally say
about that, but I know that Google is not digitizing
everything. They have specific size, dimension, and
other types of issues, so in my collection maybe 40
percent. That’s a gross estimate. Don’t quote me on that, but Google is not doing everything.

A couple of, well, one comment and then an idea. I don’t know that this preservation versus access is such a good dichotomy to be discussing because in the digitization effort a lot of times what you’re doing is you’re digitizing to TIFF, which is a preservation standard, and then you’re converting from TIFF to PDF or text or other kinds of standards, which are access standards. So in the process of digitization, you’re doing both already. So I don’t know that we should get bogged down in that sort of discussion.

The idea that I was thinking of the digitization registry is already happening, and there was a July document called “Priorities for Digitization of Historical Collections,” GPO July 20, 2009. It’s available on fdlp.gov. There is a list of some priorities, but I think that list could be expanded and could be expanded with the help of the community in that it doesn’t have to just be GPO saying digitize the hearing, and digitize this and digitize that. It could the community saying, ”Hey, we need you to digitize or we need somebody to digitize the BIA pamphlets.” That kind of stuff. So I’d like to see an expanded sort of registry in which the community could help build that registry.

MR. SHULER: Another answer to that why do we have to do this if Google has done everything. Many of the publications such as the hearings include copyrighted material, which throws it out of complete viewing under Google standards. I have found this with many hearing throughout the decades. Some you get lucky on, but I’ve become more cautious about recommending those hearing that have been digitized by various Google projects for exactly that reason. They fall under the copyright gray area.

MS. TROTTA: I think Ric has a comment.

MR. DAVIS: I don’t want to speak for Mark. Is Mark Samler (ph) in the room?

Well, I guess I get to speak for Mark.

(Laughter)

MR. DAVIS: Mark and I have been having discussions not only in the past week but in the past
months about the effort. GPO is certainly supportive of any digitization effort, but it fall under certain parameters: Open, free, permanent access. And if the CIC would like to make that project available in the registry, we’re very happy to point to it. One thing that gets a little bit tricky though is -- I think Bill Sleeman made a very good comment about what the Government’s role should be and sticking with this approach about preservation-level quality. I think as we’re approached by various parties about giving us content to also put in FDsys -- I’m sort of asking this as a question of Council and the community as well -- is that something we want to do? If the CIC or another group was to make that information available, is it enough to point to it through a registry like we have or even an enhanced registry? Do you also want to duplicate the effort of putting it in FDsys if it doesn’t meet a preservation-level standard?

And my second point to that is one of the things I’d like to talk about as well during the Conference is what can we do to make the registry better so that you will want to come to it. One of the comments I heard on break was they’d like to see the -- someone said they’d like to see the registry give a complete title listing of every project. I’m interested in hearing things like that as well.

MS. LAURA HORNE-POPP: Laura Horne-Popp, University of Richmond. We actually do have projects registered. We do the America of War 1941 and 1945 project, and I like to think of our project as a success because the standards that GPO helped established are so good. That’s just the platform we use for all of our digitization now. So I think the way that we were able to go about it because we were very careful in selecting our parameters, we only wanted to look at the life of the soldier during World War 2, we could consider high level of preservation because we weren’t doing something like all the hearings or anything like that.

So I think for some people if you can get your parameters situated in such a way where you get to focus on a collection that means something or you can meet a need because I think you had an excellent suggestion about matching needs with want to do
something -- you get a better handle on it, because I
don’t think my institution would be willing to just
make access-level material because they don’t want to
do it again in a few years.

So I think because we were able to make this
argument these standards are so good, we could use it
across all of our collections. And because of that now
we’re integrating our Government documents into larger
projects, so we’re actually in the process of doing
kind of “America’s Occupier,” where we’re digitizing
all the Japanese criminal war trial material, and we’re
doing it with the strategic bombing survey.

So we’re not even trying to separate out those
materials anymore. We’re trying to pull them together.
And we would not have been able to do that if we
weren’t able to kind of wave those high-level
standards. So I strongly advocate for it. I think
it’s a matter of parameters and biting off what you can
actually chew.

MS. TROTTA: At the back mic. I think you
were first.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I think we came up about
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the same time.

MS. RAMONA HILTON: I’m Ramona Hilton. I’m
from East Stroudsburg University in northeast
Pennsylvania, in the Pocono area. I have a collection
that I’ve been looking at digitizing on Tox Island, on
the whole Tox Island situation, which I believe took in
Federal agencies. I’m also part of the depository
librarians of State system of Pennsylvania’s libraries.
I know that there are some collaborative efforts that
are taking place in digitizing things. The thing that
comes up for me is money, grants. I’m open to
accepting if there is something that I’m missing, but
grants and money is not staring me in the face like
where are the dollars are going to come from.

I’m a small depository, a selective
depository. A lot of the other state system libraries,
document collections are also selective. I hear money,
a grant information from our state collaborative, but
I’m not hearing enough from GPO. So I think -- I don’t
know about everybody else, but I think that money is
big in this, and if you could give us some grants that
might inspire us; also that might help us to take it to
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our supervisors because people like to, they always --
it always good when you say that I got a grant and I
did this great things, so maybe we might want to
consider grants. Money. Funding.
MS. SEARS: That sort of takes us into
Recommendation 3, and I’d like to defer to GPO to
explain their legal authority on grants.
MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: I’m at the end of the
row. It got passed down to me.
(Laughter)
MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: GPO does not have grant
funding authority. We did check in response to the
Council’s Recommendation 3, and Mr. Priebe had
cornerstone with our General Counsel. That’s not
within our purview at this time, but we would like to
hear further discussion on ways of perhaps moving that
discussion forward to another level.
MR. GREER: Robin, I wanted to follow up
real quickly on that. Did you General Counsel have a
position on whether you can contract with a contractor
who would be responsible for a grants-making program or
a subcontracting program with state entities?
MR. TED PRIEBE: I think there was a handoff
that just happened. Ted Priebe, GPO. The answer to
your question is, yes, we had the discussion with them
in terms of what options, as you described, based on
our salary and expenses appropriations being just that,
an appropriated fund source, there would not be a
vehicle like that for us to use appropriated funds. On
projects such as digitization, it would need to be
conducted in a competitive bidding process. So we
would in essence be required to go out with formal
requirements. And even though you’re a depository
library, since it would be a competitive bidding
situation, you would literally be submitting proposals
in that type of a format were we to even be able to
expend fund in that type of manner.
So unfortunately, in the answer to that
question from a grant perspective, we don’t have the
authority and we don’t have the legal means or ability
to go through any organization or another Federal
agency that would. I’m sorry to report, but that is
the facts, and from the legal perspective, that’s
really the response that we got.
MS. SEARS: Before you sit down, Ted. So what are our options then? Would it be possible for GPO to have like maybe a best practices site where if we’re trying to get a grant we have like some experts that we can talk to because it may be the first we’ve filled out a grant, or is there any way that GPO can alert us when a grant is available that we could go out for? I mean are those within your legal purview?

MR. PRIEBE: I think what you’re suggesting to me is another opportunity for the community to look at as a whole what we can do versus GPO exclusively. So when you look at community site and we look at all of the grant opportunities that are out in the Federal Government, not just in the Federal Government, in the private sector, and how those grant opportunities are leveraged and successes that some of you may have had in terms of getting grant that you won and how you went about doing that and how that kind of information can be shared in a collaborative environment to say “Here’s a new opportunity that came out from a public or private sector group.” I would suggest, and I’d be interested in Council’s perspective as well, would that perhaps not be a better way for the community to interact and have multiple opportunities, not just say one depository that puts in a grant proposal, maybe several.

MS. TROTTA: James, you have a comment?

MR. JACOBS: I’m thinking -- I know that the legal parameters are pretty strict on that for good reason I’m sure, but I wonder if as part of the registry, as Suzanne was mentioning, having a list of granting agencies and the possibilities that -- I know that IMLS has not in the past couple of years been all the interested in one-off digitization efforts, but if they had a stamp of approval from GPO that this was not just a one-off digitization that a library submitted a grant for but instead part of a larger permanent preservation and access initiative, I think that would go a long way toward helping those with funding give that funding out to libraries. So just an idea.

MR. PRIEBE: Thank you, James. And another perspective I might add to you, we have had requests in the past and LSCM would be happy to continue to support these requests when folks have grant proposals that
they want to put forward that they come through GPO and

certainly request a letter of support or as

appropriate. That’s another vehicle that we are here
to try to help and strengthen that regardless of the
funding source or funding vehicle that you have, so
please consider that as well.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you. Okay.

MR. MARK ANDERSON: I’m Mark Anderson, from
the University of Northern Colorado. I was one of the
people that raised my hand when you said how many
people have digitization projects that you haven’t
registered. And so I thought maybe the perspective
from somebody who hasn’t registered his projects would

--

MS. TROTTA: And it would be very helpful.

Are there barriers to registration or --

MR. ANDERSON: No. The reason is because
our project was put together in response to a local
request. One of our history professors got a great big
grant from the Department of Education to put on a
series of workshops for K-12 teachers in the -- well,
the Navajo reservation region, the Four Corner, yes,
southwestern Colorado and -- well, what we call the
Four Corners region, and basically he asked me to
digitize as many old reports from the Bureau of Indian
Affairs and old maps and just anything that had to do
with Navajo history that I could find in Government
documents that could be scanned without worrying about
copyright. Basically, he had the history department
grant was paying for the graduate student who did the
actual scanning; basically, where I’m going with this
is that none of that stuff is going to conform to GPO
standards. We just threw it up there because we -- and
we also had an imminent time deadline, so we just ran
it through the scanner and made it into PDF documents
and put it on a web page and -- but there is no
metadata or anything. So I’ve been kind of reluctant
to register it because I was afraid I’d get a call from
GPO telling me that that doesn’t have -- that it
doesn’t conform to standards. I know that, but there
is a lot of really terrible scans in there. It was
kind of a rush project, but it was being paid for by
somebody other than GPO or the library, so that’s --

MS. TROTTA: Ric, do you a comment?
MR. ANDERSON: Do you still want that registered?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

(Laughter)

MR. DAVIS: I want to go on record as saying we want to know, and --

MR. ANDERSON: Oh, okay.

MR. DAVIS: -- it’s not about standards in terms of that awareness. If any of you have projects, I’m encouraging you to register; and if you find it in any way difficult to register, please let me know because I want to make it as easy as possible to expand full awareness of all of these projects.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Well, the other thing about it is there are some documents where we would just scan four or five pages out of a 200-page document because that was all that had all that related to the Navajos, and we didn’t do the whole thing; like we have about 80 or 90 years worth of Bureau of Indian Affairs reports, but just the four or five pages that were actually written by the Navajo agent, so ... 

MS. TROTTO: Robin, do you have a comment on that?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Yes. I think it’s important that information like you just explained is conveyed in the registry, and that’s why it’s a registry of collections. It works to our advantage if people -- if we know what people are working on. And if you have a limitation like that, there is a field that allows that kind of information and also the specifications to choose from would include PDFs not to standard, so to speak. So as Ric said, if you’re finding it difficult to register a project, please do let us know because we took the registry from static web pages to the rather unique format that it’s in now, and we want this to be useful to all.

So I think your project if you would consider registering it would be great. Thanks.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Thanks.

MR. ANDERSON: I didn’t say it was difficult. I just said I never tried.

MS. TROTTO: I think it’s -- (Laughter)
MS. TROTTO: -- I think it’s a very important question, and I really appreciate that you brought it up because I do think that maybe that is why some people have not registered is that they feel that they don’t meet the standards, and it is important for the entire community to know that you have those available because we could access them too. So thank you.

Julia.

MS. JULIA STEWART: Julia Stewart, Southern Methodist University. Let’s see. I look forward to working on a digital project some day. I’ve in the past year have worked on -- ran into some stumbling blocks, and I’m hoping that can -- can find out some more information here. I was working on a group of -- it was from the Department of Social Research, which does not exist any longer. It had to do with photos. It had to do with charts and graphs put together that centered around WPA projects. We didn’t even register. We did -- my team did contact GPO in regard to copyright because we were concerned about the photos because they were from very high-profile photographers. Basically, the response we got back was that GPO didn’t know the copyright and that it was on us to find that out, and I mean that’s fine if it’s true. We had in-house counsel, but that’s time. That’s time, that’s three people working on community, stopped right there. And as the depository coordinator, I was kind of looked at as -- I should have known more I guess. So we never moved forward on that project because we -- Well, first of all, we figured out that our quality was not going to be very good and there were others things in American Memory.

So the things -- the two questions I have: It would be helpful to know a little more about copyright, be able to find out more about copyright issues on a project because we can’t -- we don’t want to -- I can’t devote the time to it until I know it’s something that can be done within copyright guidelines.

And the other suggestion would be -- we didn’t even register this, but if there’s a -- somebody who could serve as a development-type person because, like I said, we got to a point and we realized the quality wasn’t there, and American Memory had a lot of the photos. I mean yes -- we had everything all in it
together, and it was a really cool collection that we
had the whole run of, but it was done better quality in
American Memory as far as the photos were going. So
somebody -- if there were somebody in a development
situation who could say, “Stop, you’re not -- this
isn’t going to -- this is not unique, this is not
quality, we would advise you not to move forward
because this isn’t going to -- this digital collection
won’t work. Please move on to something else.”

And we’re fine. We’re moving on. I think
we’re looking into doing something with the military
now, something with the Department of Defense. But I
would -- I have a great collection I would love to
digitize. I need to start out slowly because I don’t
know a lot about it, but I do have someone to do the
metadata. I do have a digital specialist. I have
equipment, but I don’t -- it’s just discouraging when
you start doing something and then your -- GPO’s
response is, “Well, we don’t know about the copyright
either. If you don’t know about it, we don’t know
about it either.” That doesn’t make you want to move
forward. So that’s all I have to say.

MS. TROTTA: And Robin, you have a comment?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Yes. It really wasn’t a
flip answer. It was an honest response. I asked in
the agency for specifics on that, and consensus could
not be obtained about that particular issue. So the
language that I proposed back was --

MS. STEWART: Sure.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: -- the language that’s
found on the American Memories page essentially saying
we did our best to do due diligence on this and at this
point forward we’re putting it forth; and that was our
best suggestion. A lot of the material in -- you’re
going to find it in the Congressional Record, you’re
going to find it in hearings, as you said, that there’s
copyrighted material there, and releases were never
obtained. If you remember the Royal News Connection
and the FBIS fiche, releases were not obtained for much
of that material also.

That’s a really good question, and the timing
is excellent, but I hope that people don’t think we are
being flip at -- what we put forward is our best
recommendation in response to that.
MS. STEWART: Thanks. We’ll looking forward to moving on and doing something different, and we understand -- we ended up finding out that it was more of a quality issue, but believe me, we’re trying to do the best we can too, so -- and that’s why we contacted GPO when we do have questions, so thank you.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Uh-huh.

MS. TROTTA: Barbie.

MS. BARBIE SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. And there’s a grants program at this Conference, I think, on Wednesday maybe, so that’s -- GPO is helping us somewhat with grants by having programs where people who have gotten them can tell the rest of us how to do it.

Just in response to what she was saying. I mean I was thinking of like a mentoring thing where somebody like the University of Richmond, who’s done a successful project -- there be some putting together of people that could happen through the registry. But the main reason I came up here was we talked by FDsys and the registry and there’s WorldCat and there’s Google and there’s the Catalog of Government Publications and -- I don’t think it has to be the registry is here and FDsys is there and they don’t talk to one another. I would like to see some more transparency because people in this room know those things, but Google will it find it all for us? Probably not. So having some pointer from FDsys to the registry or something like that might make some of this a little bit more discoverable than maybe it is now.

MS. TROTTA: Justin, did you have a comment?

MR. OTTO: Yes. Thanks. I’ve been sitting here thinking about, John, your question: What about all the people who didn’t raise their hand? And I’m one of them. And it’s not that I don’t want to help. It’s that at my library -- sorry, I’ll move this thing over here -- at my library right now for the next couple of years my time is pretty much all spoken for with my regular work duties. There is no spare student employee time that I can requisition to work on these things in a -- in a big way. But I hear -- everybody is talking about and using the term digitizing sets or digitizing collections. What about just digitizing items, individual items? I think the overall goal --
an I’m not saying that anybody is wrong in thinking about things in terms of sets and collections, but I think the overall goal that we’re all thinking about is eventually having a digitized full, retrospective collection of documents. So what about all of the, for lack of a better word, scraps that are falling outside of these collections? I would love to have the ability to see things that are not being digitized and when I have time -- like I can’t justify a big project, but I could absolutely justify some of my time here and there to try to identify things that are falling outside of these big collections and just pitch in.

We have the equipment at my library to produce high quality TIFFs that can be submitted either to one of these big projects or submitted, I’m not sure, straight to FDsys or something like that. I don’t know if I’m the only person in the room who thinks, “Well, I can’t tackle one of these big things, but I would sure like to pitch me because I feel it’s important to try to get these digitization moving forward, but I would love to help.” And so I would hope that that idea could become part of the discussion, and I think I may be starting to ramble now. I’ve got a name tag. I’ve got a mic.

(Laughter)

MR. OTTO: Thank you.

MS. SEARS: Can I see a show of hands? Would there be others in Justin’s situation?

(Pause)

MS. VALERIE GLENN: Valerie Glenn, University of Alabama, and I’m also one of those people who did not raise my hand before, but I wanted to offer another way that people could contribute to other people’s projects, which is what I’ve, I guess, made my focus on. My institution’s priorities do not involve digitizing Government documents. I’m not going to change their mind or try to change their mind at the moment. However, I am a regional, and I have a lot of multiple copies in my collection, and so what I have done is filled in gaps for other people and sent them -- I’ve sent some to Bill of Civil Rights Commission things. I’ve sent some to UNT because I know that they’re doing a lot, and so I think that’s another way for people to help. Even if you don’t have the
resources to digitize, you can help somebody else.
That’s all I wanted to say.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you.
MS. DOROTHY ORMES: I’m Dottie Ormes, from New Mexico State University, and I had to sit on my hand to keep it from going up, and that’s partly because I’m a little confused since I’ve only been at New Mexico State for a year. Previously, I worked at Southern Oregon University and worked on a digitization project and did the metadata for some of it. So I’m very excited about digitization, but I find myself in a place that really has no resources and very little understanding of digitization although we just hired ourselves a new metadata library and are thinking about digitization, and I would like to put my two cents’ worth in and say, “Ooh, how about Government documents.” I’m hesitant to do that because I know from my experiences at Southern Oregon this is very equipment heavy, technology heavy, staff heavy. It’s amazing. It’s an incredibly complicated process, and I’m a little bit gun shy knowing what we went through at Southern Oregon University to get our project off the ground and where we got to with it where literally librarians were at each other’s throats almost in terms of “What’s more important that this library,” and digitization was kind of taking over everybody’s lives, and the ones who were into it wanted it to continue to take over and the others didn’t.

I guess what I would say is that when I thought about it in listening to Justin and what he had to say that would be the better way for me to go would probably be even to have a suggestion from someone who said, “Ho, we know you’ve got a really collection in this. Would you like to work with that and present it to your dean” because I do have a dean that’s very positive about Government documents and want to support it. And if I came up with a really good small project that could push us to the point of getting the equipment we needed.

But the other thing I learned at Southern Oregon University is also making decision on that equipment is a huge piece; deciding whether you’re going to do text mostly and really concentrate on your OCR; are you going to do images. I mean there is a lot
of decisions that have to be made, and from my experience, a lot of libraries don’t have the -- sometimes don’t have a systems librarian that get it. I know we don’t. At Southern Oregon University, we had a systems librarian that got it, but his whole time was consumed doing it, so these are huge issues. We had an IMLS grant. We also got Leader (ph) grants, but then at a certain point, you don’t have the grant anymore and your equipment’s getting old. So to me those are big issues, and I don’t know what GPO can do, but -- that’s why I did raise my hand. (Laughter)

MS. TROTTA: David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: The end of the second recommendation is that GPO takes the lead in coordinating these projects. I think that that’s a very important desire. I’ve been listening to discussions about digitization here for over five years, and there is a certain amount of coordinated chaos in both incoming -- the ingest and also what do you do with what’s already been digitized, how to organize it, how to find it. One thing that we haven’t mentioned at all in this discussion are the digitization projects that Federal Government agencies have been doing on a very large scale. The United States Geological Survey had digitized a tremendous number of heritage documents, so had NASA, the Department of Defense. I’m not sure I know what standards they followed when they did this digitization. I don’t know whether they would be willing to share their products with FDsys, whether any discussions have taken place along these lines, but the big thing that’s missing for me in this is some kind of coordination. I know that $500,000 is not a whole lot of money, but perhaps some of that $500,000 could be spent toward getting a grip on this whole problem that we have here trying to develop some kind of a map of where we are, where we want to go, and trying to coordinate where we go in the future so that we don’t have to repeat what we’ve done before, so that we realize that there will be these sort of small projects that are not going to be done to specification, which are very valuable for the short-term, maybe even for the long-term, and it should be registered, but they’re not really part of the ultimate solution of what we’re
talking about here.

MS. TROTTA: James Mauldin, do you have a --

MR. JAMES MAULDIN: Yes, James Mauldin, GPO.

In regards to your question, GPO does participate in a group called FADI, which is the Federal Agencies Digitization Initiative, where there are approximately 15 different agencies that are doing digitization as we speak. There’s the National Agricultural Library that has done a lot in the realm of digitizations. LC, Library of Congress, they’ve done the stats at large. They’re doing the bound Congressional Record, and we’re working collaboratively with them to ensure that we don’t duplicate efforts.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Thank you. I very much appreciate that. One other thing that I forgot to mention was the day-to-day difficulties that we all have in trying to find out who has done what and what is available on the Web. There isn’t a week that goes by that I don’t see a question posted to gov.al (ph) from some depository saying “Does anybody know if such and such a series or such and such a document is available on the Web.” And quite often somebody will come in, Bill Sleeman or somebody who really knows what’s going on out there and say “Yes, if you go to the American Presidency web site at UC-Santa Barbara, you will find all of the presidential papers, etcetera.” The problem is that we try to remember all this stuff --

(Laughter)

MR. CISMOWSKI: -- but my mind fills up after a while and --

(Laughter)

MR. CISMOWSKI: -- I forget stuff, and I’m sure that you have the same problem, so part of the coordination is discovery.

MS. TROTTA: Cindy, did you have a further comment along that line or is -- Okay.

MS. CYNTTHIA ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Just to add to what James said and to address David’s
comment about coordination of all of this stuff. In
the beginning of August, I participated in a two-day
meeting at the Library of Congress where the whole
topic was “A National Strategy for Public Policy
Information on the Web.” There was a lot of
frustration, as you just expressed, David, in the room
over the two days. By the end of the two days, it was
sort of begging for somebody to coordinate all this
although everybody in the room knew that not any one
institution or any one agency could do it all. When we
left, there was the suggestion that LCNR and GPO take
the lead and work collaboratively together to create
that coordination that you’re talking about. Now I’m
waiting for follow-up on that, but --
(Laughter)
MS. ETIKIN: -- but we have had those
discussions.
MS. TROTTA: I want to let the lady in the
red coat go. She’s been standing there for a while.
MS. DEBBIE MADSEN: Hi, I’m Debbie Madsen,
from Kansas State University. Suzanne, a few minutes
ago you asked one of the other questioners whether a
letter to the library director would be beneficial, and
I believe it would be actually. K-State, for example,
is a land grant. I’m thinking that a letter to the
directors at the land-grant libraries could be very
useful. In my experience, directors confined resources
to do what they really want to do, and perhaps a little
push or a little encouragement from GPO might encourage
those of us who did not raise our hands to be able to
raise our hands the next time.
MS. TROTTA: Okay. Robin, did you have a...
MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Cindy, you are a little
shorter than I am. David and Council, we had developed
the registry, and we have the open forum. We have the
discussion here. What else could we do to help
collaborate, to coordinate? I will tell you that we
have agencies visit GPO waiting for the opportunity
ingest materials into the Federal digital system. They
are very excited about the possibility of taking the
materials that they have either digitized themselves or
we’ll be digitizing and have a safe place to park it.
So that definitely is in the schema and the formulation
for the future. But how else can we do it? I did hear
the letter. That’s a pretty cost-effective way of
putting forth. We have a pile of money now. We’re not
sure quite what to do with that pile of money. I was
hoping that we would hear some direction from Council
and the community on the spend plan -- Ooh, I like that
term, spend plan -- for the digitization efforts. What
is the most effective way of doing that.

And also Barbie’s comment about the
information be available via WorldCat, via FDsys, via
CGP, via the registry; and like our FLIC group is
looking at doing pieceable record. Well, that’s
already in WorldCat. So can we come together with some
of this whole mixture of things with some concrete
directions or proposals besides what I’m hearing, and
maybe you can confirm that, that you want us to do it
to preservation level, that you want us to do it to
TIFF images.

MS. TROTTA: Justin, did you have a comment?
Okay.

MS. MARIE CONCANNON: Marie Concannon,
University of Missouri-Columbia. When we speak about
Federal agencies that have digitized materials on the
Web, I wonder whether we can completely trust that, and
I would like to give an example. The Current
Industrial Reports, of course, long ago it started out
as a paper document; and then at a certain point in
time, I believe in the 1990’s, they changed it, and
they said “Well, you look at this electronic bulletin
board on this new thing called the Web,” and so people
looked to that. And then later on, they started taking
down the older editions of the Current Industrial
Report; and as of last summer, when I was working with
it pretty heavily with a patron, we discovered that we
could get it back on the Web back to 2002, but anything
before that was historic, and you had to pay the Census
Bureau $15 for each report that you wanted. Now as of
a couple of week ago, the patron who I was working with
alerted me. He said “Do you know that they took down
that stuff? Now we can only get it back two years.”
And I looked, and he was right. Now you can only see
the Current Industrial Reports back for two years, and
everything before that is historic, and you have to pay
$15 for it.

Now there’s a couple of things that concern
me. Is this a copyright thing? I know that GPO
they’re system with PURLS if -- they will point to the
agency’s web site, and if the agency should take it
down, they would then point to their archived version.
But if the agency takes it down because they want to
start collecting money for it, will GPO still be able
to point to their own archived version. And further,
libraries, which I’m sure we would all like to have a
complete collection of Current Industrial Reports, if
some library should volunteer to digitize the early
paper versions when the Census is trying to sell them,
will be able allowed to display them on the Web? Thank
you.

(Applause)

MS. TROTTA: I was hoping somebody would
respond to that, but --

FEMALE SPEAKER: That’s what I was waiting
for.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: I’ll respond to it. I think
you’re absolutely right that there are a lot of
decisions being made about what is kept on the Web and
what isn’t kept on the Web that is out of the control
of GPO, the depository libraries, the ordinary citizen,
and it is a form of vigilance that has always been part
of our community that none of this discussion precludes
or excuse us from. I’m hard pressed in a coordinated
fashion how GPO would take on the Census Bureau about
that.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: Not to say that they shouldn’t.
There is a certain righteousness in our community that
we have quick access to that we’ve deployed in other
situations, and we look to our library associations for
that righteousness. So I think we do have mechanisms
that we can use and to deploy in those situation, but a
specific administrative mechanism from just GPO, I
don’t know if that is in a part of our existence.

MS. TROTTA: Robin, did you have a comment?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: No, but I will. If the
material is copyrighted, it takes us outside of the
scope of the program. That doesn’t mean that you can’t
become incensed and go to the parties that can make
changes, and in the past, some of these changes have
been made. You can go way back to a Census publication
where it’s made up CRADA, Cooperative Research and
Development Agreement, that the folks over there did
provide to depository libraries, and that was in part
because they knew the response from the community, but
we can’t lobby. You all can. So if it’s that
important, then that’s a direction that you all can
work on.

Now with regard to the industrial reports, I
don’t know if we captured those before they went away.
That’s one of the things I wrote down to do a follow-up
on, Marie; but if they were copyrighted, you have a
good question there especially if they were selling it.
Remember under Title 44 they must be sold to be self-
sustaining, not within scope of the program. And I’m
sorry, that’s what we have to abide by.

MS. TROTTA: Justin.

MR. OTTO: Robin, in response to your other
question, what can be done to -- just to facilitate.

Getting back to what I was talking about before, and I
saw there were a numbers of hands that went up of
people who would like to help. They just don’t -- they
picked up by the mic okay?

Okay.

MR. OTTO: As I’m looking over James’s
shoulder here, and we’re looking at the registry site
something that -- and I know this would be a huge
project to get it going, but something -- what I’ve got
in mind is just like a huge item-level checklist, and
people who are doing large-scale projects would just go
into this huge list and click the little checkbox by
all the items that they’re -- I know you’re going “Oh,
you gosh” because you’re thinking about --

(Laughter)

FEMALE SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. OTTO: But -- and then we would see
who’s spoken for what, and then I can find things and
say “I’ll do this. I’m from Eastern Washington
University and mark it as well.” And then people could
sort of help fill in gaps. And if GPO could facilitate
something like that, then -- as part of the registry
then that could kind of help keep things moving for
people who can do a little bit at a time.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED:  Boy would I love to have

an inventory that allowed me to list exactly what
you’re saying. And the reason I say smiled is because
the one comment that we had when we rolled out the
registry was it’s too much work to list the individual
titles, and that’s why it’s a registry of collections.
That said, Lori Hall’s group is working on it -- she’s
shaking her head “Why me” -- Lori Hall’s group is
working on digitization of the shelf-list project, and
it could be that we are able to marry those together a
little bit farther down the road so that we have that
capability, that inventory. It also would be a great
way to do disposals automated process, and I think
there is another whole section. Cindy, when is that
being done? After this session, we’re going to be
talking about that just issue. Come on back for more
of that discussion.

MS. TROTTA:  James, you have a comment?

MR. JACOBS:   Just one quick addendum to that.

I think Chris Brown’s idea about metadata and pulling
mark records as part of that could feed into that giant
shelf list idea.

MR. OTTO:   David used the phrase “map”
before, and I think that if we could get that kind of a
list it would probably help move people to action
because they would have -- they could see objectives.
They could see things where they can take action
themselves and contribute. So instead of like me just
sitting around saying “Well, I would like to help, but
I don’t know where to help or how,” it would show me
ways that I can do it; and then if I had a plan of
action like that, I would definitely take action.

MS. TROTTA:  Arlene.

MS. LIDDELL: I’ll follow-up a lot of what
I was going to say Justin talked about, but I do think
that if GPO with all of this money could maybe focus
some staff time into being a little bit more proactive
in populating the registry. Right now it’s relies on
us doing it, but if -- it doesn’t really take a whole
lot of effort to kind of go out there and kind of sift
around and see what’s out there, and so if some GPO
staff time could be devoted to identifying some things
that aren’t on the registry and then either contacting
the folks that are working on it to enter the data or
enter the data themselves. Why do -- why does the
person who does the project have to enter the data in
the registry? So seems to me that would be a really
helpful use of staff time at GPO.
And then another aspect of that is just the
analysis where you see, “Well, we got 10 libraries
digitizing this title; but, hey, guys, you know what
nobody is doing this,” and just drawing more attention
to where the gaps are, put that out in the community,
and sparking the ideas of folks who are interested in
doing something, but they’re not quite sure where to
focus. “Ho, hey, nobody is doing that. Maybe I will
try that.” So I think just kind of taking the registry
and having it be less -- less driven by -- making --
hoping that people will enter their data and actually
proactively go out and enter data for people that
aren’t. I think that’s a way that you could use some
of your resources to help.

MS. TROTTA: Okay. We have about 10 more
minutes. I’m going to let Robin comment on that.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: We have not taken the
stance of entering the data itself because the
information can vary pretty dramatically. We have
increased promotion of the registry, Arlene. I think
the flyers and the recent discussions, but I think your
point is well-taken, and one of the things that I
leaned over and nagged at Ric about is filling of my
preservation librarian to assist with the collaborative
and cooperative piece of this whole project. I think
it’s very important that together we identify these
materials and work to make this happen. No single
partner’s going to make -- Google by itself isn’t going
to do it. Internet archive by itself isn’t going to do
it. It’s only by working together, the small pieces,
the monographs one by one, by one as well as the larger
collections.
But if you have other ways of outreach for the
registry, please do let us know because we know that we
can go to agencies and we’re increasing our visibility
there, and we’re taking the flyers to ALA and the other
events that we attend SLA, PLA, etcetera, AALL. Tell
us how else, other opportunities.

MR. DAVE MORRISON: Hi, my name is Dave
Morrison from the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah. This is an example drawn from my background working with the Patent and Trademark Depository Library Association, of which a number of folks here have belonged to over the year. But for more than 15 years, we have been trying to get the United States Patent and Trademark Office to go back and recover the data from 1790 through the end of 1975, to recover that data and put it into something very, very usable like Excel or comment delimited file so that people could do searches and can do analyses based on classification and show historical changes in time and space for different technologies. When we have mentioned this over the last 15 years, basically the official position has always been “We don’t have the money for this.” And the unofficial opinion has been “Well, you know, we are, our mission is to put out patents and trademarks in as timely a fashion as we can. That’s what we are given money to do. It’s not part of our mission to maintain our historical products in the way in which our larger community like researchers and the -- people across the United States would like them to be preserved in.” And I’m thinking that when we mentioned that the preservation of our historical information product is larger than just what GPO can or cannot do, I’m hoping that maybe we’ll see a change in attitude higher up in the administration that might point out to agencies that they do have a mission to go back and make sure that what they’ve done over the course of the American experience is being preserved and possibly as simply as making sure that it gets scanned into some sort of preservation image. Thank you.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you. We have time for just one more.

MS. HORNE-POPP: I actually have two proposals for Council and for GPO. And the first, in terms of a place to start -- and I’m piggybacking on Justin’s recommendation that if we could fragment this a little bit more. Several years ago now -- and it’s escaped me how long -- we had a survey of what titles we thought were the most important to digitize first. I think we could easily use the results of that survey as a place to start. We’ve already decide what those
priorities are, and I think it’s a great pilot.

The second recommendation would be -- and this
is piggybacking on Barbie Selby’s comment about
mentoring -- I think we have OPAL -- and we can talk --
maybe in some fashion GPO could be coordinating
libraries to talk with one another so institutions that
have been able to digitize are able to talk to
libraries that haven’t; they’re able to talk about some
of these things; it’s in the repository; people can
come back to it. So it’s a way for GPO to establish
networking basically. So those are my two suggestions.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you. I would like to
courage all of you -- I know from experience it can
be intimidating to come to the mic your first time, so
I would like to encourage you that if you do have
comments about this topic, if you’re sitting there
talking among yourself, “Oh, well, what about this,
what about that,” please, please, please, put that into
an email and send it to somebody’s on Council so that
we’re getting feedback from you so that that
information is contributing to our discussions that
we’re having because we want to make sure that we’re
considering all of the angles. Are there any other
comments from my fellow Council members?

MR. SHULER: The follow-up to Chris Greer’s
early remarks about priorities and timelines. Is there
anybody in the audience who believes we have another
five years to discuss this?

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: Is it a better sense of the
community that if we don’t accomplish something of a
reasonable nature within the next year or two, it’s
much more realistic, otherwise we might as well just
forget it? Is there a sense of impending sooner than
later?

(Laughter)

MR. O’MAHONY: Just to underscore John’s
point of sooner than later. While the current
discussion with respect to what to do with the $500,000
is focused on the historical collection, every day we
sit here we’re losing web content of contemporary
materials. So that’s the next $500,000 project.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

(Applause)
MR. O'MAHONY: I don't need that yet.

MR. SHULER: I want to thank -- that was excellent. Thank you to the group for guiding us through that discussion. Thank you to the audience for participating. And now I get to say very simply, it’s 3:30, a little bit before maybe, I guess we get to eat cake now.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: So let us eat cake in celebration of the library of the year. Thank you very much. We’ll see you back here at 4:00.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: Thank you, group. Well done.

(Off the record)

(On the record -- Afternoon Plenary Session)

MR. SHULER: All right. I’m going to begin the proceedings for the second afternoon session, which is going to be a very deep, significant analysis of the discard process, and we’ve going to learn much from it; but before we do, I’ve been asked to announce that Goddard (ph)/SLA is having happy hour from 5 to 9 p.m. in the Skydome Lounge. Be there or be square. Gwen.

MS. GWEN SINCLAIR: Good afternoon. I’m Gwen Sinclair with the University of Hawaii at Manoa Library. I’m here to introduce this afternoon’s session on discard. This session is the product of Council Recommendation 4, which states “Council further recommends that GPO report at the Fall 2009 Meeting on best practices for the streamlining of the disposal process.” So Cindy Etkin of GPO is going to present the requested report. She’ll be followed by Lisa Russell, who will be talking briefly about needs and offers. So, Cindy.

MS. EKTIN: When John put everybody down here, he wasn’t thinking about short people.

(Laughter)

MALE SPEAKER: Harder.

(Laughter)

MS. EKTIN: Was that Larry?

(Laughter)

MS. EKTIN: As you all heard from Ric this morning when he was talking about the responses to the recommendations, he mentioned that for this particular recommendation we were taking a two-pronged approach:
One is the best practices and education, and the other is the creation of an automated tool that will help with the needs and offers process. So I’m going to talk about the best practices and education, and Lisa Russell will follow with the discussion about an automated tool, and I get to use one of these for the first time. I was told to go slow, so I hope I can and in the right direction.

One of the things that came to mind and was actually mentioned a couple of different places was that we were talking about two different processes here: The discard process and the needs and offers process. While they are very related, they have different purposes, so we’ll look at them a little bit separately.

The discard is, of course, letting depository material or selective take depository material out of their collection, those materials that are unwanted; and the needs and offers provides the sharing that’s required. For this we have consensus. Nobody likes these processes. Not your depository coordinators, not your staff, not your directors, not regionals, not selectives, and maybe perhaps used book dealers would like it, but we finally have consensus on something here.

(Laughter)

MS. EKTIN: So what does Title 44 tells us about this. Everything in relations to the discard process and the governance is in Section 1912, where it says that the regionals within the regions served will provide assistance for depository libraries and the disposal of unwanted Government publications. Further down it say “Regionals may permit their selectives to dispose of Government publications which they have retained for at least five years after first offering them to other depository libraries within their area, then to other libraries.” So the first part is the discards, and the second part is the needs and offers.

Of course, we have a little bit of a change with the substitutions, so the five-year thing is sort of not absolute. Back in around 1973 and -- Jill, you were here? You may remember --

(Laughter)

MS. EKTIN: -- when Council --
MS. MORIEARTY: Let me make this real clear: No, I was not here.

MS. EKTIN: I thought you were left standing.

I apologize.

MS. MORIEARTY: ’77.

MS. EKTIN: Oh, okay. I’m sorry.

MS. EKTIN: I apologize. The Depository Library Council around 1973 developed some guidelines, and the guidelines were a recommended level of conduct and -- in quotes there. And the guidelines included these responsibilities for regionals. The first was “Attempting to complete their retrospective collections of major serial, annuals, and other research materials by means of gifts, exchange, or purchase including microforms, screening all lists of documents withdrawn from selective depositories to ensure their future availability in the region, and providing guidelines to selective depositories for preparing disposal lists of unwanted documents.” So if you can find out who was on the Council 1973, you can thank them.

MS. EKTIN: In 1995, there were problems that this procedure that is an onerous one for depositories. Compiling lists of materials is labor intensive. It’s difficult to find space for storing documents to be discarded for months until the lengthy procedure is completed. Okay. It’s 14 years later, and we’re still having this same problem, which sort of brings this all to a head this fall.

In 1995, a memorandum was sent to regional depository libraries from what was then Depository Services -- in Library Program Service, and it granted regionals greater flexibility and more latitude and more discretion within the weeding process of this selectives. It allowed them to permit discards of materials by visiting the library and eyeballing rather than requiring a list. It allowed regionals to issue needs, “I need this. If you have anything else that you’re discarding, go ahead.” Allows regionals to eliminate listing of fiche. Allows regionals to
identify materials that always need to be listed and materials that do not need to be listed. And actually the last bullet item permits the development of an automated discards list in conjunction with the superseded list. That actually was done, and some of those things you’ll find incorporated into the substitution guidelines, which will also be discussed at this meeting. Things like dated material. If there’s an expiration date on something, you can go ahead and withdraw it even though you haven’t had it for five years. Things like that.

In the Federal Depository Library Handbook, it says the principal responsibility of a regional depository library is to ensure the comprehensiveness and integrity of the Federal depository resources in the state or region, and that come from that same guidance. And the 1974 instructions drew heavily on the recommendations in the Council guidelines. This has been brought forward in the various versions of the instructions since that time. But note that it doesn’t say that the regional collection has to be located in the regional library proper.

We were trying to get an idea of what you all thought about the whole process and what you would like to see retained in this process or given up in this process. In early August, we created a discussion forum on the community site, and we asked -- it related to needs and offers and discards for questions. I’ve only got three here. Lisa will deal with the other one in just a bit.

We asked -- Section 1912 is your only requirement. That is what I showed you earlier on the slide. “If you were starting with a blank slate and had to design a discards, needs, and offers process, what would it look like.” We got four responses. “Are there any issues that impact you as a regional depository library that you want addressed in a revised discards and/or needs and offers process?” And we got one response. “Are there any issues that impact you as a selective depository library that you want addressed in a revised discards and/or needs and offers process?” And we got zero responses to this question. So we are still seeking input. I’m very thankful for the five people that submitted, but it would be nice to have
It’s really hard to make policy on the opinion of five people.

But this is what they said: “Current system creates pressures to dumpster unwanted materials rather than getting them to people who need them. If we get no takers from needs and offers, I’d like to give them to a bookseller. Set up an eBay account to sell the discarded materials and have the proceeds go to GPO. Let libraries sell discarded materials and have proceeds go toward digitization.” And that was actually mentioned twice, that same suggestion.

“Regionals can identify agencies for which they have no or few publications. Create agreements with selectives in their area for them to hold them locally or to send them to the regional.” Another suggestion: That the regionals inventory 3,000 item numbers most frequently collected by their selectives, and then you can identify gaps. “Authorize all but two selectives to withdraw specific SuDoc stems for specific years, and then what’s left in the backup you can divide the responsibility among the selectives in the state so that everybody is participating in the creation and maintenance of the comprehensive collection.”

So while we only had five comments -- or five submissions, we got some pretty good ideas here. I don’t know what we can do about the funding thing, but the suggested uses for those monies I think are good.

We also started to collect all of the discard policies from the regionals, and I want to thank Ann Sanders and Janet Fisher. Is Janet here? Thank you for helping me gather all these together and for Ann for putting them up on the community site under the regional site accessible to all of us. And I also want to thank Ann for this wonderful summary. She sent me a summary that she had provided -- what, to Regional, is that correct?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Huh?

MS. EKTIN: Oh, to Regal. I’m sorry. And her first line was that she could tell that plagiarism was alive and well, and I told her that was certainly the case because these next two slides are her summary --

(Laughter)

MS. EKTIN: -- although I may have shorten
the lines so they fit on the screen. Five states don’t have written guidelines. About half the regionals don’t limit the size or number of lists that can be sent to them. Three states require libraries to follow a calendar that is limiting disposal list to certain SuDoc classes, certain months. Eleven states don’t exempt microfiche from listing, and a number of states don’t require listing CDs or DVDs.

Continuing on, three states ask selectives to contact them prior to weeding, and the regionals offer to visit. So here we get into a little bit of the eyeballing that was allowed in 1995. Three states are now doing that. Ten regionals covering 13 states have procedures that are intended to reduce the amount of listing required. For instance, they identify materials that don’t need to be listed or, they just ask for certain date ranges or SuDoc stem ranges that are on their discard list to make it less labor intensive to create the list. And most states use web pages or electronic discussion list to distribute the list to a broader community. One state uses a wiki and another one uses FaceBook.

So in looking at some of the comments that we got back, not from the community site but from the report that we did last year for JCP on the condition of regional libraries. There was a lot of discussion in there about needs and offers and discards lists, so I’m just putting on a thinking cap and looking at possible alternatives to detailed lists, and some libraries are already doing some of these things, but not all libraries are. Visits by the regionals, we’ve already three. One libraries is doing what they call the laptop-and-cell phone method, where the regional will go to visit the selectives with a cell phone and a laptop, and they’ll go through the stacks and look on the laptop if it in the catalog. And they’ll call back to the office “Do we have this, da, da, da, da.” So it’s a real-time process. When the regional leaves, the discard decisions have been made.

Checking the regional OPAC, this assumes that, of course, the collection is cataloged and that the records are maintained very well. Reducing the information provided on the list. We’ve already mentioned that. Titles on lists already reviewed by a
regional don’t have to be listed by other libraries for a specified period of time. So that if I’m a regional and I have a list from selective A and they’ve given me 10 pages of titles and I’ve gone through them and I don’t need them, I can say to the other selectives in my regional “I’ve gone through all of these titles; if you’re getting rid of these titles, go ahead. I’ve seen this list. I don’t need to see them on another list from you.”

Where a regional permits selectives to send to another regional that is collecting retrospectively by checking their OPAC, this would be where a regional would, for instance, say to their selectives “These are the things I need, and if you have any of those that you are discarding, send them to me. If not, anything else you want to discard, I know this library is collecting comprehensively. Check their OPAC. If they need it, you can send it to them.” This, of course, would be through memorandum of understanding or agreements between the institutions. So these are just possibilities, and I’m sure that you all have other thought of what could be done, and maybe we’ll have time to, hopefully, get into some of those ideas.

As I mentioned, Ann put all the discards procedures up on the community site, community.fdlp.gov. if you are registered, you can go on in there and take a look at them. You’ll find under file sharing I think there are about 10, and those are procedures that the files are actually loaded onto the community site. And you can also go under Web Links, and then you’ll find links to all the others on the regionals’ web sites. So all of them are there either under file sharing or under Web Links. If you are not a registered user of the community site, I encourage you to do so. Just go to the URL and click on that Register button.

I’m going slow. Factor or myth. Regionals must collect retrospectively? That’s a myth. Regionals are required to retain what’s distributed to them and there is not an obligation to go back and collect materials prior to when they became a regional? As I’ve shown, it’s been in the guidelines and brought forward; and even as it is today, the regional itself does not have to hold the materials.
It's just the integrity of the collection that's in a state.

Selectives must submit lists to regionals? That's a myth. Most regionals still do to varying degrees, but there are other options now.

Selectives must obtain their regional's permission to discard most material? Yes, indeed.

Regionals must retain all formats of all titles? No. They only need to retain one format.

Regional permission is required of selectives to substitute online for tangible publications? Yes.

Maybe this little chart will help clarify some of the requirements. So what I'm suggesting as a best practice is that regionals need to work with the selectives to determine what's best for their regional.

You all need to sit down at a table and talk about it. Let everybody know what your resource issues are. You need to consider the needs of those you serve, and you need to implement a process that's best for the entire region and recognize that compromises may be necessary, and you want to revisit the process to evaluate its success and revise it if necessary. And you can always consult with our staff if you have any questions.

So this is two processes, remember. So we've talked about the discard process, and now under Section 1912 we get to the part of depositories are still required to discard only after permission received from the regional and after first offering them to other depository libraries within their area and then to other libraries, and that's the needs and offers process. Lisa is going to talk about that. So I'll turn it over to her.

(MS. LISA RUSSELL: I'm actually not going to talk very much. I'm going to try to get you all to talk. But I did want to start with SMimaging (ph). We put some stuff out on the community web site to get some discussion started. One of the questions was if you were building an automated tool for needs and offers database, what would it look like. As of last Friday, we had 12 comments. I didn't try to go through and say this many people said this and this many said that. Hopefully, you'll all go and take a look at it. A number of people said that they wanted to see it
linked to the CGP or the ILS to sort of fill in a
template. We got that quite a bit. We also got --
Cindy mentioned the laptop-and-cell phone method.
Somebody suggested that it should be something you
could you on a mobile device and go out and check you
stacks with it. Of course, we had they wanted to be
able to search by SuDoc number. We want to be able to
sort by date range. A lot of those kinds of things.

One of the other things that we heard was
people wanted to be able to indicate if something was
needed for disaster response; if you’ve had a flood and
lost 10 years of something, you want to be able to put
that in and indicate it’s for a disaster. What I think
I heard in the last session is that maybe we ought to
be able to indicated that something is needed for a
digitization project.

So with that, I’ll throw it out there for
comments.

MR. SHULER: Does anybody on the Council have
any thoughts or questions?

MR. CISMOWSKI: In your thinking about this
and in your comments whether they come now or in the
future, I think all of us would like you to really
think outside of the box here especially for that
second part, how to automate the needs and offers
process. Right now in many regionals and states it’s a
very, very labor-intensive process that involves a lot
of duplication in many ways. For instance, in our
state, we require that people do lists. The lists come
to me via email attachment. I review the list or my
staff does. Then I send instructions back to the
selectives. Then they post the list, as an attachment,
to our state electronic list, CalDocAI (ph). The
duplication there comes in having to pass attachments
back and forth in emails, so I’m thinking for our state
is there any kind of a way that we can use a wiki or
Goggle Docs or some mechanism like that where people
can post things once, and then collaboratively we can
review these lists. That is a regional I would do
mine’s first. I would claim the stuff first, but we
wouldn’t have to pass Excel file back and forth via
email.

So that’s the type of thinking that I’d like
you to pursue in your own regions and states. Look at
your procedures, look at what your regional want you to
do, and is there any way that we can use technology to
simply that process.

MS. MARGARET JOBE: Hi, I’m Peggy Jobe from
the University of Colorado at Boulder, and we’re the
state that uses a wiki unless somebody else had joined
us. But for the things that we require a list on, they
send them to us; we search our collection; we delete
everything that we’re taking, and then we post the list
to a wiki; we never send out the list again; we just
send an announcement once a week on Fridays saying
which stems we’re posting. So something will go up on
the wiki by stem. We say what the date is, and then
people are building. Like if they’re building in the
A’s they have a certain amount of time to claim it.
Otherwise, once that’s done, we allow people to
withdraw. We found that really using the wiki has
really speeded up the process, and it eliminates
passing those files back and forth. It’s wiki-lite
because we’re really doing all the posting. We’re not
letting other people post to it, but we do use other
wikis in the state; like we’re writing a state plan via
a wiki and that kind of thing. So we’re using wikis a
variety of way. I think the selectives in my state
would say that they much prefer it to getting the lists
-- the emails with the lists attached and everything
like that. They can just know which stems they’re
trying to collect in, know what the expiration date is,
and then they’re good to go.

MS. SINCLAIR: It’s seems to me in a vague
recollection that my very first Depository conference
in 2000 somebody addressed the regionals meeting, and
it may have been Connecticut, and talked about an
automated system that they had developed. Does anybody
know anything about that or remember that?

MS. SANDERS: That was Maryland. Michigan
also dabbled it in, but ours ran afoul of Y2K, and it’s
that long ago, but I don’t know if there’s anybody here
from Maryland who can speak to whether or not that
system is still running.

MS. LORI SMITH: Me? Should I go ahead?

MS. RUSSELL: I think we got someone from
Maryland who’s going to take a shot at answering that.

MS. CINDY TODD: My name is Cindy Todd. I’m
from the University of Maryland. I’ve only been doing
documents for three years, and I’m not aware of any
such process at Maryland. What we do sounds very much
like what’s been described here. We pass list -- Excel
list -- through email, but we do post -- the different
libraries post them on their web sites, and then they
send messages to the selectives that their lists are
posted on their university web sites.

For example, I look through the list from one
of the selectives. Once I’ve cleared it, they post it
on their web site; then they send out a message to the
other members of the community that the material is on
the web site. Our listserv doesn’t permit us to pass
attachments through the lister. Hence, we have to host
them on the web site. Does that help?

MS. RUSSELL: I think we’ve got a former
Maryland person behind you who’s going to add a little
bit more to that.

MS. ASHLEY DAHLEN: Hi, Ashley Dahlen. I
used to work at the University of Maryland. We did
have a database set up. We ran into problems though
because at that point I think we had like 65

depositories in our region. We had a high staff
turnover, which made it very hard to train people how
to use it and how to use it consistently, and we also
had problems with consistent formatting. Some people
would submit lists and the column would be in the wrong
order, or they would submit one line that would have
all the information in it. So we just -- it wasn’t
workable for us given the amount of libraries we had in
our region and the staff turnover, so consistency is
very hard to get.

MS. SMITH: Now me.

MS. RUSSELL: Now you can go.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern
Louisiana University. Our regionals are now working
from some sort of 1998 list, I think it is, that was an
agreement among the regionals of specific SuDoc numbers
that they would collect retrospectively, so they now
ask us also to list superseded items in those areas
that were assigned to Louisiana. So we are not only
listing the regular stuff and doing that via email.
We’re also listing superseded thing, and if you think
people don’t like the regular superseded process -- the
exchange process, this superseded listing really grates
a lot of people. But our regional asked us, and we
want to help them, so we’re doing it. But does anybody
else know about that agreement and is anybody else
doing that?

   MS. MORIEARTY: Was that part of their
state plan?

   MS. SMITH: No, my understanding is it was
an agreement among the regionals at some point. I
think it was 1998, but I couldn’t swear to that.

   MS. ANN SANDERS: Ann Sanders, from the
Library of Michigan. I don’t know how I ended up to be
the repository of all this weird information because --

   (Laughter)

   MS. SANDERS: -- I really knew more about
disposal than anybody in America wants to or should,
but --

   (Laughter)

   MS. SANDERS: -- that agreement between the
regionals is actually older than ’98. It goes way
back. I can’t even tell you what the first iteration
of that is. When the first superseded list came out --

actually I think when that happened -- Michigan also
does ask. We don’t -- we don’t come with a big stick.
I don’t know if somebody doesn’t put something on their
list, but we do ask if there’s a title about Michigan
or the Great Lakes we don’t care if it’s superseded or
what it is we ask that you list it. Do they really do
that? I don’t have any way to know. It’s a courtesy
kind of a thing. It’s not a requirement, and we’re not
going to not pass a list because we suspect that you
didn’t list everything. It’s just not that -- -it
doesn’t seem to be that big of a deal. But I know that
superseded agreement among the regionals was not really
intended to add that much, that big of a layer of
bureaucracy to the whole process.

   MS. RUSSELL: I think Cindy’s got a follow-
up, and then we’ll go back there.

   MS. ETKINS: You didn’t get to the little “r”
thing, and I think what they’re referring to, Lori, is
in the superseded list there are some of those entries
that have R’s by them, and those are the ones in the
superseded list where various regionals have agreed to
keep retrospectively. The superseded list doesn’t tell

which regional is keeping which “r,” but those are the things that are covered under this agreement.

MS. BETH HARPER:
Beth Harper, University of Wisconsin-Madison. I can say from being on the regional’s list in a very great while someone will say “I have someone looking for this item that was really supposed to be superseded, but now they want it in print.” So as much of a pain as it is, it has come in handy one and a while.

I was going to go back to -- kind of pie in the sky what would I like in a needs and offers automated list. I do picture something where you can like check off the -- put the SuDoc in the Needs and Offers List and something that would allow you to collate a bunch of lists at a state level; like our list come out the third or fourth week. We go up on the third or fourth week, and I’m looking for certain SuDocs, and I like to scan one list to look at all the SuDocs, not go through the ten or whatever.

MS. WALSH: Again, being encouraged to think outside of the box, we’ve got basically two conditions for problems. If you stuff is catalogued, it’s a heck of a lot easier for you to generate that list from your catalog and shoot it someplace. So you need a system that can import, say, a list of item numbers or a list of SuDoc stems or whatever in some sort of delineated fashion that we don’t have to manually check off. Then of course, we’ve got the 18XDX through 1974, which many of us haven’t catalogued yet, which we would prefer to have something we could check off boxes on rather than to have to -- or maybe even that if we only had to key in the SuDoc and maybe the title and the date. It would be helpful.

But how you get that list, do you work from the 1908 checklist? Do you spend your $500,000 buying access to some of the retrospective digitized database? I don’t know that answer to that, and I’m not technologically savvy enough, but -- so you’ve got the old stuff, the new stuff, the cataloged stuff, the uncataloged stuff. Ideally for stuff that’s newer and/or cataloged we want to be able to shoot automatic concatenated lists so that we don’t have to look through this list and this list and this list and this list. And I’m with Wisconsin on that one. And then
what do you do with the old stuff. Having said all of
that, I’ve just made a connection for my Bureau of
Indian Affairs pamphlets. Yes, I’m so excited.
If anybody has them, come see me. As much as
this is a pain in the petuti, there are -- in the
things that you may not think are valuable may be
really valuable for everybody, so I hope that we don’t
end up saying, “No, don’t need to list anything” or
just going to say, “I’m getting rid of A’s this month,”
because that’s not going to help the people. That puts
the onus on the people who are trying to
retrospectively collect rather than discard.

MR. SHULER: I’m going to say a comment here.
It has nothing to do with what we’re talking about, but
I need to make an observation. We’ve been requested by
several people in the audience that when Council
members speak they somehow stand to be recognized. I’m
going to say back rather than trying to -- this is all
new to us as we’re doing this on the floor. We’ve
going to discuss that during the Council meeting and
see if we can find and elegant way to address the
problem from those that you can’t see us when we’re

talking, like I am now, and maybe come up with a
solution.

(Applause)
MR. SHULER: So if you don’t see it right
now, it isn’t because I didn’t listen to you. I just
haven’t figured out an elegant way to introduce the
problem. Thank you.

MS. MARTHA CHILDERS: Hi, Martha Childers,
Johnson County Library, in the Kansas City metro area.
This is a little bit outside of the box of the problem
that we’re discussing here, but I wanted to present to
the group to things that we are doing. If specialized
libraries might be interested in some of the things
we’re discarding after they’ve gone through the whole
process, we are offering them to them. We’ve given
five boxes of things to the Library of Congress. We’re
going to be giving some things to the Linda Hall
Library. The Eisenhower is interested in some things
we have. Truman’s taken some things. The World War 1
museum is interested in something. They’re chomping at
the bit for something that’s waiting for the process.
If we are not able to get rid of things in this way,
then we put them out for the public on carts, and they take them.

MS. SELBY: I’m not going to ask for a show of hands or anything, but a selective asked me wondering how many selectives really look at these needs and offers. You’ve got this state-level version, and then the national-level version. Could it be one version instead of two, where they were advertised once to everyone?

The other thing I was just thinking about: We check our things out that we know we’re missing, and so my state has to review that list before they then -- then they send me those things that they’ve got, and then I can look at the list. I’m wondering if there is any way to use CGP to do that at a national level somehow so that there is one review list that’s checked out in CGP and UVA needs this and Maryland needs that or something?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: This may be a far-fetched comment, but I guess it just occurs to me to wonder when I see the statement about regionals only need to keep one format that there are some things that only regionals get in print like the serial sets, the bound Congressional Record, and maybe nobody would ever get rid of that to keep some other format, but I would just hope that that would be sort of an exception that they would have to keep that or at least offer it to somebody else in their state like a law library if they didn’t want to keep it.

MS. BETTY FEBO: Betty Febo, Wellesley College. One thing that I do that makes it a little bit easier is when I send out a discard list I send it to the regional and to the other selectives libraries I sent it to at the same time with the caveat that the regional library has first choice of any materials that they need. I give the other selectives a deadline. The regional has no deadline, but then at least I know that when I get information back from the regionals whatever they need I send it to them; whatever they don’t need, I’ve already taken care of the other process, so I can then just discard the materials. To answer Barbie’s question a little bit about the national Needs and Offers List, I do not usually look at it. I had a grand plan at one time about
making it a student task to look at the Needs and Offers List, to look for publications on women because as a women’s institution I thought perhaps that was a role that we could fill, to collect retrospectively women’s publications. It didn’t work out very well, but thinking about it, I may go back to it and see what I can do.

The other thing is at one point decided to get rid of duplicate copies of the Economic Report of the President and Statistical Abstracts, and I decided that was important enough that I was going to post it on gov.al. I had put it to our state and local area first, but I put it out on gov.al and got response, which led me to a problem that nobody’s addressed yet, and that the issue of postage. Because we, our institution could not afford to pay the postage to send these materials out, if somebody wanted one item that was fine; but I had responses back that said “We’ll take anything you can send us,” which led to multiple cartons. So then I felt in good conscience I had to tell them an estimate of how much this would cost just so we all knew, which led to weighing cartons and sending them and how we were going to get labels; and it led to sort of a big process that made me wonder why I did it in the first place.

(Laughter)

MS. FEBO: But anyway, that led me to wonder is there a way the GPO could help with postage in some manner whether we tell them how much it will cost and they send us a prepaid label, whether they give each library a certain sum. I hadn’t worked it out, but I was wondering is that a role that GPO could play so that postage does not become an issue?

MS. RUSSELL: That’s a good question. I’ll have to follow-up on that one. Here comes Robin.

She’s going to follow-up on it right now.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: It is a good question. My initial gut reaction is I don’t think we can do that, but it doesn’t ever hurt to ask, so we’ll check that out.

MR. ROB LOPRESTI: Rob Lopresti, Western Washington University. You’re talking about thinking outside the box, let me just tell you what I think would be wonderful to see happen, which should be a
national computerized system which, as someone suggested, we could download stuff directly from our catalog into it or type stuff in. This would be a form so that you’ll have a place to put the SuDoc number and the title and the year, and I think that’s probably all most people want or need. And since it was a national system and we have to go through the regionals first, you could set it up so that the first week or the first month only the regional of your state could see it, and then only the ones in your state could see it, and then the whole country could see it, and then it’ll be one system. So you would have to reinvent the wheel or put anything in twice or three times.

And at the same time, you could put in offers on that -- I’"m sorry -- needs onto that system, and the computer could do the matching for you because computer can match things real easy. Okay.

MS. JUDY SOLOMON: Judy Solomon, from Seattle Public Library. Just throwing this out: As a public librarian, I’m the one that actually types up the offers list. The library spends $33 an hour to have me do this. More hours than I care to imagine, and I am only in census right now, so I have a ways to go for evaluating our collection and putting up the offers. Yes, ideally it there was some way that we could have some system to be able to offer things without having to type up a list.

MS. BARBARA LEVERGOOD: Barbara Levergood, from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. I have a concern about particularly old and valuable materials. We recently had several volumes from the American State papers that we offered through needs and offers, and we go takers for two or three out of the four or five volumes. I’m told within our state that after we go through this process no one wants them but we still want to withdraw the materials the next step is to pulp the documents. That’s against my professional ethics, but the only other alternative for us is to put the materials back into the collection and then hope that next time we weed someone will take them. So I’m wondering whether you might have a last resort collection somehow for materials such as these that we want withdraw from the collection but can’t find an immediate home for.
MR. JOHN STEVENSON: Hi, John Stevenson, University of Delaware. The question about postage and postage reimbursement for offers comes up pretty frequently. A lot of us don’t have the authority to issue stamps, but in our library, we were able to reimburse quite well by using the same carrier as the other library offering us items was using and our number could be then applied so that it was basically like a C.O.D. And this maybe really advantageous if you’re getting several boxes from a source to simply have it billed to your library, and someone in your acquisitions department who does this with other vendors may be able to help you set this up.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. CONCANNON: I’m with a regional, and I know that I have the authority to eyeball collections and point to huge swatch and say “Well, this part you should definitely list. This part we want. This part perhaps we don’t have to.” And what I need is more collective wisdom about what is considered desirable and needed and what isn’t based on what gets claimed from lists. Because it’s usually the selectives that receive the requests from these exchange lists, they know more, I think than I do, what tends to get requested from their list. I’m in a little bit of an unusual situation because I have quite a bit of backlog that I’ve been listing myself. I’ve been typing exchange lists. We’ve been doing them ourselves and sending them out, things we had in storage that were just -- we don’t know the status of, so we’re just listing them. And I see people don’t want CDs. They really love the historic hearings. Fiche, people don’t seem to request that. And even down to different title -- I have heard that the Mineral yearbooks, nobody wants these things.

(Laughter)

MS. CONCANNON: I tried to list census materials, and had some difficulty placing those, and the Congressional Record I’ve got -- I can’t even tell you how many hundreds of volumes that I could not place, and they were on the national needs and offers; and like a previous speaker, I feel very uncomfortable throwing the Congressional Record into the dumpster; 500 years from now or 100 years from now these would be
extremely rare, and I’m sure that the public, whose tax money paid to have them printed, would like to have them exists.

What I would like to see, to sum this up, I would like to see more collective wisdom from the selectives who are making these lists, a sentence or two after their list has expired to say “This is what was popular and this wasn’t.” This would help me as a regional quite a bit.

MS. RUSSELL: Just to follow-up on that. Would it be helpful if we developed a system that could provide some sort of statistics on particular stems that are claimed more often than other?

MS. CONCANNON: Statistics would be nice, but even some qualitative data would be fine. By the way, the library of literature does not seem to address this.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. SMITH: In this theoretical automated system for creating lists that we’re spitballing, everybody seems to want to be able to search by SuDoc number, but we have in our Dewey Decimal Classified collection lots of documents that predate our designation as a depository, and we don’t have SuDoc for those. So keep in mind that we will need to be able to look it up by title or some other -- ISBN or something to do that automated list. And also, if it’s serials, we’re going to need some place to designate exactly which issues we have to offer -- probably not a check-off box, but something if it’s serials to say which ones we have.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. CARMEN ORTH-ALFIE: Hi, Carmen Orth-Alfie, University of Kansas. I’m one of the few people that actually posted some suggestions, and I have no idea how widely it was read, so maybe it was an important -- an embarrassing thing, but I actually posted that maybe something very similar to a library thing could be used so that we could have -- get away from having high expectations about what the record quality is, that we’d have something out there. We would access to over 600 online catalogs that you could search and pull records into so that -- I know there’s a lot of students that do a lot of the data entry for
these lists, and at least they would not have to know quite as much as -- they don’t know very much. I’ve seen some lists that students do. (Laughter)

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: And I understand that the selectives have very limited resources, and so if you could have a student go pull off a library thing, which they’d probably kind of start to understand already because it appeals to them, have them search by calling -- not by calling everybody -- by title, find the matching record. If we started having a database or our own collection within something like library thing, then that would be the first place she’d go look. And we could have it -- within that we could have collections of this is being digitized, collections of this is needed, and collections of this is being offered. And you could create a whole national list. Now I don’t think we could probably do this with library thing, but maybe there’s a way we can make an agreement with library thing. But I think it’s definitely an outside of the box way to approach it and a national level of approaching it. I echo some of the same concerns other people have. If I just go eyeball something as a regional, I might be allowing something to be discarded that is desperately desired by someplace else.

And also, the other thing I wanted to point out is that the way we’re doing lists right now -- we did a small little survey within the state of Kansas, and I know that my selectives pretty much are not looking, and if they are looking, there’s so many lists that are posted on email that if it doesn’t clearly have some kind of clue as to what it is, they won’t bother to open it. So if you just say “We have a new list,” I really doubt there’s a lot of people looking at that; and that the list that they’re taking the time to look at and the list that I take a moment to look at are the ones that give me some kind of clue to that call number range, that date range, etcetera. Thanks.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. WALSH: She sort of beat me to it, but we’ve heard it now from several people. We’re more likely to look at lists that have been pushed to us rather than lists that we have to go in and search.
I’m not quite sure -- maybe we need to be talking with Amazon.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I think that your comment fits in with Rob’s comment earlier because I’ve been thinking about the possibility of a national list that is much more technologically robust than the current Needs and Offers List is on the GPO web site. You can bad-mouth the SuDoc number system a lot, and there’s a lot to bad-mouth about it, but one of the really wonderful things about the SuDoc number system is that every SuDoc number is unique if carried through to its fullest extent; that is, every single piece has a unique SuDoc number. So what if we could develop a system where you could input titles into a national Needs and Offers List, and I know as a regional that people don’t know how to input SuDoc numbers correctly, but maybe that doesn’t matter because you can normalize the SuDoc numbers. Then people who are looking -- depositories who are looking for material, who have needs could input SuDoc or ranges of SuDoc numbers, and then the system could do that automatic matching that Rob was just talking about and send out an alert; that is, yesterday somebody posted what you need. And I’m wondering if that could be technologically possible. I think it can.

The other thing I’d like to say about automation is that I’ve thought a lot about the mechanism that’s used in documents data miner, the shelf list feature of that, and wondering if that could somehow be applied to automatically creating disposal lists. The problem with documents data miners is that it only goes back to about 1998 or so. The other big problem is that it’s based on your current selection, item selection profile. So if you’ve changed your profiles since 1998, you’re not going to get what you selected in 1998 or 1999 if you use the shelf list function. But one of the things that I’ve brought up with some of my selectives in order to get them thinking about this is that what if you went in to documents data miners and specified “I want everything from 1999 that I selected” and it would be today’s current selection, and you would get a lot of stuff that you would have to weed out of that list; but you
can download the SuDoc number, the title, the date, the shipping list date. You can download all that stuff automatically in a common delimited form format. Then you can take that and you can strip out the stuff that you’ve lost, strip out the stuff you’ve already offered, strip out the stuff that you don’t want to offer, and then you have your list.

So those kinds of automation could really be used to keep from having to key in every single thing. So those are just some of the things that I think about when I’m taking a shower in the morning.

(Laughter)

MS. RUSSELL: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: One of the frequent comments in the comments that were appended to the report on regionals was that regionals don’t review their selectives offer list in a timely manner. So I’m wondering if we can get some feedback from the community about what is your definition of a timely manner.

Come on. Someone’s got -- pie in the sky, how fast do you want it to happen?

(Pause)

MS. RUSSELL: Did you want to respond to that?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes, I would be generous and I would give them one month.

(Pause)

MALE SPEAKER: That’s pie in the sky right there.

(Laughter)

MS. COLEEN PARMER: I like the way we do it in Ohio. Coleen Parmer, Bowling Green State University. Our regional does not review our list. We put our list up, but we review what they’re looking for, and so we can highlight for them if there’s stuff they need. And we only have to leave it posted for six weeks, and then we’re done.

MS. SANDERS: Is Audrey here? Is the regional collection in Ohio really completely cataloged?

MS. AUDREY HALL: No.

MS. SANDERS: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Any other thoughts on that
one? Okay.

MS. ELAINE HOFFMAN: Elaine Hoffman, from Stonybrook University. I’ve been a documents librarian for about 18 years, and I’m just curious seeing as we have all the people in the room. How many of you are actually looking for anything?

(Pause)

MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. There are a few because what I get complaints about from my two office people that are left is we’ve been doing these lists for years and years and year and nobody ever wants anything; it’s a waste of time. So it’s good to know there are a few people looking for things.

MS. SELBY: I guess -- Thank you. That was my point earlier. I find it interesting that we just had the digitization discussion and what do we want with that, and now we’re talking about moving paper documents around the country where we know there are 50 -- theoretically. I know there’s not 50 copies of each of these, but -- it’s a cost benefit here, and we do it at the end of the month; we turn them around in a month; we leave them up for -- and I don’t review them all. I eyeball the lists, and do find things that I want and go check those, but I don’t check them all, and most of the things are five years old, and there’re new when I’ve got them, and they’ve -- no, I haven’t lost them because they’re not checked out to discard or to loot (ph) missing. So I just -- I do think there’s a cost-benefit here that we need to examine in this whole issue.

(Applause)

MR. JACOBS: Barbie, do you think it would be faster to digitized those documents that you wanted to --

MS. SELBY: That’s what we were saying.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Send them to you.

MR. JACOBS: Yes, digitized them and send them to FDsys.

(Laughter)

MS. SANDERS: I guess I’m the professional devil’s advocate here. I come from Michigan, which is the land of the obsessive organized when it comes to disposal, but we have a situation in our state in which we used to have two regionals, and now we have one.
The one we have is kind of precarious these days, and in reviewing lists from the Detroit Public Library when they stopped being regional and became a selective, the first year I took 10,000 items. So, yes, there’s a cost-benefit analysis for you there. I think the key to this whole discussion is that it’s different in every state. I was fascinated in looking at the different disposal guidelines in -- I was fascinated by the states that said “We don’t have disposal guidelines. Just mail it all to the regional.

(Laughter)

MS. SANDERS: My staff had palpitations when they read that, okay. I seriously thought I was going to have to do CPR for a minute.

(Laughter)

MS. SANDERS: A lot of states where you have to contact the regional before you begin to weed, well, that to me suggests that weeding is an occasional process or project rather than a daily process. So I think that’s kind of the point I’m trying to get at here is that it’s absolutely unique in each state, and the amount of communications between the selectives and the regionals I think is pretty key to making everybody a lot happier.

MS. SINCLAIR: For some reasons, your remarks made me think about what states that don’t have a regional, that are not served by a regional are going to do and how they’re going to fit into this best practices model because it’s certainly possible that there will be more and more states that are not served by a regional.

MS. RUSSELL: Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: I can address -- can you hear me? Okay. I can address Gwen’s question there. If they are not served by a regional, they cannot discard. We just had a recent ruling on that from our General Counsel.

MS. SINCLAIR: Back again. Maybe we need to take David’s pie-in-the-sky, technologically robust system and marry it to Barbie’s cost-benefit analysis, okay.

(Laughter)

MS. SINCLAIR: And instead of listing everything you have to offer because I’m one of those
people who are looking “Did you really throw out the Congressional Record?” “Hey, I’ll talk to you later.” I’ve got holes I’m trying to fill. If I thought people were looking at the needs lists on the national Needs and Offers List, I’d be more comfortable; but since I know, even though I’m trying to fill holes, unless the list is pushed at me saying “This has got census materials, this has got Congressional Record material, this has got serials set, etcetera,” I don’t tend to look at it. So maybe we should have a national need list and not worry about the offers. That’s real devil’s advocate, complete opposite.

MS. KIM FOURNIER: I’m Kim Fournier, from Schoolcraft College in Michigan, and I’m going to have to go against the grain here. Our regional posts a list of their needs, and we check it monthly. If we have something that they want, we send it, and then we post our list to the national Needs and Offers List, and I was really amazed to discover that every, every list that I’ve posted of my offers I’ve had takers from all over the country, and I was astounded. But it’s really gratifying for, and I hope we keep it up. I don’t think -- maybe because it doesn’t work well for everybody we shouldn’t throw it out. I think it can be improved upon and expanded and enlarged because it really works for me.

(Applause)

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MS. HALL: We do post our needs list. However, not everything we have need of is on that list, especially the older material that’s not in our catalog. So when I get a list from a selective, I kind of scan it, and if it’s something maybe ‘30s, ‘40s and earlier, then I take it to the shelf and check, and I’ve been -- we’ve been heavily weeding in our state, and I’ve taken quite a bit of material.

MS. SMITH: I did a presentation this morning on how I had to dramatically downsize my collection, and I think that’s true for a lot of selectives. We are losing our land to other purposes in the library: Information commons, they want more computers. So I think most of the selectives we’re trying to get rid of our collections at this point is my impression. So, yes, we’re mostly in the offers,
and it does seem like there are some people who are in
the needs business and are actually collecting things.
So I really like the idea of the national needs list so
that we wouldn’t have to type up anything. We could
just search the national needs list. If our thing that
we have is not on that list, then it could go. Of
course, after our regional has approved it somehow. I
don’t know they would do that. But I really like the
national needs list idea.

MS. SEARS: I like the idea too, but here is
my question. Does anybody know exactly what the
hundred percent inventory would be so that we would
have a list to check against to say what we don’t have?
MR. CISMOWSKI: I think I have the same
concern. As a regional, we have over a million titles
in our physical collection, and every time I take a
list out to the stacks I find something that is missing
or we never got. Granted some of those things are
inconsequential I suppose in the larger scheme of
things, but if we’re supposed to have a comprehensive
collection as a regional, maybe they’re not
inconsequential. But the problem with only have a

needs list is if one of the primary purposes of the
disposal process is to make sure that your regional has
a copy of what you’re getting rid of, short of a 100
percent inventory, and when you have a million items to
inventory, that’s just not going to happen with us.
How do you just have a needs list? It’s a good idea,
and I want to do some thinking about that, and I think
we’ll all going to do some thinking about that, but I’m
having a hard time wrapping my mind around that right
now.

MS. JOBE: I don’t want to contradict you. I
just want to give people statistics. We’ve been doing
a hundred percent inventory on portions of our
collection, and we have 10 percent of the collection
that we didn’t received or is missing, so that’s
actually for the areas that are a hundred percent
inventoried. That’s kind of alarming. That seems very
high to me. I’m not sure what other people think, but
that number seems high.

MS. ETKIN: I just want to ask a question of
regionals. Do you all ever say no when people put
something on a list and say, “No, I’m sorry. You need
that to cover your area of the state or what have you?"
MS. SANDERS: Believe it or not, yes, I have. I had a selective library that their catalog was largely -- their collection was largely uncataloged. They dated from 1907, and they wanted to get rid of their run of the monthly catalog, and I said no. And they fought me all the way to Sheila McGar (ph), and Sheila backed me up.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: I’ve been thinking about Buffalo.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: And I’m trying to imagine what we would discuss about this topic in Buffalo. What do you guys want us to do? I’ve heard a lot of different things. It still seems to me that I haven’t heard clarity yet except somebody needs to do something some time soon. Is that about right?
FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

FEMALE SPEAKER: That’s true.

MR. SHULER: We have a lot of people throwing up stuff to grab. We’ve got a lot of people wanting stuff, but it’s like eBay with dyslexia nobody is connecting.

(Laughter)

MR. SHULER: So I’m -- I’m turning toward GPO folks here. Help me out.

MS. RUSSELL: I would actually like to put in a plug for the community and anyone here who has comments when they get back home, if they have comments that they get a chance to put in today, I’d like to ask you to go to the community site and share them. If anybody -- if you read anything there and it triggers anything, please share your comments. We will be starting on our requirements document, and we can share that out and get comments from the community and see if you like what we come up with based on what we’ve heard here and what we hear through the community site.

MR. CISMOWSKI: When Ann and I and Gwen were talking with Lisa and Cindy about this program, John, it became apparent to us, I think, that GPO is in sort of a brainstorming mode as far as automation of needs and offers. And I guess what I thought that we were doing here is just doing that brainstorming, and
it’s got to continue because we have very little representation from the entire community at this Conference, and we need to use the community web site, and we also need to maybe post appeals for other people to input ideas. But eventually I think that there will be -- there will be something -- there will be a product that will come out of this or a methodology that will come out of this eventually. It’s just that we’re not -- we don’t have enough raw material to forge that product yet.

MS. ETKIN: I just want to respond to David. He’s absolutely right. This was a brainstorming session and to try to encourage use of the community site so we can gather all of your ideas. We know that not everybody is here, and so we are planning to do an OPAL session in early December, sort of a repeat of this and with the transcription service available we’ll be able to include also all the questions and the comments that you all have provided us today. But the end result of this, Lisa is absolutely right, is we’re going to take all the comments and design something and put a requirements document, and we’ll be able to share that.

MS. MORIEARTY: And I’m about to get in a whole lot of trouble. We’ve had this discussion for decades, which has been pointed out to me that I’ve been here --

(Laughter)

MS. MORIEARTY: -- through several --


MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you.

(Laughter)

MS. MORIEARTY: Guys, one of the things that also come across is it is flawed, it doesn’t always work, but it works an awful lot. Even people who admit it -- and I’m the first one to admit -- it can problematic when you looking for something or when you’re trying to give something that you think is very, very valuable and your community says, “No, it’s not.” I don’t want it, no one wants it, and then you’re left with, “Yeah, but somebody’s going to want it in the future.” Well, no one wants it now, and they may not want it in the future. But you know it has worked. If
we could put our collective wisdom together and figure out how to modify this enough, perhaps make it electronic, more interactive, certainly faster. We’ve all been in that condition that we’ve taken it off the shelves, and it’s piled up somewhere that GPO can’t find it if they paid a visit, and it’s there --

(Laughter)

MS. MORIEARTY: -- in three, four, five months, respectively --

(Laughter)

MS. MORIEARTY: I think we’ve got the bare bones of what works for us, but if we could just move it technologically, make it more interactive, then we’ve got a pattern already. I’d hate to see we throw this out entirely and invent something new that hasn’t been as proven as this. And you can find me tomorrow morning at coffee and tell me how wrong I am. Thanks.

(Laughter)

MS. RUSSELL: I think we’ve got about five minutes left, so if the two people who are at the mics want to go ahead and comment.

MS. BARBARA REHKOP: Hi, I’m Barbara Rehkop, from Washington University in Saint Louis. I thought I heard in last session that GPO was automating the shelf list. Is that correct? Could I have 150 word summary of how that project is going? Thanks.

MS. RUSSELL: Lori is going to address that.

MS. HALL: The shelf list, the pre-’76 shelf list, we have transcribed about 6,000 monographs from the historic shelf list from 1880 to 1992; approximately 850 of those are now available in the CGP. There are also mark record with one authorized LCSH subject heading, and one authorized name authority file. So the project is still continuing. We’ve just announced the award of a contract for a company to come in and transcribe the rest of the shelf list card for the next two years, so that project will continue till we finish up. That’s what the omnibus money was for. Anything else specific? Now remember these are brief bids. They’re just from our shelf list card. They’re not going into OCLC right now because we do not have the material. We’re working with OCLC right now to determine how we’re going to batch load these things,
but they are -- they’re pretty good little records if you take a look --

(MS. HALL: Well, yes, of course, the shelf list is only what we have. We don’t know whether it’s complete or not. It’s what we have. We have not compared it with the MoCat or anything yet. We’ve just transcribing it. So does that answer the question? Is that okay? Okay. If you have any other questions about it, operational open forum, we can talk a little more about it there.)

MR. ANDERSON: One of the problems that hurts my soul the most about this whole things is -- people have been talking about rare and historical documents when you have a -- when you have some of them too that you want to get rid or you want to leave for the library, but the places that are -- the limits of where we are allowed to offer these things is limited to depository libraries; in other word, if you can’t find another depository library that wants it, you have to toss it in the dumpster. Or you can keep it.

(MS ETKIN:)

them only to depository libraries. They just have first choice.

(MR. ANDERSON: But you can’t go to the rare books and antiquities dealers and sell them. MS ETKIN: That’s not offering them to other libraries.)

(Laughter)

MR. ANDERSON: Well, yes. The things that bothers me about it --

(Laughter)

MS ETKIN: Yes, I -- I know --

MR. ANDERSON: -- is you go on the Web to these rare book and antiquities dealers, and they’re selling these things for 4 and $5,000 and so -- there’s got to -- there should be a way that we could offer them out on the open market if there isn’t another depository that wants them and with the profits going either to FDLP or the library or --

MS ETKIN: Yes, and -- you don’t know how many times we’ve heard that --

MR. ANDERSON: Uh-huh.

MS ETKIN:
that we got on the community site too, and maybe it’s
time we asked that question again of our General
Counsel, but for the short term any way, our hands are
tied on that.

MR. ANDERSON: I’ve seen maps that were
pulled out the serial set probably stolen originally,
but they’re first -- they’re in a nice frame, and
they’re like $700 bucks a piece and I --

MS ETKIN: That’s why one of the suggestions
was --

MR. ANDERSON: -- yes --

MS ETKIN: -- set up an eBay account and the
proceeds go to GPO.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes. That would be --

MS ETKIN: I think it’s a good suggestion.

Now --

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS ETKIN: -- whether we’re allowed to do
that is certainly another matter.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

MS ETKIN: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: And I’ve got probably four or
five copies of the Ferdinand Hayden survey of the
geological survey of the territories where they went
through Yellowstone Park, but anyway.

MR. LOPRESTI: Cindy, I’d like you to
follow-up on what you just said. He said that you
don’t -- he said you can give them to depositories or
nothing else, and you said, no, that only the first
step. There’s another step after that. What is it?

MS ETKIN: You can offer them to other
libraries. Or do as some folks have done and put them
out and people just take them.

MR. LOPRESTI: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: Robin has something to say,
and then we’re done.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: If you are in a
multibranch system -- after the regional says, no, we
don’t them, the selectives say we don’t want them, go
ahead and share them out to the other libraries in your
-- on your campus or your multibranch system. You can
also reach out to neighboring public libraries. And
yes, a lot of time they’ll say “We don’t want this
stuff,” but if you got maps, maps are great things for
offering up to other folks, especially folks that are
doing instructions, so high school and other media
institutions. Go ahead and think outside the box with
those. You just can’t sell them, and if you do, you
have to return the money to the Superintendent of
Documents.

MS. ETKIN: One final note, John. (Laughter)

He’s dancing here.
(Laughter)

MS. ETKIN: The last institution I worked I
found great success in sharing some of the materials
that we were discarding with the public schools.
Always in need.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, again to the group.
Let’s give a great hand.
(Applause)

MR. SHULER: Personally, I think this is
going very well; and to show you how selfless your
Council is, while you were out having drinks and
whatever with yourself, we will continue to work here
selflessly on your behalf considering these important
issues you raised. You can stay and watch us before
you go drink.

MR. SHULER: Or not. But thanks again.
Session is over. Wait a minute. And Council just stay
for a moment, and --

MALE SPEAKER: John?
MR. SHULER: Yes.
MR. SHULER: Five till 7:00 on the very top
of this building in the Sky -- excuse 5 till 9:00,
Skydome Lounge, the tiptop of the building. Thank you
very much. See you guys tomorrow.
(Whereupon, session was concluded.)
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MR. JOHN SHULER: I call into session the second morning of the 2009 Depository Library Council, and I thank you all for coming back. We hope we have as an interesting day as it was yesterday for you all to take part of and take part in.

First of all, I must under federal law say a few things. Very important when speaking, please state your name for the court reporter. Also, if we haven't said this before, wireless is available in this room courtesy of the GPO, which we should all recognize and applaud.

(Appause)

MR. SHULER: Very good. We didn't even have to write a recommendation on that either.

Finally, public library's lunch, today at noon, meet by the registration table.

Okay. This morning is going to be focused on the strategic future of the program and those of us, the librarians, that make up our community of service. And we have -- for the first hour of this session, we have two featured speakers. One will be talking about the report that was distributed last week by the Association of
Research Libraries and mentioned by the Public Printer in his remarks yesterday. The second speaker will talk about the future model, a future grant that is looking at the education of government information librarians in a world dominated by the term "electronic government and digital services."

What we would hope would happen in the last 30 minutes of this session is that both speakers will generate a conversation, first amongst council members and then with the audience, about what these two views of the future might mean for the strategic purposes of the Government Printing Office. Of course, the Public Printer alluded to some of what he's interested in, and we really, really, really do care about what he's interested in, but we are also practitioners who have our own body of best practices that are influenced by both what is happening in our institutions, as well as what's happening with GPO. But as I said, it is a community of expertise that is shaped not only by what these agencies do, but what we need to do in order to inform the public with government information.

So I would like to first introduce our first speaker. That's Roger Schonfeld (ph) from Ithaka Consulting Group. I didn't say the whole name because, you know, that's just the way I am. And he will give a few remarks about the report, the summary of the report that was issued last week. So if I could ask Roger to step up to the podium, thank you very much. We'll have questions after the two speakers are done. (Applause)

MR. SCHONFELD: Thank you, John, and thank you to all the members of the council for having me here today and to the GPO, as well, for inviting me to speak.

I am actually going to try to speak from a laptop because I was too afraid of that clicker thing that everyone was working on yesterday, so I hope that that will work out okay.

I'm really delighted to be here. My -- I'm -- oh, sorry. How did that happen? It's still going to have a minds of its own.

I'm really delighted to be here today, and I wanted to just start off by giving a quick word of introduction to my organization just because I know many of you in the room will not necessarily be familiar with it. Ithaka S&R is the strategy and research arm of an organization called Ithaka, which is a not-for-profit organization that -- that has been 0005
in existence for several years that, in essence, supports innovation, especially in higher education, developing sustainable business models for initiatives, as well as organizations themselves.

Some of the research and analysis that you may have seen or may not be familiar with basically is on the impact of digital media, and particularly the impact of digital media on research teaching and learning. So we've done some work on the sustainability of online academic resources, a lot of work on the print to electronic transition that libraries are facing, things like the economics and preservation of policy questions associated with that transition, work on university publishing in a digital environment, faculty attitudes and practices where we've surveyed faculty members extensively, so just to give you a sense of some of the kinds of work that we've done prior to this project.

Chasetore (ph) and Portico (ph), just to be, you know, sort of full disclosure and let you know are also part of Ithaka. There are other arms of Ithaka along with the strategy and research group. And for those interested in more information, there's a website that I could point you to.

On the project that I'm about to -- to share some background on, I just wanted to acknowledge my colleague, Ross Houseright (ph), who's in the audience, was my collaborator in this project from S&R. So the project itself, as John mentioned, was and is an effort that was commissioned this summer by the Association of Research Libraries and an organization called COSLA, the Chief Officers State Library Agencies that many of you will be familiar with, as well, basically to examine the current state of the FDLP and make recommendations about -- about what its future might look like, looking at -- looking towards a sort of comprehensive framework that would take advantage of what the digital environment is all about.

Now, the FDLP, as you all know, serves a wide variety of needs across different -- different stakeholder communities, and one of our tasks in this project or priorities in this project was to try to understand all those different stakeholder communities. So we spoke with something on the order of 80 individuals, actually a little larger than 80 individuals, talking to people from 30 academic -- excuse me, not 30 academic libraries, 30
libraries all together, including academic, law, public and state libraries, and we really tried to build a system-wide understanding of the -- of the program.

And so while I want to emphasize that although Ithaka S&R's background is in the academic community, we really worked hard, not least through COSLA but also through a number of public libraries and law libraries and the AALL to really understand all of the different communities at work in this program.

And one other thing that I would just mention briefly is that Ithaka S&R's experience is principally on the sort of questions that touch on organizational structure, so you'll hear me using words like "incentives" quite a bit during the course of the presentation. But what I want to emphasize is that that's not an effort to undermine or in any way call into question the deep set of public interests that are at stake here and the -- and I want to try to do my best to emphasize that at the same time.

And finally, I would like to just say a brief word of thanks to the many individuals in the room who actually participated as interviewees, including several members here up on council, so we really appreciated and valued the help that so many people were able to provide.

Now, what I thought I would start with is a vision for -- for the program, and this is a vision that -- I mean, this is not sort of a -- a well widely vetted vision, but this is a vision that -- that at the level of consensus across the various members of -- who we interviewed, I think, is something that probably would ring right at least at a high level sense with many of you. And what I'd like to suggest is that we're -- in this project we're looking for a way to make this vision true not only today, but also in the future, and I think that -- and we also want to examine how well today the program lives up to a vision like this. I imagine this is visible in the back, so I won't -- I won't try to read it out, but this is -- this is the kind of vision that -- that we like to look at.

So in looking at the state of the program today, at a high level, what can we say about it? Very, very valuable historical collections, hugely important current information that meets a range of important needs for a democracy, services to maximize discovery and expedite support, the use of the information, and I think a number of things that -- where access to the workings of the government is actually
imperative to the work of a democracy in a way that -- in a way that really syncs nicely with the open and transparent agenda that the Obama Administration has before it today. So I think one of -- one of the questions that we've pursued in the background is what -- how could -- how could this program sort of fit -- fit in in a certain way to that kind of -- to that kind of agenda.

Now, this is a graphic that many of you will have seen from the summary document, but I just thought it would be useful to walk through it, because this basically encapsulates our sort of analysis of what the -- how the FDLP operates today. So what you have going from left to right are a set of con -- what I've called content types, the collections that are managed and preserved and disseminated, we hope, and ways of empowering the use of those collections. So I don't know how well the colors come across, but boxes numbers one, two and three are pink, and the reason those are pink is that those are digital. So born-digital government information, as well as digitized print documents feed into digital collections that then have a set of management and preservation and dissemination affordances associated with them. And then boxes number four and five, which are blue at least on my screen, are the print side where print documents are produced and print collections are, again, managed, preserved, disseminated and so forth.

The vertical line between digital collections and print collections indicates that there's actually a substantial -- as we all know in part from the discussion yesterday, substantial dependency between digital collections and print collections, in the sense that as more and more collections are being made available digitally, libraries are electing to -- to collect and maintain a smaller amount of print looking from a system-wide perspective. And at the same time, the quality of the digital informs what can be done with the print, and the quality of the print informs the thresholds that are needed for the digital. So there's a very tight set of interdependencies both on that vertical, but also moving from left to right in terms of the quality of information and what that -- excuse me, the quality of the documents and what that means.

And then finally, both digital and print collections drive both discover -- drive discovery and outreach and use and all -- and many of the important services that are
provided around government information.

So I think I've -- I hope I've mentioned the
dependencies here adequately, but what I also want to say is
that there's a very particular set of incentives that are
baked into the program the way that they -- the way that the
program has existed, and those incentives are particularly
on what's now labeled numbers four and five, the sort of
print documents to print collections, and then to number
six, the discovery outreach and support, in which the
incentives that libraries have had to participate in the
program at the institutional level, that there was a
particular set of incentives that existed there that are
increasingly going to be different, and as -- given the
amount of dependencies in the system, as you begin to pull
things apart, the incentives change, and I think that that's
one of the most important findings from our project.

So I'm going to just very quickly run through those six
boxes in a little bit more detail. Most of this is not
going to be new to very many people in the room today. As
you know, there's a significant share of government
documents. It's in the 93 to -- I think it's now in the 97
percent range that are available digitally, and there's a
decreasing share, it has been decreasing the last several
years, that are available in print. So the reality is that
prospectively the program has become increasingly a digital
rather than a -- or I shouldn't say the program, but rather
the information has been increasingly available digitally
and decreasingly available in print.

At the same time there's some -- there are a number of
considerations here. One is the issue of authenticity that
I know is particularly important to the law library
community, but also to some other elements of the community,
where the GPO as we've been -- as we've been told by the
AALL has been -- has successfully developed mechanisms that
will address some of the previous concerns that existed
about authenticity, and we heard quite a bit about the sort
of, you know, different levels of authenticity that might be
needed for different kinds of documents with the -- with the
core legal records certainly at the top of that pyramid.

But looking forward, the notion of thinking about
stand-alone documents with -- sort of in individual
containers of their own is one that -- is one that's
increasingly being broken down as publications are turning
into dynamic sources of digital information as things that
were once encapsulated in, you know, PDFs, let's say, are now living on agency websites that have interactions across them. And questions about how those will be preserved and authenticated and other things like that, whether those things are needed is one that we heard a fair amount of discussion about.

Now, on the topic of digitization, we heard from virtually everyone we spoke to that digitization dramatically enhances accessibility. Again, probably not a surprise to anyone here in this room. On the one hand, some of the most valuable materials due to the presence of commercial players here are actually not -- although digitized beautifully and in ways that are hugely useful to users, don't actually present the opportunity for permanent public access in the sense that they're not freely available, they're not part of the program, and that's certainly a big concern.

There are, as many people mentioned yesterday, library-driven initiatives digitizing significant share or at least significant collections of important content. And the mass digitization projects that I think are going to be increasingly important for this community, in particular the Google/CIC partnership, but also some of the other mass digitization initiatives that either have taken place or are on the table potentially in the future where the -- where for the first time significant volume of the program is -- of the collections and the program are being digitized.

Now, at the same time, as we all know, the digitized collections vary significantly in quality, and they're not by any means comprehensive; and to the extent that they are, some of the highest-quality programs, as I mentioned, are often provided from the commercial sector, so there's a very sort of fragmented set of digitization initiatives.

And as came out a little bit yesterday in the conversation, there is no title level registry that might enable a certain kind of strategic digitization across some of the -- some of these significant areas in the community and some of the libraries in the community.

Now, on the digital collections management front, there's actually quite a lot of good news here. GPO access has given way, as you all know, to FDsys, and the plans for FDsys, you know, although it's in data and it's a process to roll it out, seem to be moving in the right direction. The direct ingested materials from agencies is quite well
established and hopefully will continue to grow in the future. There are experimental harvesting strategies that are going on, and hopefully these platforms will eventually allow GPO to incorporate so much of the digitized content into the program in a formal kind of way.

Now, as many of you know, there's formal partnerships between GPO and agencies to help -- to help with management of information systems, but there's a significant share of materials that are held neither on FDsys nor in -- under -- through those kinds of partnership agreements, like with NLM or some of the other agency partners. And materials that are not held in those ways can't be said to be preserved, and I think that's something that should give us all some cause for concern. And at the same time, at this point neither FDsys nor any of these government partnerships provide audit or third-party preservation custody, which is an important shortcoming that will need to be addressed in the coming years.

With respect to print document production, we heard from both users as well as documents librarians the strong preference that users have for accessing materials in digital form. Now, at the same time we are also quite well aware and it became quite clear that significant kinds of material types are not necessarily going to be useful as PDF, so whether those are data tables, for example, or some of the visual content or maps, that we are -- we are -- the sort of flat -- a flat PDF format may not be the right way to engage with those kinds of materials, and, in fact, print or tangible formats may actually be better until more dynamic or more appropriate kind of formats are possible.

And at the same time broadband -- you know, you don't need me to tell you, but broadband is not uniformly available even in public libraries in the country, and that -- and that is -- in certain areas of the country, and that constrains what can be done with digital collections and what can't. But at the same time, less than a third of new documents, as I mentioned before, are actually produced in print, which is a significant -- could be for some materials a significant problem given the fact that decision-making about what is produced in print and what is not is not really done with as much of user needs in mind, although the GPO has tried with some of its efforts to develop lists in terms of what, you know, sort of core documents that need to be available in print. These
decisions are largely up to the agencies, and so we're not necessarily seeing all of the -- all of the best choices about what should be issued in print and what can be issued just digitally.

And then finally with respect -- excuse me, not finally, fifth with respect to print collections management, the demands by users for digital access and online discovery have led historical collections, and we heard this at virtually every single institution we spoke with, to -- the print collections to be decreasingly used and actually dramatically underutilized relative to the richness that is contained in those collections. And I'd submit to you that this is actually an area of significant concern, should be an area of significant concern for the libraries and librarians who participate in this program. As you know, many libraries hope to reassign the space occupied by historical collections to what they see as higher value purposes, such as information commons or materials that they see as higher use materials, and this is an important pressure on the system.

As you know, many selectives have left the program in the last 10 or 15 years, and many more have reduced the amount of print that they hold by a significant amount. We've talked to many regional directors who do not have flexibility in print collections management or have relatively circumscribed flexibility and print collections management for whom this is therefore becoming an area of significant concern. And we heard, and this was reflected yesterday in the talk from GPO in the afternoon, an overwhelming call by everyone for a streamline print deaccessioning (ph) practices, and it's good to see that that is something that's really being thought about and addressed now.

But in the long run there really are -- as a result of the underutilization of the historical print collections, the incentives that libraries, through their directors, face to participate in this program, both selectives and regionals alike, are declining, and in the long run without structural change, we see this as the most significant threat to the program as it now stands today, so that's one that we're going to be -- that I'll be tracking through over the next few minutes.

At the same time on the discovery outreach and support side, I've heard, you know, during the course of the project
and especially richly over the last 24 hours or so, some
really fascinating conversations, and I think John's
probably going to talk a little bit more about some things
in this kind of direction, but we're -- librarians are
deploying their expertise in new kinds of ways, in some
cases to reach beyond documents, in some cases beyond the
program -- beyond just the FDLP through to other sources of
government information, and it's actually -- the vanguard of
change here is really moving along quite speedily, and it's
actually really heartening to see some of the progress
that's been made here.

At the same time, we also came across a number of
libraries where government information -- and this is both a
physical and a digital issue, but where government
information is fragmented into discrete service points in
certain cases, certainly a discrete bibliographic
infrastructure where that bibliographic infrastructure even
exists locally, and discrete discovery tools that are --
often do an absolutely poor job, I guess is the way I would
put it, in meeting user needs. And I think this is a --
this is something that so many people are aware of and are
working on, but it would be remiss of me not to -- not to
point that out.

The upshot is that there are too many users out there,
some of whom we spoke to during the course of the project,
who don't -- don't seem to succeed in obtaining and making
good use of the government information that they seek. And
this is not to indictment, you know, the government
information system exclusively, these are problems that
libraries are grappling with across their bibliographic
infrastructure and across the services that they provide,
but it is something that does live here in the -- in terms
of providing for a discovery and outreach and user support
with respect to government information.

So the system is organized around -- as everybody know,
around a series of regional depository libraries.
There's -- this will not provide any new information. This
is just a graphic so you don't see any more text for a
moment or two, but there are, as you know, 50 regional
depository libraries. We've lost a number in the few years.
And based on -- based on the work that Ithaka's done, the
interviews that we've done, it seems quite clear that we
stand to lose several more in the next few years, and that
that's part of that sort of structural change where the
incentives for participation are just moving inexorably in a
certain direction.

The structural issues, many of you will be aware of
this, there's a vast -- there's a wide range of the number
of selective libraries that -- that regional needs to serve.
So California, David, you'll know that you support more
selectives than anyone else, and, you know, it ranges down
quite significantly. All of this, of course, is
uncompensated work by the -- by the regionals in terms of
financial compensation. Population per regional is even --
is actually even more -- slightly more dramatic when you
calculate it that way.

And I'm sorry, I don't know if -- the state names are
probably not visible to very many people. It doesn't
matter. California is at the top, and North Dakota is at
the bottom, and there's 48 in the middle, and, you know,
I'll be happy to share my slides, but I really want you to
sort of see the -- see the patterns that exist, and the
incentives and disincentives that libraries face here.

We heard from regional directors, I think every single
one of whom -- every single one of -- every single regional
director with whom we spoke told us, how's that, about the
challenges and the burdens associated with playing this
role. This is a real issue for the regional directors, and,
you know, they see the services that this program provides,
and I think they -- the ones that we've spoken to are
committed to -- to government information and committed to,
you know, using -- to deploying their resources to provide,
you know, expertise around government information, but the
incentives that they face is -- is -- is different, and it's
unevenly distributed even as it is declining.

So here's a -- here's a list of the -- a graph of the
number of Federal Depository libraries from the early '90s
through the present. And, you know, the graph doesn't look
dramatic, but the direction is quite -- the directionality
is quite clear.

I thought I might try -- at some risk here try a little
experiment. Who -- if you are at a selective institution,
could you raise your hand, please? Okay.

If you have reduced the -- okay, sorry, keep your hands
up.

Okay. If you have reduced the size of your print
collection, your tangible collections by, let's say, 10
percent in the last years, could you keep your hand up,
please? Okay. And what about, let's say, 20 percent?
Okay. And what about 30 percent? Okay, still some hands,
not too many. How about 40 percent? They're still up. 50
percent? 60 percent? 70 percent? 80 percent? Okay, that
got all the hands down, I think.
Okay. So what I wanted to -- what I want to illustrate
is that there's a lot more reduction of print going on than
this graph suggests. I mean, the people in this room
largely, if not exclusively, represent selectives that are
still in the program, not the selectives that have departed
the program, and so this graph actually masks the amount of
print that has departed from the program in the last ten
years or so. I just think that this is an important part of
the dynamics of the program at a structural level that needs
to be addressed.
So in sum, structural change is needed for three or
four key reasons. Users needs are not well served by
fragmented and manual discovery and service environment and
by the lack of digitization. An insufficient share of
born-digital government information is incorporated into the
program, and that suggests potential for concerns about
preservation and access over the long run.
As the assessment of library quality is moved from
collections to services, which has happened across
libraries, across library sectors and across library types,
incentives for participation in a program where the main --
where one of the principal incentives was the free
availability of tangible collections that featured at least
in part into volume count, but also was necessary in terms
of serving user needs with the print. Those incentives are
decaying, both at selectives, as we've seen from the
departure of selectives and by the reduction in the amount
of print at selectives, as well as at regionals.
And so what this -- what this means is that we would
project that Federal Depository libraries will continue to
leave the program, putting at risk the loss of historical
collections that have not been digitized, but also the loss
as selectives depart the program, in particular the
potential for the loss of the expertise in government
information that is represented so richly here in this room.
And I think that that is part of the structural issue with
this program that, you know, whether -- whether you're at a
library whose users are still in a print environment for
whatever reason, or whether you're at a library where your
users are, you know, gung ho for digital, the structural issues of the program matter either way.

I'm going to say very quickly a few words about the future of the program, because I don't have as much time as I'd like, so I'm going to run through this very quickly. I'd be delighted to say more either in public questions or individually, and, you know, certainly will have a long report out in short time that will engage with some of these issues at greater length.

But at a level of principals, here's what we see for the future of the program. We see three of them: Government information made freely available in digital form and digitally preserved for the long term. This feels like a core -- a core and virtually unarguable element for what the future of the program should look like. At the same time, the historical print collection must be preserved somehow. It shouldn't just be digitized and find ourselves with zero copies left even though it will play a significantly reduced role in providing access for users, and this has already happened in terms of the latter phrase there, and it will continue to take place. And I think that's okay and that's something we should embrace.

And then finally, participating libraries and the librarians who support the program must really reemphasize their commitment, and I think this is already happening, so I don't mean to make this so much prescriptive as much as sort of reflective in many cases, but we emphasize their commitment to serving user needs around outreach and discovery and increasingly advanced forms of access and use. And I think that as the management of the print collection becomes a decreasing consideration for many libraries, our hope in the work that we've done here is that that will make available time and capacity that can be redirected forwards, again, outreach and discovery and support of use.

So there's -- excuse me. As we see it, there's four elements to that. One is on the historical collections, a real recommitment to digitization and an increasing commitment to digitization which will enable an increasing migration away from print. To remain useful, the historical collections really must be digitized. They are not being used as much as they deserve to be used, and this is just a tragedy in a lot of ways.

We have a lot of ideas about how to do that and how to gather materials from all the different richness of
digitization efforts that are going on and incorporate them
to the program, but I won't get into those right now.

The fact of the matter is that once digital surrogates
meet preservation thresholds, as many of the digitization
projects underway will provide for, the fact of the matter
is that fewer print copies will be needed, and the number of
print copies will vary by material type. Again, we have a
lot of work on this that I'll be happy to share. We
actually -- Ross and I actually released a paper on this
very topic with respect to journal collections just about a
month ago so -- but I'd be happy to say more about that
later on. But the upshot is fewer print is needed as
digital -- digitized versions meet preservation thresholds.

Selective libraries of their own volition, I would
anticipate, based on the interviews that we conducted, will
continue the print drawdown, and in some cases will continue
to depart from the program, but more importantly will
continue to reduce the amount of print that they hold
locally.

And at the same time, in the long run, again,
substantially fewer regional libraries will be -- I
shouldn't say regional libraries but sort of fewer --

substantially fewer collections will be required, which will
allow for a drawdown in the number of regionals. And this
is -- this is -- I want to emphasize, this is inevitable.

This is not something that -- where there's going to be a
lot of choice based on the incentives that exist in the
program. We see three models -- I'm just going to run
through them extremely quickly, but one is an individual
drawdown where a regional just walks away from the program,
and we've seen that happen in a number of states with two
regionals. We've seen that happen in one state that had
only one regional already, and from interviews with regional
directors, this is a real risk that this will continue over
the next three to five years.

This is the highest risk approach because it leaves
selectives not well served in terms of the assistance that
selectives have come to look to regionals for, but it's also
the easiest to implement, and in the absence of structural
change at a system-wide level, that's what's going to
happen.

A second model would be a coordinated drawdown in which
the regionals together provide for -- provide for a
coordinated departure that takes into account preservation
concerns and in which the regionals work with one another to sort of in what someone called a daisy chain to sort of take on regional responsibilities from one another so that -- so that the selectives continue to be served, the regionals can manage the drawdown. This is feasible. This is legal under today's statute. It's unknown whether this is actually implementable, and I'm not trying to recommend it. That's just another model here.

The third one would be legislative change where we would empower the GPO to actually -- to actually take account for what has been digitized at what levels of quality, under what kinds of digital preservation considerations, and what does that mean for the number of copies that are required, and how can we allow libraries to get to that, to get to that point. This is unquestionably the lowest risk from a preservation and collection integrity perspective; but as we know, legislative change brings with it implementation challenges, but this is ideally probably what we would all -- what we would all like to see.

On the prospective side, we'd like to see more coordination and -- by the GPO in terms of other born-digital materials, and this is something that we heard from a number of our interviewees where -- where making sure that materials are -- the born-digital materials are being preserved, making sure that they're subject to relevant authentication thresholds is important. And, you know, this is -- this is -- at the same time, we recognized that the notion of the stand-alone documents, as I mentioned before, is beginning to give way, and this suggests a whole additional set of concerns and considerations around the integrity of government information that hasn't really been grappled with to as great an extent as is needed.

And finally, I just want to emphasize, there are remaining user needs for print, whether that's for non-text formats, whether that's areas poorly served by broadband, and print on demand is potentially our friend in those cases. Digital infrastructure, FDsys is going to be -- is clearly going to be an important component of that. We're highly recommending both downloads and APIs to enable libraries and others to get access to that content, and we were really gratified to hear the Public Printer yesterday talk about digital deposit and that -- and the opportunity that he would provide to allow libraries to take on digital deposit if that was what they wanted.
There's a need for outside audits and third-party preservation both of FDsys as well as -- as well as some of the agencies that are partners with the GPO in terms of digital infrastructure, and the kinds of new and revamped discovery environments, law.gov would be an example of such a thing, that are desperately needed to help users get at government information and other kinds of relevant information, whether it's a part of the FDLP, or whether it's part of other kinds of programs or sources.

And then finally, but really not least in any kind of way, is outreach and use, where the opportunity to reemphasize the role of the librarian seems imperative here. As I mentioned, some librarians at the vanguard have already successfully redefined their role. We see an opportunity to define the role from government documents librarians to government information librarians. I don't pretend to be an expert in this area, but I really think that this represents some of the most innovative approaches to librarianship that we -- that we came across, but I certainly pose that more as a discussion point than quite as prescriptive as it seems. But the idea is to conserve and re-purpose the existing expertise that exists in the program, raise awareness of government information, train other librarians in its use, develop discovery environments, support users.

And I want to emphasize that as the program moves away from collections, moves away from tangible collections towards -- towards digital collections that are in many cases provided from a central point of access, the services rather than the collections may be the principal contribution that many participating libraries make towards permanent public access, and that should be seen as an opportunity. And for the two or three hands of people whose libraries have -- you know, are now 80 percent -- have reduced their print collections by 80 percent or something like that, that is the -- one of the principal contributions that's being made, and I think we should -- we should embrace it, and I think there's a real opportunity to study what that looks like and think about what an environment with a -- with a fully digitized program actually looks like.

So in sum, the elements of our model, I don't want to put too much stress on them. I think at a high level there is a coherent model here, a coherent framework that makes some sense, but in some user needs and information
dissemination practices have changed dramatically, and the program truly must change structurally to accommodate them, or the incentives that are currently baked into the system will no longer be able to support ongoing participation by many of the libraries. And I think that that's at the core of the recommendations that our report makes. So thank you very much. I apologize for my length, but appreciate the opportunity to present to you.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: I want to thank Roger very much. I think that set the stage proPURLy. I also want to give a shout out to the Association of Research Libraries. I think they continue their outstanding traditions of helping our community think about what we're doing and our future implications that we're doing, and I think we probably should give them a bit of a hand about that.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: And just as we talked about how our institutions are changing, we now need to move the conversation to how we change ourselves, primarily through how we educate future government information librarians, as the -- Roger's report might highlight, as we call ourselves.

And to help us with that thinking and that discussion, I am very pleased to introduce John Bertot (ph), who is a professor at the University of Maryland's School of Information Science. He has many titles after his name, which in the professoriate means he's reached a high level of status, and he's a distinguished professor, a contributor, and is no slouch either in making a difference in our library lives. He's the editor of Government Information Quarterly, as well as Library Quarterly. He works closely with ALA on internet issues involving public libraries. And he has made a long study of our institutions and our practice, and I think he's bringing that to bear in a new project he is directing. John.

MR. BERTOT: Thank you. I probably should sit down right now after that introduction. Well, thank you for allowing me to come in here and present to you, and it's actually nice to see so many people that I've presented with before and had some great discussions over the years; and frankly, it's your work and your dedication to the information profession, particularly with government information, that's led to this project that I'll be talking a bit about. But I'd really like to kind of set a broader
context for it and broaden the discussion a bit. Roger
actually touched on a number of things sort of from the
introduction that I was going to touch on a little bit, so
I'm doing some adjusting on the fly to try and keep us on
time so that we can get to some various discussions.

But basically over the years I think there's been a
fairly substantial shift, and Roger clearly touched on
those, from sort of printed digital, but it resides within
what I would consider to be a much broader service context,
it's not just about the collections anymore, and it deals
much more broadly with how do you deal with digital
government information and digital government services, and
how we, as librarians, provide those services to a broad
range of users. Over the years my primary focus has
obviously been in the public library community, and we've
seen what's happened over the years as governments have
shifted services to electronic services, and to some extent
as academic libraries and others have gotten sort of out of
the depository and information business, we've seen a pretty
dramatic uptake in service requirements from users in public
libraries, right? So there's been this kind of major shift
going on, and some of what we need to do is recast our focus

and how do we deal with building an information profession
around these pretty dynamic shifts.

Oh, it does work. Okay. All right. Actually, I
didn't get a chance to play with this beforehand.

So basically the context, you all know this, right?
We're an increasing digital government, but it's a
combination of services, resources and technologies. More
importantly, one of, I think, the key issues that we're
dealing with increasingly is that now our information and
our services are embedded with a whole range of
technologies, and, of course, the technologies increasing
aren't ones that we control, and this is creating a whole
range of issues for us as a profession, but also as
government service providers. You know, Twitter, Facebook,
YouTube, all these range of services -- in fact, GSA has
spent a pretty substantial amount of time over the last year
trying to deal with how do we, in fact, negotiate
arrangements with Facebook and all these other social
service -- social service, sorry, social networking type
sites and maintain -- have any of you looked at the
disclosure statements on Facebook and Twitter? I mean, who
owns the contents? Is it you? No. And so this is a big
thing for government agencies. If we're going to suddenly
start putting out a whole range of services and products and
information resources in this kind of context, they want to
retain some control over that. And then, of course, there
are all the issues that Roger touched on, preservation,
authenticity, I mean, there's all kinds of stuff embedded in
here.

I pointed you to that GSA website because it's actually
a fairly interesting website, and they're trying to put up a
range of helpful suggestions, and they've been contracting
with all these different social networking sites. They've
been dealing with cloud computing issues. There's a whole
range of things that are sort of embedded under that
umbrella site that you may find of interest.

And so as Roger mentioned, you know, we're focused on
physical (ph) collections housed in a building and
increasing -- and also from an agency perspective, we
provide services through service outlets. You know, you
have regional Social Security Administration offices, you
know, this is the model that we've traditionally dealt with
for decades, but we've seen this shift towards distributed
access to digital collections and a major shift towards
online services, which, you know, we call the E-government
for shorthand, which integrate and kind of create a whole
new way of service -- information service products and ways
to deliver those services and resources.

Now, one of the things that I want to kind of move the
discussion from is just to focus on digital information --
digital government information, because although I know that
this is a key focus of this conference, but we have to
realize that in this E-government environment, there are a
range of constituencies with a range of objectives, goals
and needs, frankly, and service demands, you have academic,
law libraries, public libraries in this, and you also have
agencies. And one of the things that we have to realize is
that each one of these constituencies has different goals
that they want to have. I mean, for example, agencies want
their services to be used. They're putting up a range of
government information services and resources, and in the
public library setting one of the biggest -- we had two
really big wake-up calls in the last several years dealing
with this kind of continuum and trying to deal with digital
government information and the integration with
government -- in government kinds of services. One was
Katrina, all right, and for those of you who lived in the gulf states -- I actually was in Florida for the last eight years, so we went through a series of five hurricanes in the eight years I was there. That was really interesting, you know, and fortunately Katrina -- I lived in Tallahassee because I was at Florida State University. Fortunately for us, Katrina went west of us so we didn't get all the damage, but one of the things that we saw from that event was a number of people ended up in the public library looking for help, filling out FEMA forms, finding out what services were available to them, getting electronic benefits cards, you know, the electronic credit cards that government -- you know, all this kind of things, how do rebuild a house, how to find their families, you know, all this kind of stuff that created a whole series of pressure points.

The second event that happened to public libraries was Medicare part D, because what happened there was a whole bunch of seniors flooded the public libraries for help with technology, access to broadband, access to public computers, but also they ended up coming in and saying, hey, which program's right for us. And if you ever watched, you know, public librarians freeze up, you know, try and, you know, work with seniors who are basically saying, hey, you know, we have a choice of 20 different prescription drug benefit plans, which one works for me, and they bring in a list of their medications. You know, and it was really -- talking to the public librarians, they're a great, great community, good senses of humor, but, man, they did get their attention because all of a sudden they weren't just being asked to be providers of public access to a range of services and resources, they were actually asked to engage in the service provision.

And the reason I bring that up is because right now on a different project we're trying to work on an E-government collaborative with libraries and agencies, agencies have a range of what they will partner with you on, all right? For example, I've been talking to folks at the Social Security Administration about this, and they will be happy to help disseminate information through public libraries and other library institutions, they're happy to work with those entities when things change in the program and send out information, but they absolutely do not want non-Social Security Administration personnel dispensing Social Security Administration information and acting as social service
providers, all right? They stop -- you know, they draw a line right there, okay? Whereas in other forms of partnerships in Florida, we had the Department of Children and Family and Services, and they were very happy to partner with public libraries and have them do all the work for them filling out their online applications, because DCF had basically eliminated over 3,000 positions that were all social service providers, they were all the case workers, and so they were happy to shift, you know, over and say, hey, you do all this stuff, all right? So we have a range of different things that we need to do and consider in this environment, and then public libraries and academics and others take on a range of those services from just being a provider of public access and a venue and a point of information, all the way to actually trying to integrate with agency services and provisions. So you have a really broad spectrum that you can deal with these things, and you can see that through some of those examples. All right. So here's some key questions and issues that we've been trying to deal with over time as we deal with government information, digital government information and E-government. You know, should E-government librarianships serve as a tradition -- as an extension of the traditional government information documents approach, right? Should it be subsumed into the older tradition? Are they coequal? Is E-government -- government information, are they coequal partners, or is E-government librarianship really something completely different that embeds, you know, services, resources and a whole range of new different kinds of services and the ability to provide those resources in a very different kind of service context? I don't have answers for you on all of these and -- but I do raise them because I think we're looking at a very different kind of service context that's been coming for the better part of 10, 15 years. I mean, this isn't anything that should be catching us by surprise. Maybe the speed with which some of the technologies are moving and the interactivity of those services and technologies is probably catching us a bit off guard, but the reality, this march towards digital has been going on for quite some time. I can remember working on a report for OTA, anybody remember OTA, office technology assessment? Oh, thank you, I feel like I'm -- you know, at least a few people still
remember that, you know? We worked on a study for them back in 1993 when I was in a -- still in a doctoral program at Syracuse University trying to deal with federal electronic services, and that's what we looked at. And, you know, actually the Department of Agriculture, you know the reason why we have, you know, debit cards at the grocery store? Anybody know the history behind all that? The Department of Agriculture is in the electronic benefits program, right, because basically they shifted over from paper coupons for food stamps over to the cards, and they needed a way to actually have those inside service outlets like grocery stores. I mean, so there's been a long history with government agencies trying to deal with these government services, and it's just now it's just become so pervasive that I think we're trying to sort of rethink some of what we do.

So the scope, you know this, right? This is just the federal government, all right, from a study that was done back in 2007 that we actually published in GIQ, but basically we had, you know, 30,000 websites and over a hundred million pages at that time, and this doesn't even include state or local government websites and information resources. So the scope is massive, all right?

And there are huge issues, Roger touched on all of those, the authenticity issues, the preservation issues, the embedding of content within proprietary technology, that's a really big one, and we have different delivery models out there, building collections versus distributive partnerships, and Roger went through a lot of those, and we're all looking forward to seeing that report and its contents and looking at those.

So enter our program, and like I said, we don't have all the answers, but we do know that these are issues. And, in fact, there's a flyer out in the back that looks something like this. If you want to take some with you and pass it on to people, we were funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services, and by "we," I mean, yes, it's University of Maryland, University of Chicago, Illinois, and it's the government information online folks that we're partnering with in this program. We were -- INLS gave us enough funding for 20 scholarships. This is a full ride for 20 Master's students to get their degree program through our Master's in library science through our program at the University of Maryland, and it's online, all right, so we're
working on trying to create a national program that partners
with all these key agencies, and has really four
cornerstones to it.
The first one is course work. It's really interesting.
John sent me this morning a note that his home institution
at the University of Illinois at Chicago has started an
E-government certificate program through public
administration, and I went and checked it out, and it was
fascinating to me because you couldn't get a more directly
opposite approach to E-government than what we're taking,
you know, because it was databases. It was GIS, it was
technology management, it was technology delivery, and so
basically it's all the operational stuff, right? It's nuts
and bolts, which is fine. You know, someone's got to build
the apps, okay?
We're very much on the other side of it, which is,
okay, how do you use the stuff. You know, how do you get
people involved and engaged and access to this content so
our course work focus is on policy environment. We're
dealing with information policy, legal issues, electronic
librarianship and dealing with what it means to be a
librarian really primarily in the electronic environment,
digital government information resources. So we're trying
to pull together a whole range of intellectual content that
is all about the new existing environment, with an emphasis
on public service. And I think you saw that thread through
some of Roger's comments earlier. So it's how to actually
engage all these services and resources serving the public,
which is very different in many cases than sort of managing
a collection that you hope people come to, all right?
Practice. Through the GAO partnership, we are actually
assigning all the students to mentors, and so they will be
assigned with all those individuals across the country,
depending on which host institution they're nearest to,
hopefully, and we'll see how that works out.
Professionals. They're going to come to your meeting
in D.C. every year for the next two years. So next year and
the year after that they will be here, they will attend your
sessions, they'll get a chance to talk to you. We're
actually going to set up special presentations for them so
that they learn what it means to be part of this very
wonderful community of practice, and hopefully you'll
welcome them and not scare them. You know, you're supposed
to encourage them that this is a really great place to be.
And the last part, of course, is the scholarship part. These students will be working with us in Government Information Quarterly. They'll be writing reviews of websites, government information resources, and we hope to pull them into the publication process, because we expect a fair number of these folks to go out into academic institutions where they have to join sort of your scholarly community and be able to continue that on for tenure and other kinds of things.

So these really are what we consider to be the four pillars of the program, so it's the course work, it's practice, it's professional development, and ultimately the scholarship piece, as well.

There's a URL there for -- there's more information about the program and applications and all that that -- and it's also on the handout in the back. Please, you know, pass along the word to colleagues of yours. I mean, obviously I think all of you are -- have your degrees already, but it would be really wonderful if you could pass this out and at least make other people aware of this program. Applications are due February 1 because we'd like to start the program in the fall of 2010.

All right. So in conclusion, to sort of move forward and get us to the discussion point, we are building a new profession here, and it's the E-government librarian, and it's built on what I consider to be very strong traditions of documents librarianship. It's your professionalism, it's your expertise, and key to all this, I think, is your ability to collaborate. What's going to be required moving forward, and this program sets it up through the relationship and partnerships between GPO, the regionals, you know, the selectives and all of you, is it's going to require increased kinds of partnerships with government agencies and a range of partnership types between government agencies, libraries and the information community and the scholarly community, as well. So it's a much broader kind of thing. You're used to this, that's a great strength to build on, and it's also something that we need to address as we continue down this new path of E-government librarian.

But it's also designed to work in an evolving E-government context, and it does require new skills, new approaches, new ways of thinking and new ways of interacting with the public. You know, when -- I've been in a public library conducting interviews when I've actually seen people
walk in and have a breakdown in of the librarian. I mean, these people are at like wits' end. You know, every agency has shunned them, you know, and there they are. In fact, it's really fascinating to me, it's kind of an ironic fascination, that the very constituencies that some of the social services are designed to serve are the least able to actually engage in E-government services. They don't have the technology, they don't have the access, and they don't have the skills, and this program is designed to really help with that kind of service context and move the discussion forward and create a new generation of librarians that also, you know, frankly builds on very good strengths of the existing program that we have before us.

So with that I'm going to stop, because I know that we want to have some discussion and be able to continue on later this afternoon. So thank you very much.

MR. SHULER: Following the new traditions we've established yesterday, the council will talk about what they just heard and invite the community to join in that conversation shortly.

I'll begin by throwing out a comment and then asking council to pitch in, and I think what I find interesting in listening to both presenters is this essential connection among some that require that a collection exist for a government documents librarian to exist. The idea that you can draw down your participation in a depository program just because your collection is disappearing, and I'd kind of like to challenge that. I think the purpose, as we'll probably hear from George Barnum in his talk about the history of GPO, the over hundred-year tradition of the Depository Library program was primarily about the service. The collections, the technology, the procedures, they were all there to support the service, and regardless of how they are deployed in the future, the service is what is dominating our practice.

So I'll leave it at -- I'll leave my comment at that time. Council, over to you.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski (ph), California State Library. I have -- I have a question for Roger, and it has to do with the number of individuals and the number of different libraries that were surveyed. I believe that you said that there were 80 individuals from 30 libraries, and of those 30 libraries, there were academic, law, public and state libraries. Can you give us either a
numerical breakdown or a percentage breakdown of the
different library types that gave input for this study?
MR. SCHONFELD: Absolutely, and I'd be happy to do
that. I actually anticipated that question.
At the -- at the regional level we spoke with seven
academic directors and six academic documents librarians,
five state directors and five state documents librarians,
and I should say for things like an ARL kind of person,
I've, you know, put them into the director category, so when
you see the full interview list, it's not perfect, but just
to give you a sense.
And then on the public side, two directors and one
documents librarian. Wait, that can't be right. No, that's
not right. That was one director and one documents
librarian. And those are all among the regionals.
And then among selectives we spoke with eight academic
directors and eight documents librarians, four law directors
and one law document librarian, one state director and one
state documents librarian, and two public directors and four
public documents librarians.
And that was just a quick count that I did last night,
so it may not be perfect, but just to give you a sense that
we have -- you know, it's not perfectly representative. It
wasn't designed to be a survey so much as a set of
interviews to talk to key stakeholder communities, and, you
know, certainly -- you know, but I do think that our
findings were broadly representative of what GPO and others
have found through survey exercises that they've -- that
they've conducted.
MR. CISMOWSKI: Also, of the academic libraries
that you surveyed, how many were not ARL members?
MR. SCHONFELD: I don't have those numbers with
me, but I can circulate the interview list without any
trouble. It certainly is weighted towards the ARL directors
among the academic libraries, there's no question about
that. We spoke with -- but we did speak with a significant
number of non-ARLs, and even going down to small college
libraries, smaller college libraries like Brooklyn College
Library was an example of one that we actually visited and
spent several hours with the staff and directors there.
MR. CISMOWSKI: And one last question, did you
survey any members of the public who were not members of the
academic community, or did you survey any -- any
nonlibrarian?
MR. SCHONFELD: Oh, we did. We spoke with a number of users. Most of the users that we spoke with were -- were academics. The nature of the project was that we had -- you know, we had a very constrained period of time in which to do the -- in which to do the project. We received help from one or two of the -- more than two, I think three of the academic libraries that we visited, and one or two of the state -- one of the state libraries in reaching members of their communities. So in the case of the state library, you know, we were trying to talk to members of the general public, so to speak. We -- we had one or two interviews with people that they recommended. I think in that case it was probably state employees, frankly, and not members of the general public, but, you know, we worked very hard in the interviews that we conducted, especially with the documents coordinators and other librarians in trying to understand the needs of the communities that they served. It's imperfect to be sure, but I hope we've done at least a reasonable job of bringing in a diversity of perspectives in that respect. But if there are perspectives that you see missing, I'd certainly welcome the opportunity to learn about them, because we haven't -- you know, we haven't finalized the report, and there's an opportunity for more voices yet to be heard if that was appropriate.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And one last question. Is the breakdown of the data collection process, including identifying the percentages of different library types and the people interviewed, going to be in the final report?

MR. SCHONFELD: Oh, the list of interviewees will be in the final report. We could provide some charts or graphs if that were helpful.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Absolutely. Thank you, Roger.

MR. SCHONFELD: Okay.


Roger, don't sit down.

I would be interested to know if in talking with -- in the various interviews you conducted, it's -- your conclusion that documents collections are underutilized is I think -- I think we can all agree with that. That's not really a surprise, I don't think, to this community. My question is how many of those collections are cataloged?

Because in my experience -- well, the literature tells us for over the last 20 years that when you catalog a
collection, your circulation both in and out of the library
increases by 500 percent, and that's -- we've known that for
a number of years. And I guess I'm not as surprised as --
I'm not very surprised by your exercise of, you know, how
many people are drawing down the size of their print
collections because most of them are probably drawing down
the size of their non-depository collections in a similar
fashion, but we're all re-purposing space with the increased
availability of digital documents.
So I guess I don't -- I'm not really sure if I -- if
you're going to have an answer for me, but I would be really
intrigued to know if you had factored the availability of
metadata or bibliographic data for these collections into
any of -- any part of your study.
MR. SCHONFELD: We -- sorry. Thank you for the
question. We absolutely asked those questions of many of
the libraries that we visited and other interviews that we
conducted, and you're absolutely right, there's very --
there's an under cataloging of these collections, I guess
it's -- I guess it's fair to say, and I'm sure that if they
were to be cataloged, the usage would increase to some
degree. I haven't seen the 500 percent figure, but it
doesn't surprise me to hear it.
I think that when we thought about where to
recommend -- and because of the speed with which I was
running through the recommendations at the end, it wasn't
possible to get into this at the length that I might
otherwise have done, but because of the -- one of the
questions that we faced in thinking about recommendations
was whether limited resources should be devoted towards the
kind of discovery-level cataloging that might be -- might
help in the way that you're suggesting, or whether resources
instead should be devoted towards -- towards digitization
but that, of course, enables, you know, full text
search ability and, as we know, discovery that's, if
anything, even more powerful for many purposes anyway than
traditional cataloging. And so the nature of the
recommendation is therefore in the direction of
digitization.
Now, that's not to say that for those libraries where
cataloging is possible -- and I just heard yesterday about a
large, selective library that has, at least for collection
management purposes for moving things off-site, just
cataloged something like 550,000 titles in the last -- over
the summer or something like that. And so it's not to say that cataloging isn't possible and isn't feasible and isn't doable, with an outside contractor I should have mentioned, and -- but, you know -- but -- so it's not to say that cataloging isn't possible or feasible or necessarily even desirable, but in terms of -- it seems to -- I mean, from the purposes -- for the purposes of structural change in the system, it seems as though digitization takes us to the future we want to get to, whereas cataloging, although valuable, would only provide an interim step, and I think that's the -- but I agree with you that cataloging would certainly make a difference.

MS. SANDERS: Okay. And if I can ask a second -- this is an unrelated question. Of your three models that you offer, the one that suggests a coordinated drawdown among the regionals, you have the conclusion in your -- at least in your interim report that that is legal under the current statute, and that's not the message that we've gotten at least in the Kansas/Nebraska proposal --

MR. SCHONFELD: Well, we weren't -- let me clarify.

MR. SCHONFELD: We were not suggesting cross state regionals, which is my understanding of what the Kansas/Nebraska -- cross state -- two libraries serving across a state boundary as a single regional, that was not what the recommendation calls for. We were calling -- that model that we had targeted was one in which -- to take Kansas and Nebraska, not to focus on them but just as an example, in which let's say Kansas -- the University of Kansas would cease being a regional, and the University of Nebraska would become the regional for both states, and that is legal under the current statute.

MS. SANDERS: Is it?

MS. ETKIN: Where's Lance to lower this? Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. Yeah, Roger and Ross talked with us before making that particular model available in their report, and they are, as they described it, looking at a model very similar to a regional that serves multiple states, which is a model that has been in the program for decades, like Maine serving Vermont and New Hampshire and Florida serving Florida and Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico.

MS. SANDERS: But correct me if I'm wrong, I understood that those were more or less grandfathered in but
were not found to be particularly legal from the perspective of general counsel. Am I misunderstanding that?

UNIDENTIFIED: Can I interject for just a sec?

Under the guise of a contract relationship, that's what Rhode Island does with Connecticut State Library.

MS. SANDERS: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED: So it's a consortium or a group of libraries entering into a contract with another library that happens to be a neighboring state's regional --

UNIDENTIFIED: And may --

UNIDENTIFIED: -- since 1884.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I don't think it was -- we necessarily don't need to look at this report as giving us the answers. I think what they have unearthed are the questions that will remain with us about how we organize ourselves and what we're legally obligated to do, and I think their coordinated drawdown is probably edging closer to the grandfather clause than what was asked for in the Kansas/Nebraska, however, not to let Cindy off the hook -- excuse me, Cindy, I'll personalize your GPO in a moment here. I think one could very easily say, well, if it's grandfathered in, why doesn't it have grandchildren, and then what is -- if the legality extends into the future, why doesn't that act as a precedent, and I think that's a very important question as a community we need to ask. Because, indeed, if the objection to the Kansas/Nebraska arrangement was that a state could not serve multiple libraries, then since 1963 or thereabouts we have been existing in an illegal state that must stop now.

So that is the conundrum I raise as a council member. That is a question we need to wrestle with, not whether a particular report, a particular project either stalled or whatever. That is a question I think we need to wrestle with as council.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. It wasn't our general counsel that indicated that Kansas/Nebraska was not legal. That was a memorandum from the Congressional Research Service to the committee, to the oversight committee. And at that time there was no -- no effort, no indication, no request made of GPO to discontinue the arrangements that have already been in place, and they knew that those arrangements were in place when they were doing their research.
MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

I know I'm injecting at this point, but I did not want John
to get away free and clear, because I have no doubt I'm
going to welcome your students here. I mean, they -- it
sounds like a fascinating program, and I won't scare them,
all they may well scare me. Yet the last several years I've
been on a good number of search committees, meeting many of
the best that our library schools are producing, and the one
thing they are leaving library schools without is what John
indicated, service. The bells and whistles are there, they
can flip technology in ways that I need explained to me
sometimes, but it comes down that we are a service industry.
It comes down to what tangible service can these bells and
whistles produce? How do you relate ultimately to people?
And I think that's -- that's what I hope you will expand
your -- your program. I think that "E" depository
librarians are a reality. You know, we've been seeing it.
Whether we want to admit it or not, it's there, and a lot of
them had a grounding in good service, and so once they help
people with the electronic, they can all -- they can teach.
They can educate. They can follow up and make sure that
they've gotten what they wanted. Maybe that's not what they
knew they wanted, but they had their needs met. But what
I'm really concerned about is I've been seeing these newer
librarians come out and the bells and whistles are there,
but nothing for service. Ultimately, how do you talk to the
people? What are you going to do about it, John?

MR. BERTOT: You know, actually I couldn't agree
more with you. In fact, it's a complaint that I completely
agree with. So you're not going to get a counter argument
or, you know, a contradictory perspective from me. And, in
fact, it's why we built the program the way we did. If you
look at -- besides the course work, and I want to talk about
that just momentarily, we are intentionally partnering these
individuals with people who are, in fact, in this room in
some cases, and trying to teach them about what it means to
serve the public. And increasingly you have to understand
it's all -- well, frankly, we're all in public service. I
mean, that's the reality of what we do. Some people may not
agree with that or maybe that's not what they thought they
were getting into, but at the end of the day, you're a
public service provider, and our program is designed through
working with the government information online people and
partnering with them, bringing them to these meetings, and
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also the last part of it is in the course work, all the
course work that we have that is particular to certainly the
certificate -- or the specialization is all about the con --
the service context and how you deal with the public in a
range of ways.
  In fact, Paul Yager is also on our faculty, and some of
you may know his work. Paul also does a tremendous amount
of work, and, in fact, we have a meeting this afternoon on
dealing with underserved populations and persons with
disabilities, and so we have a whole mechanism in place to
try and bring that public service element into the program.
Now, the challenge we will have, I mean, and let's be
candid about this, is that we're initially creating a
national program, and it's going to be online. So the
public service element initially is going to be sort of how
to deal with the public service from an online context,
right, government information online and those kinds of
things, so the one piece that we're still working on is how
do we integrate that face-to-face public service aspect of
what we do, as well. So we're still working on that, but it
is not something that's lost on us, and we really do hope to
build through a range of these activities I think through a
range of these activities I think a fairly strong public
service ethic and understanding of electronic service
delivery within a public service context. I hope that
helps.

MR. SHULER: We have time for one more question
perhaps from the audience. Yes.

MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County
Law Library, otherwise known as law library for San
Bernardino County. First, just a real quick announcement.
Law librarians, if we could also meet at the registration
table for lunch today, we're going to take a little walk to
our lunch site.
And then just two real more comments than questions.
Having read the synopsis as well as having been one of the
participants, in general terms I think it really doesn't
represent all types of libraries and I think -- that are
part of the program, and I think Roger kind of hinted at
that. It's really ARL focused. It's not really focused --
I think it meets the crisis that a lot of ARL libraries are
facing, but not necessarily all types of libraries.
And I'm still concerned about access. As I was sitting
back there thinking, I've got broadband in my three
0065
locations; however, two of those three locations are in poverty areas, for lack of a better term. I'm limited to how much broadband access I have. If everything comes PDF broadband, if I've got more than two or three users at one time, nobody's getting it, and that's a concern of mine.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. We've nearly come to the end of our time here today, and I want to thank our speakers. Let's give a big hand.

(Applause)

MR. SHULER: I think they've given us a lot to think about. They've unearthed other ancient questions amongst us, and I think they've given us some possible directions to go to.

We will not be seeing you as a group, as a council, until tomorrow morning when you will hear us discuss what we think about what we heard here today and what we're going to do about it, you'll hear about the wonderful things we're going to use and devise in order to attract you to Buffalo, and I hope to also be able to continue some of the points that have been raised these last two days tomorrow morning.

The next session that will be taking place at 10:30 will be the small session. Help me somebody. I'm having a senior moment.

UNIDENTIFIED: Item numbers.

MR. SHULER: Item numbers, thank you. Yes, a small break-out discussion about item numbers. Not all the council members will be here. They may surprise you in solidarity and they will, but I suspect what we've given ourselves is the freedom to go to the other meetings to hear what's going on and a chance to mingle among you.

There will be a second smaller council session with much the same constraints in the afternoon, smaller, not everybody here, and then, council, I ask you to be back here at 4:00 to start our working session. But I ask you to stay for a couple minutes because I want to say a couple things. Other than that, have a great break. And thanks, it was a good session this morning.

(End of first session, beginning of second session:)

MR. SHULER: If we could kind of get together for the tremendous topic of revision to item selection. And because we -- we envision this as a true discussion with all of you out there, those of you way in the back who are truly committed to this passionate topic might want to come forward so you can share your passion a little bit more
equally with all of us.

My council partners on this are Justin Otto and Ann Marie Sanders, and we're also going to hear from Laurie Hall of GPO.

This session results from the Fifth Council recommendation that came out of the Tampa meeting. This is the longest recommendation, but I'm going to read it anyway because I think there are aspects of this that are very important that we want to try to bring out here and get your input on this.

The council recommends that GPO retool the current depository library item selection system. This retooling should allow for the following: Number one, greater granularity of item numbers assigned to different formats of the same titles or series, that is, every format available for distribution would have its own unique item number so depositories could select only desired formats.

Number two, the ability to select EL only item numbers without risking receiving unwarranted tangible publications.

Number three, a thorough revision of list of classes, removing all item numbers for titles and formats no longer distributed.

Number four, the ability to receive only specified formats of general publications. At present, an electronic only depository must deselect general publication item numbers in order not to receive unwanted tangible publications, even though many general publication monographs are issued both in print and electronically.

For purposes of this retooling, the two proposals dated September 8, 2005, that were formally presented to council at the spring 2006 council meeting for new models of selection of tangible and electronic item numbers should be revisited.

Now, that last point may be somewhat foreign to people who were not involved in this -- in this process in 2005/2006, so for the purposes of sort of revisiting those models, which were a rather substantial revision of the current structure of item selection, which I think we heard in Tampa loud and clear, is very frustrating and inexact.

Justin Otto is going to give a brief overview of those item selection models that were presented by GPO back then but were never implemented.

So, Justin, do you want to...

MR. OTTO: Good morning, everyone. Can you hear
So just very briefly, I'd like to give a quick review of what the 2005 model was, and that doesn't mean that what we're looking for today is just a discussion of the merits of that model. We're just kind of using it as a review and a starting point for our discussion today.

There were two parts to the model. There was a -- the first part being the tangible items model, and GPO proposed a tiered selection mechanism with four categories, first category being high-profile items which would be distributed to all libraries, things like the 9/11 report. Second type would be selected items, much like our current model. Also, it sort of -- you can think of it as akin to a standing order with a book dealer. And it would have had greater granularity than the current system can accommodate.

Other tier would be review items, and this is -- this is new, and this is a new concept. Item numbers contain titles a library may or may not want, so if people mark things as review, the library would be notified when the item is available, excuse me, and they could be sent an electronic copy for review and then make a decision of whether they do or don't want to receive the tangible item, and they'd have a specified time period in which to make that decision, and extra copies could be distributed on request to libraries that didn't request -- decide it in advance.

And the fourth tier was non-selected items, it's similar to the current model when an item number is not selected, and libraries that mark an item as non-selected could request a copy if any are remaining from that review inventory. So libraries would be able to change their status from non-selected to review or selected twice a year as opposed to the once a year that we can add items under the current system.

So the electronic items models, as I said before, it was kind of considered to be two separate models, and there's two selection mechanisms within this model, the first being an electronic notification service that would replace new electronic titles. All online titles listed on the notification service, they would be listed on the notification service after cataloging them, they would be listed in SuDoc order. And the alert in this new notification service would contain a brief bib record and a PURL for, you know, review of the item.
The second was subject bibliographies in the GPO ILS. For new publications, they would be ordered by state and major region to facilitate selection by geography, like, for example, where I am in Washington, we can select things, you know, from our region. Also, they can be ordered by topic areas such as, you know, as you can see here, terrorism, healthcare, things like that. And, again, these would contain the brief bib record and a PURL.

Now, one thing about this new proposed electronic selection system would be if you're using agency-based item numbers, you would have to select all publications for an agency or sub agency. What that means is if you selected the item number for the Forest Service, you'd have to select all electronic titles from the Forest Service, and this would actually reduce the granularity of item selection.

And, again, for electronic libraries would be able to add online numbers to their selection profile twice a year, just like with the new book model, as opposed to under our current system where it's once a year.

So that's the quick brief overview, and with that, I'd like to turn it over to Laurie, who is going to discuss where GPO is on this currently.

MS. HALL: Where we are and what -- I'm sorry --
MR. OTTO: And what your -- you know, what you guys have been doing, are doing...
MS. HALL: Are doing. This is Laurie Hall with GPO. I was going to put together some presentation slides, but that just didn't happen since we rolled that web tech notes on Friday late, so we were busy with that.
I wanted to give a few statistics though, because I think that there is some misconception or just people don't know. Joe Paskoski took a poll from the list of classes file I think October 14. There's a total number of multiple formats that -- I think there's a big perception that there are a lot of item numbers that have multiple formats, and currently there's only 492 out of a total number of item numbers from the list of classes, 8,548, will then give a little bit of background about why we have those multiple formats on specific classification numbers and titles.
Originally when we started in the electronic transition, when we would go to a website or find out from an agency if they had electronic items, in some cases in some series and some categories and some titles, they didn't
have a very good run on their website. They may have had one or two issues, they may have replaced, you know, an issue, they would put one up and they would take one down. So we did not create a separate item number and a separate classification number for those that we did not feel were very stable websites, because we weren't sure. They didn't have a full run, they -- most agencies were just starting to load their documents to a website. So that's one of the reasons we started out adding multiple formats to a series, say open file report, for instance. Not all of the publishing entities that produce open file reports two or three years ago, 2005, whatever, did not put their stuff on the web, so we were still getting a CD, a paper, or some of them may be electronic, so we really couldn't break them out, because if we did break them out, you would only get pieces of the series. So we wanted to make sure that you would get every single issue, and it could come out in various formats.

Now, granted, that has transpired over the last couple of years as agencies become publishing more and more to the web, they're putting more comprehensive holdings on the web, so we've started to break a lot of the -- those things out, creating separate item numbers for different formats.

There are some downsides to that. We just recently did the congressionals. I think people are under the assumption that there are -- if you select the microfiche or select the paper or select the electronic, you're going to get the exact same thing. That's not always the case. We had some agent -- some committees only want their publication online. They're not giving us a print version. So people need to recognize that when we do break out those item numbers by format, you may not always get the -- everything that's been published by that format, so just be aware of that. We had a committee that we called a couple of weeks ago, one of our acquisition specialists, and the committee -- we were saying is there a paper version coming out of this because we found the electronic version, and the committee said no, there will be no paper version, and we do not authorize you to make a paper copy. Now, we all know that we can go to the website and make a paper copy, but they basically told us that we could not make a paper copy without their permission, and they did not give us permission to do that. So if you selected the fiche or the paper, you would not have a representation of that document.
in your collection. It was only available electronically.
So there are some good and bad points about breaking things
out.
The series problems are a problem. That's the way the
SuDoc class is. So if we broke out open file report, there
may be one division that still puts out something in a CD
format. You may not get that item. They're not always
doing them online. Now, as things go on, more and more
agencies are doing online, so I just want to make sure that
people understand that there are some downside to -- down
sides to breaking out item numbers.
Anything else -- anything else that we had talked about
that you wanted me to think about? Oh, brainstorming at
GPO. Since 2005 when Lisa and Suzanne worked on this
report, we constantly undergo brainstorming at GPO about
what to do with the item selection. I think maybe you think
we aren't doing that. We are doing that on a constant
basis. We have this old system that Bob talked about, one
of many. It's called DDIS, the Depository Distribution
Information System. It was built in 1982. That is our
basic infrastructure for most of the depository program. We
all know that it is needed to be replaced, but we're always
not sure what to replace it with. Lisa Russell here has
been writing requirements for a new system based on a lot of
the information that's in the 2005/2006, we're moving
forward with funding with a team to do that development, to
hire a contractor to build the system for us, so we are
moving forward.
But there are also some things that have changed since
2005/2006 that we're concerned about. One of the things
that comes to mind, knowing how much we spent and how much
development time it took for us to get an integrated library
system, we know that since this is a major system, it's
good to take some time for us to develop.
There's also some questions in -- at least in my mind,
and this is my own opinion, is that building another system
for item selection, is that the best way to go, using item
numbers. I know there's some little bits of law in there
that say something about selection and number, but the last
count -- when I was a little surprised, we only distributed
in the -- since 2005 we distributed -- total titles
distributed was 12,000, in 2008 we're down to 7,000 titles,
and for some reason we're back up to 9,700 titles, tangible
titles, were distributed in the program in fiscal year 2009.
Now, I would say that's probably a transition from one administration to the next. But we're concerned -- at least our discussions have been should we keep up with this item number scheme for such a small number of tangible publications. That's another option that we've talked about, should we possibly just use item numbers for the distribution of tangible documents. Is there some other way we can, you know, let you know about electronic documents without using the item number scheme. So we've talked about -- Cindy has done some investigation about the Canadian library system, looking at some of their systems and how they notify the libraries, how libraries participate in their program, and what kind of services they provide. So we do a lot of discussions, a lot of out-of-the-box discussions, talking about no SuDoc, no -- no item number, we do have those discussions over lunch sometimes, so we are looking at a lot of these things. I think we just need some additional input since the 2005 is too -- you know, what would be the best way to go forward. Or a suggestion was to Justin and Ann and to David is to maybe a couple of models that we could vet through our systems requirements that we're -- that Lisa is preparing now. So that's just to give you a little bit of idea where we are.

We are also going back the whole list of classes, cleanup is happening. It always happens. It's always going on as part of our regular routine day-to-day operations. We add new items every day, but we've also retooled our whole cleanup process, going back and looking at items and getting rid of microfiche formats, calling the agency to find out if it truly is dead, if it -- what's been replaced. So we've retooled that entire work flow with the help of library planning and acquisitions, so you'll be seeing more and more changes to the list of classes.

What else have we been doing? We've retooled -- redone web tech notes, more about that in the operational forum. Like I said, we have broken out some of those big chunks of things where people have asked us to, so we're always willing to take suggestions and work through some of that cleanup in the list of classes and contact the agencies.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Laurie. Before you leave, I think I understand the dilemma that you face with certain series that, you know, some of those are available.
online, some are not. Is there any -- because I get
complaints from some of my selectives who have chosen to
be -- to trend toward electronic-only publications, and they
don't want to receive any real new publications that they
have to keep for five years before they can discard them, is
there any way that you could tag certain libraries as -- you
know, they can select these hybrid item numbers, but if a
title in that series does appear only in tangible format, it
would not be distributed to them?

MS. HALL: I'm not -- that's sort of a Robin
question, as well. I'm not really sure -- sorry, Robin. I
can't give an answer to that. We really have to think about
that because the lighted bin system, remember, does go on
item numbers. I think there has been a suggestion about
creating general pub, some of these general category classes
in various formats. That might be something that we can
investigate a little further. We've talked about that a
lot.

What we also are doing as part of the list of classes
cleanup, that was contacting a lot of these agencies, and
when we do, if we can get to the right people, not only to
find out things that are dead, but we do talk to them on a
regular basis about websites. There -- you know, there are
big databases full of publications, and what's their
publication policy. We're finding more and more are moving
to most everything online.

So I think -- at least in my opinion I think a lot of
that's going to be -- is continuing to change, where we
won't -- we'll have some of those big series, majority of
those big series all available online.

Did that answer -- Robin and I will have to talk about
that. Sorry.

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Robin Haun Mohamed (ph), GPO. And
I'm going to bring up something that may shock lots of you,
but can we consider making an all or nothing tangible
program? Yeah, I know, Jill, it's pretty radical, but that
would allow just the kind of library that you're talking
about, David. And also, as Laurie said, we are all
receiving much, much less material in a tangible format, but
I threw it out there for conversation knowing it won't go
down the successful road, but it's at least a place to talk,
because we keep -- we keep talking about it.

MR. SHULER: How seriously? Do you talk about it
seriously?
it's my dream.

MR. SHULER: That's pretty serious Robin.

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: My dream.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

Robin wouldn't say it in public if it hadn't gotten serious,
but I'd like to know from practitioners, what do you think
about this? Ah, we're getting -- Steve Hayes, you can't
hide. I know you've got an opinion. He's gone.

MS. CHILDER: Martha Childers, Johnson County
Library. I'm just going to -- I have some other things I
want to say about this, but I'll -- I won't address it now
in hopes that it will come up later. Did I say my name in
place? Okay.

As far as web only, I do believe that the National
Library of, what is it, Transportation and maybe Education,
some of them are only web-based, so it might make it
interesting for them to join. Just throwing that out.

MS. SMITH: Just to expand on my thumbs down, this
is Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. I don't
want to go any direction that decreases selectivity. I will
take print, I'll take electronic, but I only want those
things that are going to be useful for my population,
because every record that goes into my online catalog is
something I have to maintain, whether that is electronic or
print, and database maintenance is becoming a huge part of
my life. So the cataloging is onerous no matter which
format you get, so either way I want to be able to select
and just get the things that will be useful for my
population.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington
University.

Correct me if I'm wrong, GPO, but if the DDIS system is
replaced, then basically it's a clean slate, right? You
could -- you could have a subject-based selection system?
Yes? No? You could -- I'm just brainstorming here.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. One of the
problems we've run into both with the whole item number
model and DDIS is that we've sort of gotten into the chicken
and egg thing. We go, oh, we need to replace the system,
but we need a new model, and we don't know what the new
model is so we can't build a system; and then we go back the
other way and say, okay, we need a new system, but we don't
know what the system will do. So --
MR. OTTO: Sure.
MS. RUSSELL: -- everybody's trying to get around that. The approach we're taking with the DDIS requirements is to try to build something that will handle item numbers for now and possibly be flexible enough to get away from it in the future. Does that answer your question?
MR. OTTO: Yes, it does. I also, you know, since we're brainstorming here -- oh, please, go ahead.
MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. I just wanted to make certain that everybody understood, it's just not a system replacement. There's staffing training, I mean, depending on what you're asking for, we're talking -- you know, if we're asking for staff to make your selections for you because -- you know, we don't know what you need all the time. I mean, you are the experts on what you really need and want for your collection. So we're not only talking about a system replacement, we would be talking about staffing replacement. There is -- DDIS is just one system. There's a lighted bin replacement, so, you know, it's a multiple tiered kind of thing. I just want to make sure everybody -- you know, based on the model, it's a pretty big change to our organization as a whole, at least from the operation perspective.

MR. OTTO: Well -- Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University. Just since we're brainstorming here, like what I would love to see in the future for a selection system is one that at least would have the option for me to do like subject-based selection, say I don't care what agency this comes from, I would really like to see things about substance abuse, you know, since my university would have a big program in social work; and then also have the ability, you know, to either check a box, I only want things that are electronic or, you know, send it to me regardless of format or -- you know, because, I mean, if -- when you look at things I -- I guess what I see in my head is like one of the commercial, you know, book vendors and their online ordering systems, and they have, you know, plenty of options. I mean, you can -- you can -- even those -- a lot of those things can even be like format neutral. And, you know, I know that, you know, the processes are different for you guys, but you can say I just want to know if this vendor has this book, and then, I don't know, something like The Da Vinci Code, so then it shows you, yes, you can get it, and then it says would you like it in paperback, would you like
an E-book, would you like a hard back, and you pick that, too.
So there's, you know, there are -- people have figured out, you know, how to do these kind of flexible systems, you know, so in the future I don't see any -- you know, depending upon what we come up with, I don't think there's any reason why something like that couldn't be -- couldn't be a model for the future.
MR. SHULER: Peggy.
MS. JOBE: Hi, Peggy Jobe, University of Colorado at Boulder, and we're the regional for Colorado, and so I may be making mistakes since I never have to select or deselect, but one of my -- one of my selectives has really expressed some frustration with the process for selecting electronic materials after the item numbers are separated. So, for instance, the Congressional members items were separated after the annual item selection period, and so this person would like to get the electronic, but she won't be able to add that to her selection profile until the next selection period, if I'm right so far. Okay, I see heads nodding so I'm not dead wrong.
So I contacted GPO, and I got the response that, no, that couldn't happen until the next item selection period, and so with the legacy system, I understand that there's some real issues to managing the print runs and all those issues with those kinds of things, but could we build in some flexibility that allows people to select electronic items at any time because it only affects how they get their records from Marcive or another vendor? So -- and I didn't understand the answer I got, and I understand that you're working with a very old legacy system, but, you know, what are the possibilities for that?
MR. SHULER: I see Cindy hesitating here.
UNIDENTIFIED: I'm going to address the requirements in the new system. We actually do have a requirement for the new system that you would be able to add online titles at any time, so that will take care of it in the future. I think Cindy's going to talk about the current state.
MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. If they only want to select EL but can't actually add the item number till the profile update, there's still a way in which they can get those titles by using the new electronic titles, because if they know the item number that
they would have added, could they have added, they can search
that way. And I can anticipate the next question is the cataloging and the profiling for different record services. That doesn't necessarily have to be dependent on
the item number being in our system. You could let the service know that you want this item number added to your profile. Did I anticipate that incorrectly?

"MS. JOBE: You know, my -- the library that raised the question, I think that basically except for the annual intervals, whenever you change, you ask them to add something to your profile, it incurs some charges, am I correct? Okay. So that's one of their issues.

And then the other option that's been, you know, mentioned is to search the CGP and get the records that we already use under the electronic titles, all of which require a little more staff time in terms of getting the records into your catalog. And basically, you know, in these selectives that -- there are some other ones that are kind of hanging on by their teeth, and so anything that creates more staff time for them becomes problematic. And I know from my own experience, we somehow lost about 3,000 bib records from our Triple A system, no idea how it happened, but we know that it was in the Y1.1/8s. So we're getting those item numbers and we're overlaying it, but using the Z39.50 client, we have to rely on really high-end staff in our cataloging and metadata services to do that for us, because my staff who loads the Marcive records just -- you know, they're a little intimidated by that whole process so -- and we have to do it all. So the smaller ones, they're still pretty -- it's a barrier, and if we would make it just easier for them, I think it would be better.

"MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin. Thanks for the clarification, and we'll look into it. Can't make promises, but we'll look into that.

"MR. SHULER: John.

"MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University of Delaware. I wanted to follow up on what Justin was talking about with commercial services and the model that they offer for selection. Our library recently evaluated competitively two major vendors who offer profiling, and recently there was training on the system that we chose. Not only did you have a subject selection, which was very nice, but what I liked and what I thought might be applicable to this situation, even if you stay with item number based
selectivity, is the ability to either say no handbooks, no CDs or all CDs, you know, to be able to say we can't use Braille. We don't have the people who are reading it. They have other assistive technology available to them which they prefer. And so that someone at GPO who is helping to disseminate the information would be able to see by switches, you know, this library, although they're interested in this topic, this is not the format they can use, effectively, and they'll be dumping it within five years, which is a waste of everybody's time.

I know that Braille in particular is a very expensive format to produce and disseminate, and it's very bulky, but there are other formats, as well, where if a library chooses to select mostly electronic, I think that if you were to double the number of item numbers, essentially, and say, you know, given the caveats that you've explained to us, you may select the electronic version of anything within these areas, I think that a lot of people would bite. I think that a lot of us would choose electronic, evaluate its use, figure out does it meet our needs, and if the electronic meets the needs, many of us would drop the more expensive to disseminate formats as needed to serve our clientele. But it's just a thought.

MR. SHULER: And a very important one. Arlene?

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible (ph) from the Oregon State Library. I think, you know, this is one of these situations where you're never going to please everybody, because everybody wants to do it their own way, and I -- you know, the key is flexibility.

I think the thing of it is somebody else earlier expressed the notion of, you know, format is not primary interest. I'm interested in content, and if it's about Oregon, I want it no matter what it is, CD, Braille, whatever. So I think that you have to understand that while format is vitally important for certain types of libraries, content is really an important selection factor for others, and anything that we can do to increase selectivity by subject, by geography is really important for most -- most libraries. Anything that you can do to let us know what the titles are before we get them as opposed to in a series I think would be very much appreciated by a lot of libraries.

So, you know, I know that format is really important, but I really don't want to lose sight of those other selection criteria, because they're important to, you know,
different types of libraries.

So -- and I also want to echo the fact that, you know,
vendors have been doing approval plans for a long time, this
is not a model that needs to be created from scratch, and I
really hope that GPO considers looking at some of those
systems as they're looking at requirements and what systems
can really do.

MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders from the Library
of Michigan. I want to dovetail on one of John's comments
that I -- one of John Stevenson's comments that I do hear
from my selectives, and that's language, materials in
foreign languages, and I'm talking about things that you
get, you know, the Portuguese version and the Spanish
version and so on. That is an area in which libraries would
appreciate a filter.

But basically speaking from my -- just my general
experience, I think what we mostly want to get away with is
anything to do provenance, because we're librarians, we
think this way, but we're really not normal, and nobody else
does, and why we're working this hard is -- I mean, it was a
wonderful 19th Century solution when Adelaide Hasse came up
with SuDocs, and item numbers kind of grew out of that, but
it's really time we all moved on. And anything to do with
provenance is just something that I don't -- I don't want to
see us go down that path in a new system.

MR. SHULER: I'll call on you in just a second.

I want to ask a followup of GPO.

Given the fact that item number selection, at least the
way I understand it, is -- was developed primarily as a way
of budgeting in the sense that you need to know how many
publications from a certain series are people going to want
in the coming fiscal year so that you can either produce
that number if GPO is producing it in-house, or you can ride
that number of publications if an agency is having it
printed outside of GPO.

And, number two, given the fact that we have discussed
and seemingly rejected the whole concept of print on demand,
what are the -- what are the obstacles to developing some
kind of an approval program from GPO's prospective? That
is, how could that even be done given the fact that you need
to know so far ahead of time how many copies of a particular
publication to print or ride?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall from GPO. Do you remember
that we did do approval kind of, we sent out surveys back in
the mid '80s. Just when I came, we were still doing
surveys. You're right. Remember, we order things before
they're even printed so -- and we do send general counts to
the Congressional Publishing Office two times a year so that
they can -- when anything comes -- any hearing comes off the
line, we already know that there is 500 libraries that get
it. I think it really is a cost issue. We could order
1,250 copies and send them out to everybody, and everybody
selects them. Then there's also that waste issue. So those
are things that over the years, and probably way even before
my time at GPO, and I've been there long enough now, that
those things evolved where we did get massive amounts, but a
lot of things were thrown out, so we were trying to stay
close as possible to the total number of documents that
really were going to go out so we didn't have a lot of
waste. Did that answer the question?
MR. SHULER: So would it be fair to say that
given those constraints that you face, that you don't want
to print 1,200 copies on the off chance that some -- that
all depositories are going to want a tangible copy of this?
It sort of seems to me, and correct me if I'm wrong, that if
we went to an approval process, we would be faced oftentimes
with a situation where we get more demand from the field for
a certain publication than can be filled --
MS. HALL: Right.
MR. SHULER: -- from available copies?
MS. HALL: We would have to -- we would have to
estimate by either the format or the content how many we
think may be interested in the document, and then if we do
get more than we have, we would incur reprint or, you know,
reproduction costs to make up the additional amount. So
those are things that are always on our mind, especially
for --
MR. SHULER: And is that additional cost
something that GPO could absorb?
MS. HALL: We do do some of that now, Joe. I
don't know what percentage we go back to press on. Not very
many.
UNIDENTIFIED: Not very many, and it's an
expensive proposition.
MS. HALL: Right, because sometimes we have to go
back to, you know, set-up charges. We can -- sometimes we
can duplicate it, but we try not to go back to press on --
you know, sometimes if it's a ten-page pamphlet or whatever,
the costs are not as great, but if it's some kind of bound volume or whatever, then you -- you know, we don't get that as many as we -- I mean as much as we have in the past.


You have done that though historically with -- I'm thinking of the 556C and 1004D, the -- you know, the 9/11 report --

MS. HALL: Right.

MS. SANDERS: -- things like that where you have made a decision based on its content that all --

MS. HALL: Yeah.

MS. SANDERS: -- of us needed it. And, actually, I have occasionally heard from libraries why do I get this. I don't want it.

MS. HALL: Correct.

MS. SANDERS: But that's just sort of an executive decision made at your level --

MS. HALL: Well, yeah, see -- and back to that other discussion we just had -- once again it's Laurie Hall, GPO -- how much do you really want us to filter? I heard that word. You know, how much do you want GPO to make some of those decisions for you based on our best judgment? 9/11 report is exactly the thing. In our judgment we thought that was a really -- we live in Washington, what can I say?

That was really an important document that we felt everybody should have, and then hearing from you, then another library saying, no, we don't really want it so, you know, there are some -- if you -- how much you really want to rely on us to make some of those decisions. We do our best to try to make a decision we think is unilateral for the entire program, but that may not be the case. So I'm a little cautious on saying that we can help you best make your selections for you.

I do trust my staff. I have every confidence in my staff, but that's a lot to understand, what 1,250 libraries need and want.

MR. SHULER: My purpose in asking this is to sort of get some thought processes going on out there, because I think we all would agree that a true approval process where we could see a document online and say, yeah, I want a physical copy of that for my collection is the way to go, but what kind of tradeoffs might happen budget wise if we were to go to that? I don't know.

I think you were next, the lady sitting down.

MS. CHILDERS: Martha Childers, Johnson County
Library. I don't have time to deal with an approval process, to look at every item. It's not going to happen. I wanted to comment on a couple of things. I am in a large public library. If the rationale that you all use when you decide about the item selection, to put an item with paper and electronic or web together as you addressed earlier, if there would be some way for us to know what that rationale is, that might help us when I have to address a question from the collection development department or the people who shelve are going like why am I shelving this again, or having to shift it for five years because nobody's checking it out or -- you know, it's just I am constantly working on building -- I just want everybody in the library to love the FDLP as much as I do, and it is a big struggle. So the more information I have on that level, the better it is. Also, I wanted -- as a public library, the DVDs and the CDs are very desirable for us, also foreign language materials, so if there's some way that we could select that way, that would be great.

MR. SHULER: Steve.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame.

I'm a business librarian. I did government information for 20 years. I gave you a no answer when you asked me flippant because one of the basic things -- and I've been in this business 35 years -- is the depository librarians want it their way. I mean, I only want what I want when I want it. The rest of the time don't send it to me. You should have read my mind. We're like faculty at the University of Notre Dame. How many in this room have gone through an approval process with a real approval process? I mean, this is quasi, and it's not a criticism, so we know what that's like. And having done it, and you're absolutely correct, it takes a huge amount of time. It builds in certain things. I mean, if we have a return rate of over ten percent, guess what? My AD says go back and retune that again because we're -- we're sending too much back, and the publisher tells us that. I mention it because often I think our field looks to itself as totally different. You are doing an approval process. Provenance that we're using in terms of their -- when I'm teaching my juniors finally to do research and they're assessing something, provenance is an important
process to take into consideration. Is it important that,
okay, I get everything for the Department of Labor, well,
big provenance.
So I'm mentioning that we may have to look to that
model with all the overhead that we have to do once. And
yes, indeed, you know, I don't refuse books simply because
it's not worth my time. I'll put it on the shelf. You
know, that 9/11 report, we have a culture here that says,
oh, don't send it to me. You know, it's important that you
have it. If you don't have it now, you're not going to keep
it -- you're going to keep it for five years and then dump
it. Well, are you best serving your population ten years
from now or some such like that, depending on the population
that you do.
So while I think we think of ourselves, we have unique
problems, we don't. It is a matter of how do we construct,
yes, you're going to have some overhead that, okay, we
ordered X number and guess what, somebody doesn't want it,
you know, heresy, you're going to recycle that.
That balancing act between the Burger King approach of
have it your way and the heresy of the business approach
that I have to live with all the time that says the cost is
no -- you know, you've got it, it's going on your shelf for
five years because it costs us more to save one or two
libraries from getting that.
So, you know, the main point of this wandering is
maybe -- and GPO probably has done this already, look to the
private sector modeling in terms of approval plans and see
how it is, and in some cases it's going to be -- the program
is going to eat the overhead. We'll have to do it because
in the long run we will get down to the type of granularity
that we have wanted since they were shipping documents to
Indiana by Pony Express. I don't want this one. Why did
you send it to me? You know, 1890 something. Okay.
MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University.
I have to echo what Steve says. We have an approval plan
now. It's just that some people don't like, and I'm
probably one of them, the item number basis. One of the
things I think probably gets in the way of moving to the
granularity we would like to see, the subject content, the
language content, the format content, is you either have to
take your item numbers and create all new item numbers for
all those possibilities, or we don't have the structure in
place. When we look at our approval books, we know what's
in press but hasn't been shipped yet. I don't know that you
guys have that capability, so that's a real problem for
them.

So just two cents on that, but I really have a quick
transition period question to whatever we get. How long
would it take GPO to go through the remaining 480 some
odd -- I'm sorry, I didn't quite catch the number --
multiple format item numbers and split those out?

MS. HALL: It's Laurie Hall, GPO. 492. Here's
the list here. It's interesting. A lot of them are
category classes, so like posters, so if we could come up
with a decision to, you know, break out category classes,
general pubs, whatever, by format, that probably wouldn't
take us too long.

Some of the other ones are -- a lot of them are series
so -- and a lot of them probably would require contacting
the agency, looking at a website again to see, you know,
through the list of classes cleanup project probably would
eliminate probably two or three hundred of them, because
chances are they're probably dead by now.

So, I don't know, I can't give you an estimate how long
it would take. How many have we done so far in this list of
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classes cleanup? We've just done recently 200, but that's
because we just totally retooled the whole process going
through acquisitions to cataloging to web tech notes,
whatever. So sometimes we get information from the
agencies, sometimes we don't, and sometimes we just say,
okay, we're going to -- if we don't get anything from the
agency, we'll discontinue it.

So a couple of months, but we're coming up against the
holidays, so spring. Spring, is that okay?

UNIDENTIFIED: Within this fiscal year?

MS. HALL: Oh, yeah, yeah.

MR. SHULER: Gwen.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of
Hawaii, a couple of points. Item selection is one of the
issues that my selectives ask me for help with the most,
because they just don't understand it when there -- there's
a lot of turnover in some of my selectives, so there's
constantly a new person who's faced with this system that
they don't understand. They're not accustomed to dealing
with an approval plan, so they're not inculcated in that
system.

So one difficulty that they have is that a lot of them
are nine-month employees, they don't work during the summer, and that's when item selection takes place. So if it could be arranged so that item -- the adds can be done at two times per year rather than once a year, that would really help a lot of the people I work with.

The second thing is that currently the item selection system, you log into it and you type in the item numbers that you want to add, and you type in the item numbers that you want to drop, and I think it would really help a lot of people if it could be a more intuitive system that's more like a guided system rather than a -- you know, just a blank slate sort of interface, because I cannot go and sit down with a lot of my selectives and go through the process with them. And I've even tried using Skype with my selectives to sit down with them and do this. Skype just doesn't work with some of the bandwidth that we're dealing with, so that would be another improvement that we would really help things.

MS. OVERLAND: Hello. This is Melanie Overland from the Ohio State University Law Library, and I have two comments looking forward to the future, and I think one is that, you know, all of our libraries are under great constraints about our print resources, how much space we have, how much staff time we have for maintaining them and processing them, so as the number of print items decreases at GPO, I hope we can select almost on a title-by-title basis in the future, because otherwise the pressure coming down from our directors and the head of our technical services department is to scrap the program and buy only those few titles that we want in print from a commercial vendor. And for those of us who like being part of the program, it would help us a lot if we could, you know, really be sure that what we're selecting in print or other tangible format is what want at our library. I think a lot of people are saying that.

And the second thing is for libraries like mine that don't get the Marcive records, what would be great in the future with a future system is if somehow our item numbers were always correlated to SuDoc or title, because it's very difficult to manage the collection each year and assess what we want to add or drop to go through, you know, 1,300 item numbers and use the list of classes to see what each one of those is. It takes a lot of time. So in the future some kind of system where we could list both our items and what
One of the issues that -- I believe it was Laurie who brought up was this whole concept of using item numbers to select publications from the electronic library. And I know that I, myself, have a great deal of difficulty rapping my mind around that when I first heard about this, because how can you select something that you never receive, and what does that really mean, and I get a lot of questions from my selectives about that, as well. And I eventually -- it became clear to me a few conferences ago when Judy Russell kind of explained that when you select that item number for an electronic-only publication, what you're really doing is committing to servicing that title or series or serial meaning that if someone asks a reference question about that, you're committing to helping people with that resource. But still, even though that helped a little bit for me to wrap my mind around this concept of selecting something you never get, sort of like asking Santa for a present you know you're never going to receive, I still wonder whether it's really necessary to have item numbers connected to electronic-only publications, and I would be very -- I'd be interested in GPO's perspective on that, and certainly your perspective.

I know that item number selection is important when you contract with a vendor like Marcive to get cataloging records that are attached to those item numbers, but is that really necessary to get those records, or is there another mechanism that we could use to get those records into our catalogs?

Cindy Etkin, GPO. You took my thunder. I was going to say that we were looking ahead to the point where we would be able to push cataloging records based on item numbers, the selections, and looking towards the day where -- the possibility of digital deposit. I mean, that's looking way ahead, so maintaining the system that we had and looking forward, but maybe that's not the best way. Maybe that was the thinking then, maybe it's not the best way now. Well, along those lines, Cindy, before you sit down, and I don't know how much you can talk about this, but this brand new partnership with Marcive to explore pushing records from the CGP to depositories is somewhat related, I think, to what we're talking about here.
Could you talk a little bit about that, that pilot project?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. No, but Laurie Hall can.

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. We put out that announcement a couple of weeks ago, and just from 8:30 to 10:30 this morning, we had our kickoff meeting with the Marcive folks and our pilot project team. There will be a lot more information coming out, I said that in the announcement, because there's a lot of little details that a lot of people have questions about, and we're trying to develop an FAQ and some literature and stuff with Jim and John Jappa.

It is a pilot test. We expect that we can -- that we will be able to service or use 30 to 35 libraries to participate in the pilot to get records from the CGP based on some very simple parameters, your item profile, if you want the historic shufflets. We were just developing some of those this morning, so there's going to be a little bit more detail coming out.

What else did you want -- what else is the question?

MR. SHULER: What is the ultimate goal of this pilot if it's successful?

MS. HALL: The ultimate goal is -- we heard from the libraries, we've constantly heard from you guys that you really want us to disseminate records. We don't want to -- you know, you don't want to pay Marcive for it, whatever. We looked at trying to develop that kind of application ourselves and said, well, maybe we should really try it with Marcive. They have a long history of doing that. They know all the ins and outs of the system, of what they have to do, so we thought a partnership with them would be really good for us to learn what it takes to do something like that. How the libraries -- also to try to pick up some of those libraries that don't get the service now and see if we can -- we can deliver the records to them.

We're also wanting to test records coming out of the CGP. The current records that go to Marcive come through an OCLC route, so we want to test the capability of our system to batch load-out records to Marcive and have them distribute it to those test libraries. So that's kind of our goal, to get a real sense of just what it takes.

I also -- Laurie Hall again for GPO. I also had something that I think Ann and I talked about in our little phone conversation. One of -- I think whoever said it, I
think Jill said it, the SuDoc system also causes a lot of these problems. Ann said it, whoever said it, people have said it. One of the other suggestions is to maybe move from SuDoc to something else. We do classify hearings now in LC -- you have to think outside the box. Come on, think outside the box.

UNIDENTIFIED: We can move from Dewey to LC.

MS. HALL: So, you know, we do now classify hearings in LC classification. Jennifer Davis and I have talked many times about moving to another group of classification, so that might be something as a transition to start, because a lot of the problems between -- in the system are based on the SuDoc number and then the item number on top of that.

So, of course, classifying in LC takes kind of a staff retooling for me, but maybe it is something that we really need to take a look at. It would probably be after I retire, but, I mean, it's something we really should be looking at if we're really looking outside the box.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan, as the person who opened this particular can of worms, anybody who knows me very well knows that I've had a thing about SuDoc for a number of years now, but it isn't just LC, it's Dewey for the smaller libraries and the publics. In my experience, the libraries that have been most successful in my state in delivering really, really good service are the ones who integrate their documents as much as possible into everything else, and so that has been sort of my mantra for a number of years to try to make it easier for them to do that, because it makes them so very much more successful.

And I know, I mean, I've got a staff member in Michigan right now who has all the hair standing up on the back of her neck, and she's getting ready to push pins into a voodoo doll because she doesn't like the thought of giving up SuDocs, but, honestly, it doesn't matter if you put it in raganafin (ph) as long as you can find, and you've got a -- a lot of the problems were made very clear to us when we worked with Detroit Public, because Detroit Public became a depository in 1891 and didn't go to that new-fangled SuDoc system until 1982, and so I've been working with them processing out a collection that isn't even in SuDoc. So you really kind of do have to think about some of those --

MS. HALL: Well, Laurie Hall --

MS. SANDERS: -- and go forward.
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MS. HALL: Laurie Hall again, GPO. What has it been, about five years now since we -- we -- when we first started classifying electronic publications, remember we were using the SuDoc stem and a made-up number? Well, people in the community complained about that because they were making tangible copies, and they still wanted a cutter, or we were sending out more tangibles, so maybe now's the time to take a look at that again. Some of my staff have asked that question, why are we continuing to classify electronic documents, especially when there is no tangible version that's going out or tangible document available. So, you know, we did that a couple of years ago, we went back to classifying and cutting everything, so maybe now's the time to take a look at that as well again, not classifying electronic versions.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty -- oh, I'm sorry. Do we have time to talk?

MR. SHULER: Since we have about 20 minutes left, what I'd like to suggest is that since SuDoc classification serves maybe two functions, it serves the function of allowing you to organize things on your shelves, and it serves the function of working with item numbers to select items in the first place, that we confine our argument about the usefulness of SuDoc to the selection process and not to the classification process for putting things on the shelves, because we could have an entire program arguing about that, whether to go to LC, whether to go to Dewey. Let's just talk about selection and how SuDoc relates --

MS. HALL: I know, but I just want to --

MR. SHULER: -- to selection. Is there a better way, such as subject-based selection instead of provenance-based selection.

MS. HALL: Excuse me. I just wanted to say we do have a program about that, about classification, SuDoc, integrating your collections or keeping them in SuDoc, and it's tomorrow morning at 8:30.

MR. SHULER: Did you want to say something, Jill?

MS. MORIEARTY: No.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. HOFFMAN: Well, I'm glad to hear that. Elaine Hoffman, Stony Brook University. And I was very glad to hear you talk about that, as well. Our documents collection when I came there 18 years ago was maybe one third that had been classified by LC, and the rest was in SuDoc. And even...
though we have had access to the SuDoc collection through another vendor, GDCS, people had to look in a separate catalog, and they never found the material. Maybe a couple of months ago I decided -- I asked the catalogers if we could just try a project where we would start cataloging some of our hearings, because we have this great hearings collection that doesn't get used that much anymore. So we started do it, and she started putting them into LC numbers, and then we started thinking about it, you know, we have rows and rows and rows, and they're all going to have to be redistributed. So I said, well, I just read somewhere about class -- you know, put them in your catalog, but use the SuDoc number. The system we use is capable of that. And so far everybody's been happy with that. The SuDocs stay where they are on the shelf, and people can find them in the regular catalog, and so they have to go and find out where the Y4s are, but -- you know, because I just got fed up with the stuff not being able to be found.

Oh, and, yes, one other thing I wanted to say. I got an email last week from one of our librarians, one of our subject librarians who said why are all these government documents coming up all of a sudden. I've done this class before, and I never had to deal with them. And I said I don't know. I mean, the only thing I can think of is that we started classifying hearings, and he said okay but -- I said I don't understand what the problem is. He said, well -- I said send me an example of what you're searching. So he said he's searching a key word "terrorism." Okay. Well, that combined with the fact that we cannot afford to buy any new books at all most of last year, this year and probably the next two years, the most recent things that we have are government publications, so, you know, it was sort of like get used to it because they're going to be coming up.

MR. SHULER: Carol.

MS. SPECTOR: Hi, I'm Carol Spector from USF, and I'm going to just kind of move back to a slightly different topic.

MR. SHULER: Carol, could you get closer to the mike?

MS. SPECTOR: Oh, yeah, hello. I think I'm concerned about clarity in the selection process no matter what process we're using, about whether -- whether I know I'm going to get the item. Not so much what format it's
going to come in, but based on what I've selected, what I'm going to get. So where I'm going with this is when we're talking about breaking out by format, like this is the first I ever heard that there are some committees, I think if I heard correctly, that aren't distributing and printing anymore. So, for example, and this is just one example, our library likes to get hearings from all the committees, so to be sure that we're getting it all, we thought we would select all the print. We already have the PURLs in our records, so we dropped the electronic because we didn't want to have duplicate records coming in through our Marcive service.

So now -- and I get it that you guys don't know in advance and you can't anticipate what these agencies and committees are going to do, but there's something that is fundamentally disconcerting that -- as the selection person for my library that I don't know what I'm going to be getting. And, I mean, clearly this happens with agencies all the time but -- and I know that you guys are in a real bind, but there's something that makes it really hard for us and for talking to our deans and our fellow librarians saying, well, oh, my gosh, we're now not getting it because this year they've decided to do it differently, and I don't know what to do about that. I've been sitting here trying to think about it, but it's a real problem for me.

MR. SHULER: Carol talked about this at our lunch yesterday, and I think that what she's ultimately asking is it safe to deselect particular formats when you don't really know what's going to be occurring in the coming fiscal year to those formats, what will stop being published, what will not come out that I'm expecting to come out, and there's probably no easy answer, but it is a deep concern.

MS. SMITH: Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. Another concern is being able to tell after the fact whether you were supposed to get it. For the Louisiana State documents selection system, we select based on agency, and then there's a long list of exclusions. You can say no staff newsletters, no bills, and whenever we get something, we have to look at it and go, all right, what is this, were we supposed to get this. And you have to look, okay, we select that agency, but is it a news letter, is it one of these other categories of things that we have excluded, and I think we're approaching perhaps that level of confusion if
we add too many all of this, none of that kind of things
that aren't based on something concrete. So that's one
thing of the items numbers is, you know, I can look at that
and go this was assigned this item number, I select that
item number, yes, I was supposed to get this.

MR. SHULER: I'd like to go back to the question
I posed earlier about the connection of item numbers to
electronic-only publications. If a system could be
developed -- and I'm asking this as a question for you to
respond to. If a system could be developed where you could
choose to have catalog records pushed to you if this pilot
project with Marcive succeeds, if you could choose a system
where you could have those records pushed to you based on
the selection of subject categories or geographical
categories connected with subjects, for instance, rivers in
South Carolina, I only want electronic publications that
deal with rivers or harbors in South Carolina, no other
state, would that be preferable to you than selecting
electronic-only publications via item numbers?

MS. SOLOMON: Thank you for that question. Judy
Solomon, Seattle Public Library. I am going through a
process right now where I'm looking at each item number, and
then using Marcive I'm looking for general titles and
checking them in my library catalog, and I'm like to
0025.BO1 or something like that. And thus far I'm
discovering that I have hundreds of titles that make no
sense being in my public library, and I'm having them
deleted. So I'd say yes, you know, if I had a better choice
for that, because I'm just not quite sure what the item
numbers electronic, it's true we don't put them on the
shelves, but they're in our catalog, and they really do
require a lot of maintenance.

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate, yes and no.
There are some things we want to be able to select by
provenance, I want everything from a certain Congressional
committee, and then there are other agency publications that
we would prefer to be able to profile by subject and
geography and have pushed.

MS. SMITH: Laurie Smith, Southeastern Louisiana
University. I think selecting by subject would be great,
but then what do we do, go through the LC subject headings
and mark the ones we want? I mean, how much selectivity
would you have selecting by subject? It seems to me like
that could get almost as confusing, and why can't you assign
an item number to the subject and still select item numbers?

MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University of Delaware. I think that selecting things that have been cataloged by subject is fine, you know, that you can -- basically when you discover that you have a new discipline or something that you've got to support, you might back up the truck to CGP and see what kinds of records that are available that would meet that need, but I think that there's a lot of issues that, you know, we're discussing here; and, for example, the idea that we -- we want to have something, and we want to make sure that we've got a back stop or a user copy for a hearing, say, you know, trying to determine, you know, is there something else. I think that GPO is good bibliographic work, you know, putting in the linking fields makes it possible to say, oh, this is available in another format. But while my library does not use SuDoc numbers for electronic publications, we call them all electronic resource or electronic journal as a call number to our public display. When you browse CGP by call number, you see the pairs of electronic print and possibly fiche, and that's a very useful thing.

So I guess what I would have to say is that I think that a subjects-based selection is good because that way at least in some cases you can get people to the types of things that they're probably interested in without having to drown them. If we were to, for instance, start loading records for all the bills, individual records for bills, I don't think that the public would be able to pick and choose to say, oh, and this is the one that's going to the President's desk. I think that they would have a lot of difficulty determining, you know, which one they really want to read and which one was the one that was rejected earlier on.

And so -- I'm sorry, I'm all over the place, but I think that working with our colleagues at GPO and having this kind of dialogue are very useful, and I think that this is the way toward a solution that we can all live with.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, John. One question for Laurie tending toward wrapping this up. When we spoke on the phone, you talked about the real desire of GPO to receive models from the community. If such a solicitation of models is to occur, can you tell us what the community should tell you, how specific should they be with these models?
MR. SHULER: Because we've received a number of different ideas here, but how can we -- how can we put them together and deliver them to you so that you can take action on them?

MS. HALL: Laurie --

MR. SHULER: Because we've received a number of different ideas here, but how can we -- how can we put them together and deliver them to you so that you can take action on them?

MS. HALL: Laurie, GPO. My suggestion was is that because Lisa and her staff are developing requirements for the daughter of DDIS or whatever, the DDIS-type replacement, we know that she has covered a lot of the requirements from the 2005/2006, correct? We just want to make sure that there are no other requirements out there, and if we had specific models that we could gain a little bit better consensus on -- you know, that we can vet them through our requirements process to see if what we are proposing would work. So that was my suggestion. You know, oh, can it do this, can it do that. Well, we've got a lot of those, but we obviously have heard, you know, yes, some people it works, some people it doesn't. So as Lisa said, we're trying to be flexible, but if we had a couple more specific models from -- of the entire process, it would probably help Lisa a lot to make sure that the requirements are written to cover various scenarios.

MR. SHULER: Well, I guess what I'm getting at is if I were sitting out in the audience, and even standing up here, I'm going to come away from this session wondering what is going to occur, what was the purpose of this session, and how can we -- how can we contribute to going forward here. And the development of models is a very committee-driven thing. I mean, one individual probably cannot develop a usable model --

MS. HALL: Right.

MR. SHULER: -- but a number of people getting together can --

MS. HALL: Right. So we've talked about the whole subject, you know, selection by subject. As Laurie said, what was at the LCSH, what's the taxonomy, what's the -- is it like the subject bibliographies, is it the Barnes and Noble broad categories. So if that could be one model, and what does that mean, what implications does that have, I would agree, a committee would be good. Because once you get together and start thinking about that, somebody is going to say, oh, well, what is that -- you know, what taxonomy are we going to use, how is that going to -- how is that going to be implemented, and I think that would be...
helpful to Lisa.

So a little bit more of an analysis of just what that means from the library's perspective, from their processing, and then we can also take a look at that because a subject-based model means to me a staff -- I have staffing resource issues, I have training needs, I would have system development from my side. So not only are we retooling the program and the libraries that participate, but we also would need some major retooling at GPO.

So if I knew that that was a model that everybody was -- a lot of people were interested in and we thought a little bit more about, then we can decide how well -- you know, if that could go forward. Does that -- did that make sense? Because I need to know a little bit more about it, we need -- a little bit more of the implications of that kind of model if we went that way, from the libraries' perspective joining with our perspective, and then we can figure out if we -- if we could do it.

MR. SHULER: Just for the purposes of developing mechanics of doing this -- I'll wait. Go ahead.

MS. KLAIR: Arlene Klair, University of Maryland. You know, as I'm thinking about these mechanics, I mean, University of Maryland is the regional, but we're also in a state consortium which supports a number of our depositories. I'm not the depository librarian. Please, do not confusion me with Cindy Todd. But my group does the processing of the bibliographic records and the physical items for College Park and much of the cataloging records for the University System of Maryland consortium, and what I'm beginning to think is would GPO offer one model or flexible models. And for those of us who are in consortium, if multiple models were offered, does that mean a consortia would have all its members choose the same model? Because otherwise, how in the world do we load those records with multiple choices? How do we present ourself to a vendor like Marcive or even a CLC, you know, as we try and obtain records and make sense of how to massage them.

You know, these are the concerns that I have, which aren't necessarily GPO's concerns, but this is -- you know, once these choices are made, you know, the scenario that we have right now from managing the records is as straightforward as it can get. The flexibility that we might have in a new system might make my world unmanageable in -- in interesting ways, but I can -- I can see the need.
for it, but, gosh, can I retire fast enough?

MR. SHULER: Go ahead, Steve.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I'm extremely confused because -- you know, and I have a colleague back that begins any project he has is what is the problem we're trying to solve. I have heard everything from the few tangibles that we're still trying to distribute, to records being distributed, to the librarians who you put all those pesky government document records in the catalog, and, you know, I don't want to use that stuff, how do I get down to the stuff I really want to use in a book type of a thing. So, you know, and we're solving problems that have been solved before. I mean, we migrated from Dewey to LC, and how many libraries are still stuck between two? Mine is -- we got rid of Dewey -- between LC and SuDoc. So to save GPO more headaches than they already have on their plate, I still am back to what are the issues and what are the problems we're trying to solve? What would success look like? You know, we can get down to the title-by-title in a tangible form where I only get what I want, and I don't get anything I don't want a hundred percent of the time. Well, okay, you've at least put something on the table that someone can start to design a system to get I only want the records for the records that I want. You know, we've substituted all those paper documents that, you know, we fought to get into the system, now we're fighting to get them out of the system. You know, I'm having too much stuff coming in.

So I'm back to can someone frame the basic questions in nice bullet points that says we need to solve this problem, this problem, this problem, this problem, because then GPO can magically put out that request for proposal, and it will just come back solved, you know. And I'm being a little facetious, but I'm trying to make things easier for them. You know, what are we trying to accomplish here, and, you know, can we really put things -- I'm thinking some of the things that are Laurie's plate. I don't want them on Laurie's plate. You know, you're already doing SuDocs. Don't think of a new thing. I mean, you know, we've coped with it, move on, you know, type of a thing.

MR. SHULER: Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: I just want to add one thing to that. Thank you, Steve. I called on you a long time ago. I'm glad you put forward that, because the other thing that
I think it is very important for GPO is if we add something, what are we willing to have them stop?

MR. HAYES: We have to protect them.

MS. MORIEARTY: I heard something.

UNIDENTIFIED: We have to protect them he said.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. We have to protect them. We keep --

MS. MORIEARTY: Yeah.

MR. HAYES: -- piling more and more and more --

MS. MORIEARTY: Exactly.

MR. HAYES: -- onto them, where do they start?

Instead of going, no, this is what we really want to do --

MS. MORIEARTY: But I'm also saying when we tell them what we want, part of that also has to be -- because we're all in this situation at our home institutions. When you take something on, what do you give up in order to complete this new item or this new project.

MR. SHULER: Well, in summary, I don't know if I can -- if I can encapsulate what anybody wants here because I'm hearing many contradictory things, but I think that -- I think that we could say one of the things that we want is that if you are an all electronic depository, I do not want to get tangible publications because I have to keep them for five years. Is there a mechanism that could be developed to prevent that from happening.

Number two, can we establish some kind of a selection process that would allow a depository to choose by provenance if they want to, or by subject if they want to do it that way, or flip-flop even, is such a mechanism possible in this new system.

Those are two things that I am getting out of this that I think that -- we want flexibility, some people don't want flexible. Some people are going to drop out of the program unless they have flexibility. So how can we accommodate both of those? I don't know.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to throw a thought -- well, actually, as people were talking, I thought of some other things but -- and maybe looking at the University of Maryland and the consortium idea might be one model to come up with. If I'm in a consortium, what is best for us might be one of those models.

The problem, to answer Steve's question, I think is how do we get this flexibility to everybody. That's the problem we're trying to solve. So in thinking about all of that and
thinking about provenance and thinking about subject and
taking about geography and how few -- comparatively few
titles we're sending out in tangible format now -- anybody
have tomatoes, because I'm just going to throw this -- I
shouldn't have worn a light color today. I'm just going to
throw this out. What if we did a whole switch in the
processes of GPO and our work flow, and you all could select
after cataloging. At this point you all are selecting prior
to what we even know what the printed product's going to
look like, and the cataloging is the last thing. With the
lesser amount of tangibles, what's the tradeoff in getting
them quickly versus getting what you really want after
cataloging? Now, this is looking at like the Canadian
model.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Why would you think that would be a tomato concept?

UNIDENTIFIED: Because that answers --

MS. SANDERS: It sounds to me like what we've been
asking you for.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, that answers -- would seem to
answer a lot of the topics -- a lot of the items that have
been mentioned today, and that is being able to select by

title, knowing what you're getting, and I think with the
number of tangibles decreasing -- and I don't know this for
sure, but it would seem to me that the cataloging would be
done a lot faster than it used to be because there's a whole
lot less.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the reasons
I thought I might get tomatoes is because of the time lag in
getting the materials into your library. What is the
tradeoff from having them as soon as they come off the print
or in from the printing contractor and out to the libraries
versus holding them for a while until they're cataloged, and
then you can choose.

One of the possible down sides of this is that there's
the question of if we do it this way, we're not -- we
wouldn't be able to ride the print orders from the agencies,
so we're looking at some kind of mechanism to get the print
products. For those of you not familiar with the Canadian
depository program, they automatically get enough for what
they call their full depositories, and then they order X
number for what they think will be available for choice by
their partial depositories. Sometimes they guess correctly,
sometimes they don't. Sometimes there are enough to go
around, sometimes there aren't. And then when there aren't, it's up to the library then to find that copy by going to the agency or some other mechanism. So there are some downsides to that. We'd have to look at how we would actually get the print copies, or what is an X number that we might want to order.

MR. SHULER: I'm sorry, folks, but we're going to have to wrap this up. I know that there are people who want to comment on this, and I also know that GPO is very, very open to your comments, so if you could summarize those comments and send them in an email to Laurie Hall, I'm sure that she would love to get all of those emails. Thank you all for your great input.

(MR. SHULER:  I'm sorry, folks, but we're going to have to wrap this up. I know that there are people who want to comment on this, and I also know that GPO is very, very open to your comments, so if you could summarize those comments and send them in an email to Laurie Hall, I'm sure that she would love to get all of those emails. Thank you all for your great input.)

MR. SHULER:  I'm sorry, folks, but we're going to have to wrap this up. I know that there are people who want to comment on this, and I also know that GPO is very, very open to your comments, so if you could summarize those comments and send them in an email to Laurie Hall, I'm sure that she would love to get all of those emails. Thank you all for your great input.

(MR. SHULER:  I'm sorry, folks, but we're going to have to wrap this up. I know that there are people who want to comment on this, and I also know that GPO is very, very open to your comments, so if you could summarize those comments and send them in an email to Laurie Hall, I'm sure that she would love to get all of those emails. Thank you all for your great input.)
tools and resources that can be used to promote the free use of federal government information products by the American public, and this is our traditional information under that desktop tab of information about events, online learning, partnerships and promotional resources. But in the broader context, our outreach also encompasses interaction, communication and consultation with federal depository libraries about depository management activities. This includes daily depository consultation by phone, email, the ask GPO messages. It also includes, really cool, future articles about very cool depository libraries and the public access assessments program, whereby GPO evaluates each library's compliance with FDLP legal and program requirements.

The library services and content management unit provides several services to assist you, including this daily depository consultation. In some cases we will proactively contact your library when we hear of something especially interesting or of concern or wish to learn more. When you have a question about your library's individual depository operation or services, we encourage you to contact us and your regional librarian so that we may discuss all the options available to your library. Considering that each depository is unique, in that you may determine locally how to apply the requirements and guidelines of the FDLP, this is important to make sure that you're aware of all options and any potential effect on public access to depository resources.

And the library services and content management unit is also committed to sharing information through a whole bunch of avenues, such as announcements, news articles, new educational resources, presentations at conferences and meetings, GPO conferences, online training and visits to libraries, which may be part of public access assessments, so they may also be what we call courtesy visits, you may hear us slip that phrase out, but basically consultation visits to libraries. A recent note relating to some of our outreach activities not specific to public access assessments, we've unveiled this really cool thing called the depository library spotlight, shedding light on different depository libraries, the unique services and offerings of our depository so we can share in the strengths and innovations of our partners and help promote this essential service to
the program. What we are trying to do is feature different
types of libraries at this point, and we're also trying to
hit different parts of the country, so we've got another
different type of library coming up for November.

We also have FDLP on the go. This is a web page under
outreach on the FDLP desktop. It shows where the library
services and content management personnel are visiting
libraries for all types of purposes, including
participations in meetings and conferences, library visits
for general consultation, on-site public access assessments,
presentations at library special events, such as
anniversaries and more.

We also have some new OPAL programs, OPAL, O-P-A-L,
online programming for all libraries. It's a service we've
had for a while, and Robin Haun Mohamed set up a really
interesting collaboration with some University of Washington
Master of Library and Information Science students, and
their students were in contact with us and chose some topics
for some canned OPAL presentations, and there are two really
good ones up there right now on GIS and geology resources,
and we've got two more coming out, one on Austi (ph) and one
about full text online publications.

And we're hoping that this encourages you to submit
OPAL presentations for the type of educational instruction
programs that you're already presenting, so just taking the
content that you have and putting it into an OPAL
presentation would be great. So we take advantage of your
expertise and share that widely so that people can learn
about different topics.

So getting specifically to public access assessments,
again putting this in the context of outreach, public access
assessment is a review by GPO staff of an individual
library's federal depository operations and services. This
review is organized around the categories of access,
collection, service and cooperative efforts. GPO has the
responsibility to ensure that the resources that distributes
to federal depository libraries remain accessible to the
general public.

So the purpose -- the primary goal of GPO's assessment
program remains to ensure that federal depository libraries
comply with their legal requirements as outlined in Section
19 of Title 44 of the U.S. Code, and the program
requirements which are outlined in the federal depository
library handbook and also in the FDLP desktop, and this
responsibility touches on almost every aspect of library
operations and services. And has always been the case, as I
mentioned before, individual depository libraries have the
flexibility to determine locally how to apply the
requirements.

And a second purpose of the assessment program, as many
of you know who have been through assessments in the past,
is to -- for GPO to help advise libraries how to reach
greater compliance with the requirements. This review is
intended to be supportive of each individual depository
library, and involve sharing of best practices and
recognition of notable achievements. That's a new section
now in the report, and it will help -- we hope it will help
libraries continue to enhance depository operations and
services.

So for the framework -- and what I'm summarizing now is
actually in a new project summary that's been recently
posted on the FDLP desktop public access assessment web
pages, and this is just a very brief summary of that.

On the public access assessment, also known as PAA, web
page, you'll find current information about PAA and its
related resources. There's a paper entitled, "Focus on
Access, Collection, Service and Cooperative Efforts," and
has broad program goals and provides the focus and
organization of PAA. The PAA's designed to make a direct
connection between the activities that depository libraries
perform and the outcomes of those activities, with the
ultimate objective being support of desirable conditions for
depository libraries that provide for free public access to
federal depository resources. So if you haven't read what I
 shorthand as the focus document, focus on access,
collection, service and cooperative efforts, I encourage you
to do so.

So we use that as the framework for a public access
assessment, and the process involves up to three phases in a
typical assessment. It's comprised of the -- there is an
initial review, a follow-up review and an on-site review.
There's a little bit -- there's more about this in the
project summary.

We also have something we're calling an expedited
public access assessment. If the timing works out for a GPO
staff person to actually visit a library on-site right away
rather than go through a process of the initial review,
follow-up review and then determine whether or not an
on-site review may be needed, we can do an expedited public
access assessment. This bypasses a few of the preliminary
steps. It speeds up the opportunity to consult on-site with
a GPO representative, and it gives you a report more quickly
that way.

In a typical PAA, starting with the initial review,
outreach librarians will be in contact with the library
staff at each juncture of the review process. We start
during the initial review by calling to schedule a phone
call, conference call, with the depository coordinator, and
if you're the coordinator, you're welcome to invite other
depository staff who are involved and may be interested in
the conference call. And the GPO staff person outreach
librarian will talk to you about what we found in our review
of by-mail survey submissions, what's on your library web
pages, any other information we may have in our official
file, and ask you some clarification questions, if needed,
and also ask you for updates, because things are changing so
fast at libraries these days, we know that. And the 2007
by-mail survey was a ways away, of course in the middle of
the 2009 survey at this point.

So that's part of the initial review. If we ask for
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some kind of follow-up review, we'll give you a preliminary
report and a time period in which we'd like a report back
from the library, and that report back is about specific
issues that we noted, and we're hoping that changes can be
made at the library that then supports the -- greater
compliance with the requirements of the program.

And the process is complete after any of the phases
when a library's found to be fully compliant, has only one
minor compliance issue, or has compliance issues that will
be resolved according to the action plan report submitted to
the library services and content management unit. And an
official report is provided at the end of the PAA that
summarizes the findings.

So I'd like to give you a summary of recent activities.
As I mentioned, there's a project plan now up on the FDLP
desktop, PAA web page. We sure are looking forward to
hiring or selecting two new personnel to join us in the
outreach -- education and outreach unit and participate in
public access assessments and work with us on other outreach
activities.

And we are conducting PAA now in response to the
following: Upon request. There is a request for a GPO
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participation form on the FDLP desktop. You can get to it through several different avenues. One is through the PAA web page. You can go to forms down at the bottom of the desktop and find all the forms available. You can also get it through some of the outreach links on the desktop.

To date we have received two requests for public access assessments. This has been since the form was available in early 2007. And just incidentally, in both of those cases when we talked to the depository staff, we decided that an official assessment was actually not in the best interest at that time, so we set up on-site visits. It took us awhile to get the on-site visits, but one of them has happened, and another is going to happen shortly.

So we're conducting the assessments upon request by depository staff or others who make that request. We're also conducting them in coordination with travel to events such as ALA conferences and regional meetings. Also, according to the chronology of the last inspection or self-study evaluation, if you don't know when your library was last inspected or you got a self-study evaluation, I encourage you to look that up. We're looking right now at libraries who were last inspected in the mid '90s in this chronology.

And we're also conducting assessments in response to any unresolved public access complaints. I'm sure this won't happen with anybody here, but if a library is unable or unwilling to resolve a public access complaint, we do feel obligated to follow up on that. Or if free public access is denied, and there have been no arrangements to accommodate library users requiring access, GPO occasionally -- it seems to be increasing a little bit lately, but maybe five or six times a year we'll get contacted by someone from the general public saying that that individual has attempted to use depository resources at a library, and of course the first thing we do is look at your library web page to see what your access policies are on the web page, but we'll also call you if you're the coordinator, or call your colleague as the coordinator, and ask you your knowledge of the situation. In a lot of cases if you didn't have the direct contact with the individual, you'll need to go ask someone who may have had that contact. And in all the cases recently, there has been a non-depository-related use of the library that is really -- where the situation has really been covered under the
behavior policy or user contact policy of the library and not depository access, but we, of course, must follow up on any complaints about a depository library. This applies to four libraries. We'll also conduct PAA in response to a non-submission of by-mail survey. There were four libraries that did not submit the 2007 by-mail survey, and also just a head's up for the 2009 by-mail survey.

So also in our recent activities, this is going to make some of you a little nervous, I know, so follow up with me afterwards. We have been to do public access assessments in Illinois and Texas. More are coming soon in Arizona, Oklahoma and Mississippi. No gasp from the audience, okay. Called the regional librarian in Mississippi and warned her since she isn't here at the conference that this was going to come up.

The 2009 by-mail survey of depository libraries of course will provide us additional information for the future public access assessments once we have that data back once the survey is closed.

So you're probably sitting there wondering if you need to do anything to prepare. In the past GPO asked you to complete a self-study. You don't have to do anything to prepare if you don't want to at this point. We're not asking you to complete any type of self-study. The education and outreach unit is working on an updated version of the self-study of a federal depository library. That is a completely voluntary resource. We hope you do use it, and you can do it as time permits each module by module, but we're not asking you to submit that study prior to public access assessment. We think the self-study will be helpful to you to do a self-assessment of your depository operation, and we hope to get all of the modules up there as soon as possible in the next few months.

So on a regular basis, too, even if you didn't hear your state named, we encourage you to review your library's depository and library-wide policies, as well content on your library and institution web pages for compliance with the FDLP and consistency as this is content that is reviewed in a public access assessment. So it's just a good best practice that we're suggesting that any library do.

It is really common for someone -- I was a former inspector, for someone looking at the depository library web pages to see a conflict between something that the library
put out, especially if you've got a lot of web pages, and
what may be a depository policy. That is not uncommon at
all -- or not common -- that is common, I should say. So I
just encourage you to look at those policies, read the
content, make sure that they are -- they do match with the
requirements of the program. I just looked probably at 20
web pages, and I wasn't able to say that any of those
actually were fully compliant. So I do encourage you to
look at the text on your web pages, look at your access
policies. If you don't have any access policies on your web
page, we're going to ask you if you have one when we call at
the beginning of the public access assessment. So we're not
necessarily saying you have to put policies on your web
pages if that is not your library's routine, and a lot of
libraries don't do that. But certainly if you have hours
information on your web page, you probably have something in
there about visitor access policy. So we look at that, and
it basically provides us with information about what you
consider to be an access policy.

So if you are notified or when you are notified that a
public access assessment is taking place, we will ask you to
gather materials that may be requested or discussed during
the initial review, the phone call, if these aren't posted
on the library web pages or if the current one isn't posted
on the library web pages. These include things like your
depository or library policies that cover the depository
operation and services, official selective housing site
agreements, procedures or processing manuals, and your
reports, strategic plans, examples of promotional materials,
possibly not a state plan if you've got a copy of that and
you know it's not current up on the web, that would be help.
We're just going to be asking you questions about those, and
it's helpful to have those available on hand rather than
have to tell us you'll look it up and call us back or email
us back with information, we just recommend that you know
where those are and that you've reviewed them and know that
they're in compliance with the program.

And this is probably a given, that federal depository
library staff have the responsibility to know and remain
knowledgeable of the FDLP legal and program requirements, so
you want to be up to date with your review of the federal
depository library handbook, anything new that would come
out through the FDLP desktop that is likely -- that will be
announced through FDLP or any successor mechanism to that
announcement service. And if you're a new federal
depository library coordinator, we do encourage you to look
at the new depository coordinator tutorial. I think that
will -- that will give you a head start.

And, also, if you've been notified that a public access
assessment will be conducted at your library, and you know
that there are going to be reviews at neighboring libraries,
we encourage you to contact the neighboring libraries so
that you can network. It gives you an opportunity to make
this networking and to share information. And remember that
I mentioned that cooperative efforts is one of the four
categories in public access assessment, so you could

And you also might be sitting there wondering what in
the world can this public access assessment do for my
library if you've never participated in an inspection or a
self-study. I know Suzanne is going to talk a little bit
more about an experience with public access assessments, but
in case it's new to you, this is our perspective. It's an
outside review that documents the current status of your
library's depository operations and services. This review
helps you identify your depository strengths and any areas
needing improvement. GPO outreach librarians performing the
PAA are experienced former depository coordinators who are
able to consult on a range of topics. And if we don't know
it, we'll look it up and get back to you.

And the regional librarian participating in the PAA
process will also give you additional feedback and ideally
continuing support, and an on-site review provides an
opportunity for all library personnel at your depository to

interact with a representative from GPO. It's fantastic

that you all are here. Obviously most federal depository
libraries are not able to attend the GPO conferences, so it
gives us an opportunity to go out and meet with the
depository coordinators and all of the colleagues at the
depository who contribute to the operations.

It also -- the public access assessment also offers an
opportunity for the coordinator and staff to remind library
administration and colleagues of unique value, service and
challenges that the depository operation and services bring
to the library. When my library was being inspected -- I
was a coordinator at a library prior to coming to GPO -- I
sent out a message the day before saying just a reminder, there's going to be a GPO inspector in the building, and I sent out lots of quotes, every quote I could think of that might be funny and humorous relating to government documents librarianship, and I brought in bagels, of course, for the staff because nothing wins them over like food, or at least not at my institution anyway. But it reminded my colleagues that we're part of this -- this national program called the FDLP. Most people, of course, in the library were not involved in the inspection, but it just reminded them that this is an important thing that you all are doing. And I'm not suggesting at all that you provide food for us, by the way, just mentioning that that was something that I chose to do at my library.

So if you find that this type of review would be helpful to your library at this point in time, you may choose to request a public access assessment now before GPO schedules one of your library's depository operation, and to do that, go to the request for GPO participation form that I mentioned earlier, and the place you can easily remember, I guess, from this session, it's linked to directly from the public access assessment web page. And there's more information in the project summary and on the public access assessment web page, too, and we'll be constantly looking at updating that content to make it most useful to you.

So I just wanted to conclude with a reminder about public access assessments, that depository libraries do have the flexibility to determine locally how to apply their requirements. The library services and content management, outreach librarians assess the current conditions at an individual depository library on the day of review, but also give the library credit work -- credit for work in progress or plans being developed that will enhance or improve depository operations or services.

We are certainly aware, as you are, of all the changes in the library environment, and this is undoubtedly impacting all services at your library, including the depository services. This is all taken into account in a public access assessment which demonstrates the flexibility of this program.

And GPO and the FDLP benefit from the assessment program, as you have another opportunity to share information with the GPO representative. This exchange of information may help address ongoing areas of concern, which
can lead to savings and resources and also lead to the
identification of best practices, which then we may share
more widely within the FDLP.
And this has been said in information previously about
inspections, but I really think it makes the point very
well, so as has been said about the inspection and
self-study program, through this process which is designed
to strengthen individual libraries in the FDLP, our mutual
commitment to provide library users with easy access to its
government information is reinforced.

So stepping back to general outreach just for a moment,
I talked a little bit about our outreach activities and
public access assessments is part of that. And you're
probably thinking, oh, my library's going through all of
these changes, how in the world can you do an assessment at
this point in time. In cooperation with John here on
council, we disseminated an article recently that hopefully
reminded everyone that libraries and GPO are partners in
these challenging times, and please take advantage of the
network of the FDLP to help you remain as knowledgeable as
possible so that you can explore all your options in the
program, and that we're available -- library services and
content management personnel and your regional librarians
are available to discuss options and best practices with
you. Please don't hesitate to contact us. That's what
we're there for.

Great. Thanks so much, end of interpretive dance.

(Applause)

MS. MORIEARTY: Kathy will, of course, remain for
questions later in our -- in our presentation.

And I think you just took my notes. Kathy, I think you
took some of my notes.

MS. BRAZEE: They're underneath. I'm sorry, I
stuck them underneath the --

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. Next point. I would
like to read a recommendation that council had made and
forwarded to GPO concerning assessments. The council
further recommends that GPO continue implementation of the
new model of public access assessments, including site
visits when appropriate. Action. GPO has worked
consistently with the council -- with council members to
reestablish an assessment program that meets 44 USC 1909
requirements for first-hand investigation of conditions for
which need is indicated in depository libraries. And as
became obvious in Kathy's wonderful presentation, they are moving forward on this council recommendation and stepping up implementation, and thank you.

I would next like to introduce Suzanne Sears, head of the government documents department, University of North Texas, who as recently as last week underwent an assessment.

MS. SEARS: Okay. Are you guys awake out there? Because I know we just had lunch, and it should be cool enough that it's keeping you -- you know, your blood circulating. It's freezing up here, if it's not out there.

So my job was to just kind of explain what happened and how we got involved in having an assessment, and what it was like to try and ease anybody's fears out there. The recommendation came forth in April because we heard from the community what about inspections, inspections don't exist anymore, what's going on.

Well, in doing some research, I found the actual recommendation that caused inspections to go away, and that was from the fall meeting in 2001, and GPO and the council, recommendation six, inspections, it says it is the sense of council that a change in the use of the word "inspection" to a more positive term such as "site visit" may facilitate the sharing of expertise, best practices and other positive outcomes. And so GPO did exactly what we asked them to do, and they changed that room "inspection," so now it's public access assessments and site visits. So they are doing them, and I do want to take just a moment to applaud both Kathy Brazee and Ashley Dowling for what they do -- I'm probably pronouncing her last name wrong -- for what they do. That's two people, and like she said, they are hiring two more, and they do these public access assessments, and I think that they are doing a fabulous job. The new depository coordinators' toolbox is wonder, and I just want to take a second and thank them for what they're doing.

(Applause)

MS. SEARS: Okay. So on to my --

UNIDENTIFIED: Robin, as well.

MS. SEARS: Well, yeah, Robin is over that area, and she's the one who came and did my access assessment, so Robin Mohammed, as well, Haun Mohamed, as well.

So Robin calls me I think October 1st, maybe it was the end of September, and said, hey, Suzanne, I'm going to be in the area, so that's where we fell in coordination with other events, so no -- yes, we did fill out our biannual survey.
No, they did not find problems on our web page, at least I hope they didn't. We were -- we were just in the area, is it okay if we come by and do a public access assessment, and I thought about it for a minute, and I'm like what day, okay, well, I should be there that day, sure, come on.

For me it was a great opportunity to showcase my department to my dean. My dean -- my old dean retired at the end of June, and we had a brand new dean who started October 1st. So she was going to come on October 13th, I believe is when she came, and that was going to be wonderful. I mean, he was going to be there two weeks, and I was going to be able to showcase to him the depository collection. It also gave me an opportunity to meet with him twice before she came when every department head in the building was trying to get his attention and get meetings, and he's having to meet with the provost and everything else. I was able to get on his schedule because we had a VIP coming, so this was important, it had to be pushed up. And I was able to say, okay, here's what we're doing and get him abreast of the situation.

I will say I am old enough to have been through an inspection both as a depository coordinator and as a support staff in a depository that was being inspected, and so I kind of knew what to expect. I also had kept abreast during council of the changes from what used to be the inspections to what are now the public access assessments, so I had a little bit of knowledge of what to expect, what I immediately, after I hung up the phone with her, went to the desktop and pulled up the initial review checklist for public access assessments and the guidelines for completing the initial review, and that's what I took to my staff during a staff meeting and I said, okay, here are the things that they're going to be asking us, these are the things they're going to be looking at, and we need to make sure that we are in compliance with these issues.

And so we went through and we looked at each one, and we answered what we thought, you know, our situation was and tried to do a self-assessment of what our situation was, and when Robin came, it was very easy, it was very simple. Like Kathy, she used three words in her presentation, interaction, communication, consultation, and that's very much what it was. It was very much a give and take with Robin and myself. Not only was she assessing my library, but she was giving my staff the chance to ask her questions.
to ask her, you know, why is this this way or why is this
done this way, and so it was very much a give and take, and
my staff was very happy after she was gone, they were a
little terrified before she came, but they -- it made them
feel important that they were asked, you know, what do you
think.
And so not only, you know, did it impress my dean and
put the depository foremost in his mind, but it also
impressed my staff. And I have a wonderful at UNT, but it
even reenergized them into what they do and how what they
did is important, and even their little piece of what they
do is important in getting that collection out and getting
it served -- serviced to the general public.
So I do want to tell those of you in the states that
Kathy mentioned, it's not something to freak out about. It
is a kinder, gentler inspection, and it is very much an
interaction.
And I do think that as far as what council asked for in
the recommendation in April, was that they continue with
implementation and the main concern was that they weren't
doing the on-site inspections, they are, and they're just
doing them a little differently, and they're not necessarily
doing every library in the state like they did before at the
same time.
So Kathy outlined all of that for you, and I'm going to
turn this over to Jill and open it up for questions to see
if we can figure out if there's something else you want us
to go further on with this recommendation, or are we done
with this one now, are we good. Everybody knows these are
happening, we're good. Do you have questions about the
access assessments, or do you have questions about the
federal depository library handbook, because that is
something you do need to be reading before your PAA to make
sure that you're familiar with the laws as Kathy said.
So we're going to open that up, Jill has some
parameters that she's going to give you, and then we'll
allow you questions from the floor.
(MS. MORIEARTY: I want to outline a few parameters
if you don't mind. First off, if you have a specific
question about your individual department, division, please,
please, get information to GPO in the form of a business
card, or please contact them at their website. We'd like to
keep these general questions. Anything specific to your own
department I think is best handled by talking one on one with GPO, who can assess your individual requirements or needs. So let's open up to questions, and do we have anyone who would like to ask some questions? Well, no one leaps up, and so toward that -- well, okay, I will save the questions that have been sent to me. And would you please say your name and institution? Which I did not do, Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

MS. PALMER: I'm Colleen Palmer, Bowling Green State University. I probably should know the answer to this, but I don't. As the assessment is done, will we get a report back from GPO on it?

MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Yes, definitely. The -- there's a little bit more detail in the project summary, but we'll provide a narrative under the four categories of access, collection, service and cooperative efforts. We've also added kind of a general catchall because there are a lot of issues, of course, that cover or cross all those four categories. We'll include any recommendations, and those are typically large-scale recommendations based on best practices.

We've added a section that was not in the former inspection report, it's called notable achievements, and we're hoping that this is something that you can point to when you discuss these things with your library administration saying, hey, we're doing really cool things or unique things, or we're doing exceptionally well in this area.

And then of course there's a section related to any compliance issues, if there are any. And if after the initial review we ask for a follow-up, at the end of the follow-up or the end of the on-site visit, there will be an official -- a second official report, the final report.

MS. LEVERGOOD: Barbara Levergood, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. I think I have a question that's of general interest to new depository coordinators, so we have the biannual survey coming up, we have the self-study, which we've been encouraged to do, and the possibility to request a PAA. I'd like to know from your experience, all else being equal, in what order we might do these and in what -- over what time period? Are we talking about over a year, over two years or so? Where do you find the depository coordinators and the depository itself best
benefiting from these steps?

MS. SEARS: Well, from my experience -- this is Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas, the biannual survey is required by law to be filled out in a certain time period, so priority number one. The self-study and the PAA actual site visit, the self-study comes first, and it's from that that, you know, you would then determine if you think you need a public access assessment, would be how I would -- I would see it.

MS. LEVERGOOD: Okay.

MS. SEARS: The self-study really makes you take a look at all of the legal requirements and where your library falls within those requirements.

MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. I was really interested in what Suzanne was going to say, so I appreciate that. You also asked about the new depository coordinators tutorial, correct?

MS. LEVERGOOD: I should have.

MS. BRAZEE: Oh, that comes immediately to mind. When someone updates the federal depository library directory and indicates they're a new coordinator in a depository library, we send out a note and copy the regional saying, hey, great, you know, we've got your directory change, and we recommend that the new depository coordinator, or the person may have been there for a while but just got around to updating the directory, look at the new depository coordinator's tutorial. That's just a start. The self-study, four of the eight modules are up there. The four biggest ones are probably up there. Ashley's saying yes because she did a lot of the web work on that recently. So it's actually not complete. You can take a look now and in the next month or two when we get everything up there. Just do the modules that you think you need to review. There's collection development, public services, there's upcoming or regional services for regionals, for example, so you can -- if you know your collection development policy hasn't been updated in a while, it may behoove you to take a look at that collection development module. You know, and in this self-study we recommend some resources to review in conjunction with that. Obviously, there's the collection development chapter of the federal depository library handbook, and then we suggest you gather resources.

So you can do the self-study in any order at any time.
If it would help you to do the self-study first and then
decide whether or not an on-site visit is a good idea for
you, if you'd like to make a request for one before a PAA is
scheduled -- because the PAA may or may not -- GPO may or
may not decide to do an on-site visit.
Actually, after the new depository coordinators'
tutorial, it's up to you.

MS. LEVERGOOD: Okay. Well, thank you both for
your advice.

MS. MORIEARTY: Any more questions from the floor?

I knew there would be.

MS. CANEY: Peggy Caney (ph), Northeastern State
University in Oklahoma, one of the states listed. We're one
of the sites that may be visited. We've been talking about
it with the regionals. And one of the questions I have,
we've talked a lot about the prep. What actually happens if
we have a site visit, like timeframe, you know, kind of how
long, what types of activities might happen on that specific
day?

MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. I know that I'm not
the one coming to Oklahoma, so obviously I'm one of two
people, so the other person is actually Darlene.

The amount of time is typically dependent upon the
initial review that's going to be done based on the 2007
biannual survey submission at this point in time and the
information on the web pages. It may depend upon the size
of your library, too. But we've done some assessments that
were just half a day, so morning or afternoon.

If you have requests for more meetings with your
colleagues, we could certainly set up a longer timeframe,
and we may determine that a longer timeframe is actually
beneficial to both GPO and your library, so at this point we
can't really say, other than it's likely to be half a day
and a full day -- up to a full day. I know that doesn't pin
it down whatsoever, but the idea is that each library is
individual, unique and, you know, apply the requirements in
a way that, you know, fits your entire library so...

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. We have a 70 percent depository in very good shape,
but we also have off-site storage, and Robin stayed five
hours. I would have -- you know, we probably could have
filled another day and a half, but she was rushed because it
was because she was in the area. So, again, it's going to
depend on your library and size and type and shape and what
issues are going to be brought up.

   MS. GIBSON: Hi. My name is Carrie Gibson. I'm from Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania. I actually have two -- maybe two comments or questions. The first question, when you were talking about the various factors for the public access assessments, access collection service and cooperative efforts, I think my ears perked up at the cooperative efforts, and I was wondering, is there a place for a best practices as to what other libraries are doing so that I may gain some ideas or inspiration, that I can work with other maybe small colleges in my area.

   And then the second question I had was is the -- is it necessary for the outreach staff from the state library to be present for the public access assessments? Do we have to coordinate that for the same day, or could that be done at a different time? Thank you.

   MS. MORIEARTY: All right. Let's take best practices first. Who wants to leap up? And there she goes.

   MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. You can look in the photo depository library handbook in the collaborative efforts chapter and also in the public access assessments chapter at this point, and I encourage you to review articles, too, that have been put out on the FDLP desktop. There may be some suggestions in there. I'm not thinking of any off top of my head unfortunately.

   I really encourage you when it comes to cooperative efforts to network with your neighboring depository libraries and discuss everything you're doing, because you're probably doing a lot more than you even think of off the top of your head. That is really common. We start asking questions and learn that the libraries are doing so many incredible things related to U.S. government information, but they never made that connection before. So there are best practices, you know, that your colleagues can suggest, too.

   Relating to the second question, is your regional at the state library? Is that why you mentioned state library?

   MS. GIBSON: Yes.

   MS. BRAZEE: Okay. So you're asking if the regional will be -- will participate in the public access assessment. GPO will invite the regional librarian or a representative from the regional depository library to the assessment, and we will try our darndest to make sure that there's a mutually convenient time for all of that. If need
be, you know, we will work something out. But certainly the
regional librarian has a lot to contribute, and we'll be
very interested in learning what's going on at the
depository just from the conversation that day, because it
is the role of the regional depository library to provide
consultation within the state and sharing the best
practices, you know, within the specified area.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. On the best practices, I would just also say if you
go to the depository spotlights, the depositories that
they've put up in the depository spotlights are doing some
fantastic things. Also, the depository library of the year
award, if you go back and look at the -- what those
libraries are doing, those are usually on the desktop, and
then just contacting some of those libraries, too, and
asking for more information about something that you've
read. Gov.go, there's always something going out about
something somebody's doing, and, you know, when you come to
the meetings, there's always the educational sessions that
are talking about the different things, and a lot of those
are collaborative efforts. And you can go on the desktop in
the file repository and look at previous DLC meetings and
the handouts and things like that.

MS. MORIEARTY: Go ahead, Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The other thing I
would suggest you do, these are all very good ideas, and you
can get lots of ideas of new things to do, but what you
might also want to do is check your files for previous
reports from GPO about your library to you and see what
kinds of things were included under the cooperate -- excuse
me, under the cooperative effort section in those reports to
give you an idea what you were doing in the past and the
kinds of comments that were received by you from GPO in
those areas.

MS. MORIEARTY: Before anyone else grabs the mike,
I have a question that was handed to me, and I'll get the
answer back to people, and it concerns the handbook. There
have been increasing questions about the status of the
handbooks in terms of it being updated and perhaps the need
for the electronic section to be expanded. Would anyone
from GPO like to fill us in about this? Thank you.

MR. PREVEE: Hi, Ted Prevee (ph), GPO. I'll just
take a first cut on this. So the handbook is an integrated
resource. It's a living document. We've had recently --
well, it's been, I guess, several months now, but we had one
of our last updates off the desktop indicated the frequency
of it would be updates as needed. If there were any major
updates that came forward, they could be done, you know,
immediately, but at a minimum it would be updated on an
annual basis.

So what we have done, and what I'd like to encourage
everyone to continue to do, is if you have suggestions,
there's the ability to feed those to us through ask GPO. If
you have clarifications, questions, certainly we're here
now. We're also here, you know, when you're back at your
institution. But I would be very interested in what kind of
suggestions might be proposed in terms of expanding any
particular section or -- you know, each of the chapters as
they were developed initially was done pretty -- in a
collaborative sense. Everybody in the community
participated. It was pretty extensive in terms of the whole
vetting process, is everyone comfortable with this. It went
well beyond a normal iterative process, but that doesn't
preclude us from revisiting chapters based on changes in
technology, based on best practices. That's why we
developed the handbook the way we did in terms of
flexibility.

MS. MORIEARTY: I think why -- at least in our area
why people wanted me to ask this question and put it forward
is with the implementation of PAA, people are starting to go
back to the handbook, I feel, more than they have been. And
that was wrong, people should keep an eye on it all the
time, but I do -- I did look at the electronic section, and
I think that there is a priority, a need to flesh out a
little bit more. As you've heard in our sessions, there are
a lot of questions about what to do with the electronic,
what -- what's the best practice or what are basically
people doing with electronic access, and I think that might
be a definite need at this point.

Would anyone like to comment? All right. I can stand
by myself. I'm a big girl.

MR. PREVEE: Thank you, Ted Prevee.
MS. MORIEARTY: Any other questions?
MR. SHULER: I do.
MS. MORIEARTY: Of course.
MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
at Chicago. How were these -- has GPO had the experience in
accessing a library under these conditions -- under these
new ways of doing things? Where there is no collection, the
services are completely integrated into libraries so there's
no distinction between documents and other material, that
there is no collection, per se, and there is no separate
public service desk. Do any of these parameters that were
described in terms of the public assessment change
significantly under those conditions?

MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Libraries did merge
reference desks in the past. I believe in the '80s there
was a lot in the library literature about that, so that in
and of itself isn't a new thing.

MR. SHULER: Uh-huh.

MS. BRAZEE: What is really new in the past year or
so is that a lot of libraries are considering or have
dropped a lot of item numbers and basically have really
become the first mostly electronic depository libraries.
They are providing access to the FDLP electronic collection
according to the FDLP internet use policy and the public
service guidelines for government information in electronic
formats as to GPO -- FDLP policies, I should say. So
they're providing access to a lot more than they're
selecting by item number, and I know there was a whole
separate session this morning on item numbers, but what
we're looking at in terms of collections in a case of a
mostly electronic depository library would be access to the
electronic collection, the FDLP electronic collection, and
service then becomes really important, making some kind of
way, process, whatever the library chooses to do to make
their status as a depository visible, having the emblem on
the door is still a program requirement, cataloging online
resources, doesn't have to be all online resources that are
available, could be selected ones, and that could be
whatever way the library wishes to catalog these things,
could be review by subject or by item number that they're
not selecting. Service can be done in a lot of different
ways, that way in terms of providing visibility to the
electronic collection and to the library status as a center
for U.S. government expert -- government information
expertise. Obviously to make sure that that expertise is
available, the public services staff need to have some kind
of training. Yes, government publications are
interdisciplinary, but it does take some in -- or staff
training, some kind of regular reminders of how to find U.S.
government information, reminder what the core resources
are, that CGP exists, that kind of thing just as a basis.

A lot of libraries are doing a lot more than they realize, I think, when it comes to service. U.S. government information is a part of a lot of libraries' regular instruction classes. It's just not identified that way when it comes to the depository operation. So if U.S. government publications are included in general critical thinking classes that the library teaches for new researchers or freshmen at an academic institution, that's great. U.S. government publications are authoritative core resources, you know, really good examples, and those are described as -- the nature of the publication is described that way. Obviously, U.S. government publications show up in all kinds of different subjects, so those are integrated, so every single way that a library is utilizing the U.S. government information expertise or government publications, whether they be of the tangibles in the library's reference collection or all of the online resources is taken into account, and we will keep asking probing questions until we get there.

Did I address everything?

UNIDENTIFIED: I think you did.

MS. BRAZEE: Okay, thanks.

MS. MORIEARTY: Any further comments or questions? Seeing none, talking very slowly to allow anyone -- well, ladies and gentlemen, I don't believe in dragging out a meeting just to fill a time slot, and it is exactly 3:00. If there are no further comments or questions -- and we have one.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. So not hearing any more questions, comments, I mean, this is your chance. Council's got this recommendation on the table, and from what I can tell, GPO has -- is doing wonderful at responding to our recommendations, so if there's something that you're not seeing in their response that you expected or that you thought we need, we need to hear that. We need to know what it is you are looking for.

MS. MORIEARTY: All right, and we have people at the mike. Please identify yourself and your institution.

MS. PALMER: Colleen Palmer, Bowling Green State University. I applaud the efforts of GPO. In my institution, we're required to do assessment across the university and across the library, so I think it's a great opportunity for me as a documents librarian to do a very
formal assessment as part of something to do this year.
I guess I have sort of a -- I don't know if it's a
philosophical question, but you don't have very many people
to do this. I think we would really welcome assessment, I
think it would be good for us, and I imagine there's a
demand out here in the community for it. Can you meet the
needs of all the people that want to go through an
assessment project?
MS. MORIEARTY: Kathy?
UNIDENTIFIED: Robin?
MS. MORIEARTY: No. Robin's gone, or we would not
call on Kathy.
MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Excellent question,
I really appreciate it. Because we have currently two
people, and we had one of those two people out on a very,
very happy -- for a very, very happy reason, on maternity
leave this past year, we kind of did an initial review with
the 2007 biannual survey submissions and identified major
areas of where there could be potential compliance issues,
and we drafted some articles and did that kind of thing. So
our hope is through our educational resources and our
continued outreach, programs at conferences and all that, we
can share information to remind everyone of compliance
issues, especially related to public access, although almost
everything that happens at a depository relates to public
access in some way. So hopefully through continued
education, our goal is to keep libraries above par related
to compliance.
We are -- we just did -- did a job announcement, I'm
not saying that correctly, put out an announcement to
hire -- or to select two more outreach librarians. We're
hoping that's going to really help. We have a schedule
whereby we can do a certain -- we plan to do a certain
number of assessments in a year, but obviously it does not
touch all libraries in one calendar year. So there is going
to be a delay. Those who were inspected farthest in time,
back in time, are going to have the public access assessment
first because it's been so long since they had an
inspection. There are a lot of libraries that were at the
very tail end of the inspection process. Unless they
request an assessment or unless we determine that there is a
need, we will not be scheduling a public access assessment
right away.
It's definitely a concern, and we definitely will keep
on track of it. It is part of our internal implementation plan to do a quarterly review of how many public -- I keep saying inspections, it's just natural, how many public access assessments we've done, keeping in mind that the public access assessments start with a review at GPO, so we're not necessarily visiting all libraries on-site. And there have only been two libraries since early 2007 that have asked for an on-site inspection or public access assessment. Please, whenever I say inspection, please think public access assessment.

So hopefully this discussion will generate a lot more discussion about a review of a library's policies and all that to make sure that they're following the requirements of the handbook.

But your point is very well taken and it is understood, and we certainly are monitoring it.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I just want to remind what Kathy said. You can ask for a PAA. So if you think that it would really help your library, you can request one.

MS. MORIEARTY: This is your time. Any further questions or comments? Please, sir.

MR. CORELICK: Okay. I will keep this really quick. John Corelick (ph), University of Alaska at Fairbanks. Okay. I'm supportive of the PAA process, but there is one concern that I have which has not been spoken about at any of these meetings so far, and it's something that GPO seems reluctantly to discuss, and I don't know why, and that is the importance of private sector indexing. As far as I'm concerned, the private sector does a better job of providing indexing and access, and one of the best things that I can do for my -- for my clientele is to provide as much private sector reference sources and indexing that I can possibly afford, and then to put notification of that on the web page where I'm discussing this. So I just want to make sure that you people realize that in a lot of these libraries we -- we construe the private sector to be an extremely important part of providing information and services to our clientele, and I want this to be recognized in the PAA process, because you have not seemed to have addressed that -- that -- the degree to which that we actually do rely on this.

And my other concern related to this is that you're overly concerned on idealistic things like, you know, some
collection development things which may or may not ever be realized and some of the practical implications. Again, coming back to the private sector, I feel if I load my place with as much private sector source material that I can, that complements, it does not replace but it complements what GPO provides, and it complements what other subject things provide, like from the legal and the political and the social aspects, and therefore I have a better rounded service, and I have a better rounded collection. And I'm really worried that your PAA process is focused somewhat on the wrong things, and you're not looking at the full spectrum of services, and you're not looking at the full spectrum of what we do as librarians. And one of the things that I do repeatedly, I go back and I fill in the cracks that GPO can or will not do by maximizing the private sector.

MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. I appreciate the comment. Obviously access -- whatever access the library is able to afford is great, and we give you credit. In the description of the different categories under access, one of the selections is the library selects appropriate secondary resources, for example, databases and indexes, that support bibliographic access to and use of the federal government information products. 

We know that -- we've always known that secondary resources are absolutely necessary to make sense of the depository resources, because the government typically does not do a lot of that type of indexing. GPO catalogs the resources and makes those available through the CGP. And the agencies themselves will have some indexing of some of their resources or place their resources in databases, but without doubt, we anticipate that each library is going to have some selection of reference resources, databases and indexes. Obviously, larger, more affluent libraries can purchase more and subscribe to licenses more readily than other libraries, but it is definitely part of the access component related to bibliographic access and providing -- identification of the resources and providing access and making use of them. Did that help?

MR. CORELICK: Yeah, sort of just, as long as you recognize --

MS. MORIEARTY: Well, it -- yes.

MR. CORELICK: -- that's really a -- not just a --

MS. MORIEARTY: I'm sorry, we can't hear what
you're saying, sir. If you'd come --

MR. CORELICK: Just as long as you make sure --

MS. MORIEARTY: Come to the mike, please. I can't even hear you.

MR. CORELICK: Okay.

MS. MORIEARTY: We do want you to be involved in the conversation.

MR. CORELICK: It's not a minor component, it's a major component, and that's what I want recognized. It's not just to fill in the cracks. It's really part of our major operations.

MS. BRAZEE: Kathy Brazee, GPO. Yeah, the item that's in the focus on access collection service and cooperative efforts stems from the entry in the federal depository library handbook basically making this a program requirement for depository libraries, so it's important enough that it is a program requirement.

The resources that you select are certainly up to your library and what you determine to be the U.S. government information needs of your users in relationship to all the other information needs of your users. Obviously, you select -- you purchase and subscribe to licensed databases based on a priority for the entire library, but we ask that depository users are included in that review process, so the depository service should be equal to or exceed -- I always love that exceed, equal to or exceed the service provided to other library users. I understand your comment, and it is in the handbook, and it is in the public access assessment, so I think it is elevated to the level that you're asking for.

MS. MORIEARTY: Any further questions or comments? And there does not appear to be any additional comments or questions. It is 11 after 3:00, and I am going to adjourn this session. A gift for our transcriber.

(End of third session, beginning of final session:)

MR. SHULER: All right, thank you. It helps to have somebody in the audience.

John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. The question was typically we don't have a court reporter at our working sessions, but because we're bleeding over into a plenary session, the court reporter is here, so I'm asking the council what their wishes are. No problem? No problem on this side?

This is a working session. Normally we have our own
 recording, and that's why I'm asking the questions. So I
think if the recorder is not needed by council, she would
probably appreciate the time away -- it doesn't matter to --
we like to think of her welfare, too. So by most traditions
during council working sessions, a recorder has not been
here.

UNIDENTIFIED: We can manage without.
MR. SHULER: Okay.
MS. MORIEARTY: John?
MR. SHULER: Yes.
MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.
MR. SHULER: Thank you, Jill.
MS. MORIEARTY: What is the advantage of having the
recorder here?
MR. SHULER: We will capture our remarks a lot
better than we usually do, okay, that would be one thing.
John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Since we
are changing the idea of writing full-fledged
recommendations to topic sentences, it would help in our
memory to go back and see what we said versus what we might
remember based on our own recording, if you will. Those
will be the advantages. The disadvantages would be

everything we say here in all its rawness would be available
to the public.
MS. MORIEARTY: John, Jill Moriearty, University of
Utah.
MR. SHULER: Yes, Jill.
MS. MORIEARTY: I don't want to hear you raw. Put
that in the transcript, I dare you.
MR. SHULER: So John uncut is not desired, okay,
I heard that. What do you think?
MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco.
Somebody has to take minutes though.
MR. SHULER: Yes.
MS. LAWHUN: That's what happened last time, and I
think we had some problems with people being either too
short or too long.
MR. SHULER: Yeah.
MS. LAWHUN: So we didn't capture everything, not
that I want every single thing recorded, but it just saves
us -- someone being distracted by taking minutes.
MR. SHULER: Okay.
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. I echo that, but then that also brings up that

perhaps I'm putting forward a recommendation that we vote
for a secretary or elect a secretary, because we did not do
that last night.
MR. SHULER: Okay. Then the sense I get the
council is -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago. The council is comfortable with the idea of the
recorder being present during this discussion? Okay, then
let us begin.
Since GPO has available to us for consultation during
our discussion of their recommendations about technological
improvement and council operations, I suggest that we begin
with that resolution so that we maximize the GPO's time
here, and it allows Karen to go back home and rest proPURLy,
considering she's -- she needs as much --
UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
MR. SHULER: Sure, or I think we all have pieces
of paper in front of us, so why don't we work with that?
UNIDENTIFIED: The audience doesn't.
MR. SHULER: Oh, I forgot about the audience.
See, this is what happens when nobody ever watches you
during a working session. Yes, go ahead. Let's evoke the
technology. Sorry, audience.
So while we're getting the technology in order, go
ahead and review --
MR. SHULER: Recommendations for technological
improvements and technical operations. We're almost there.
We've got the Gutenberg in front of us, the Farnsworth is
about to be coming available.
MR. SHULER: So while that is -- I would like
then to discuss the recommendation that begins after this
called over the last 15 years after review of the council's
historic record, the recommendation that begins with that
sentence, and followed by the draft council recommendation
that begins background attendance at council
meetings/depository conferences.
Some of this may be available to the audience, some may
not, depending on our technological capabilities, so bear
with us.
UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
MR. SHULER: That's the one everybody --
everybody has in front of them.
UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).
MR. SHULER: Sure. Okay, so --

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).

MR. SHULER: Thank you, James.

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).

MR. SHULER: So John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I encourage the council members to remember their naming obligations when they speak. Who.

Would like to open the discussion on this recommendation? Suzanne.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. John asked Chris Greer and James Jacobs and -- Jacobs and myself to work on a sub task force on improvements to FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov, so in that vein we drew up a very simple possible recommendation for us to work on to be coming out of this meeting with our recommendations, which is that council further recommends that GPO work to enhance the functionality of FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov, the rationale being that the internet is ubiquitous and collaborative. The GPO sites available to the depository library council and the FDLP community, FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov, do offer some tools for leveraging the web's power. These tools need to be more fully develop, as they currently limit the work and collaboration opportunities of the community and require enhancements to take full advantage of the web. It is recommended that GPO make these enhancements a top priority in order to move the work of depository library council and the depository community forward.

In that vein, James and Chris and I prepared the two-page document that you have, recommendations for technological improvements and council operations. We've had preliminary discussions with Karen over the phone, and appreciate her being here to talk to us further on these. And there were some recommendations that we had that they already actually implemented, which we're very thankful for and appreciate the prompt response on that.

So I open up the floor, unless you want me to read through these. I think you can read yourself, or do you want me to read through them?

MR. SHULER: Can people read for themselves?

Okay.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty -- I'm so used to people just hearing me a football field away. Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. On problem one -- problem
statement number one, when you said findable, do you mean accessible or collated and findable?

MR. SHULER: And what was your suggestion or --

MS. MORIEARTY: No, no, a definition for exactly "findable."

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Basically we are concerned -- we were very concerned with the navigation to be able for the community to find where the depository library council page was. Previous to last week there was nothing on the front page that said depository library council anywhere. You had to know that you had to go into the about FDLP and find depository library council. So Karen has added a link to the very bottom, if you scroll to the bottom of the FDLP desktop, there are now under about the FDLP, there's a listing that includes depository library council to help with that.

MS. MORIEARTY: So you mean what -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. So you're talking in terms of transparency of --

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. MORIEARTY: Okay.

MR. SHULER: Searchability of the site, as well.

MS. MORIEARTY: See, that's what I thought. It's not just -- for me findability was fuzzy, I wasn't sure what that meant.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. There's, I guess, two different kinds of findable. There's the navigation of the site, which is what we're talking about, but we're also talking about the search of the site.

MS. MORIEARTY: Well, see, that gets back to do we want to say that -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Do we want to say that, because if I read -- were reading this and I saw findable, I wouldn't know what that meant, but if we are specific and we want navigation or transparency or easily searchable, then let's -- let's say it. Let's tell them exactly and define what it is that we're looking at.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I think if you look below to the recommendations, that you'll see that although findable in the problem statement is maybe a little vague, that there are recommendations for both navigation and making a search engine better, and so I mean I --

MR. SHULER: I hope at this pint that what we're trying to do with this discussion is not work smith, because
either agree that these recommendations are in the direction we want to go, and if we want to make suggestions, it could come in another point. So I think it's good discussing findability versus not, but I think if we make the point that we want a better definition of what we mean by findability, just to say that, and the group can take it under consideration.

MS. MORIEARTY: But how much -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I understand that you want to cut through this and get to the chase --

MR. SHULER: Yeah.

MS. MORIEARTY: -- but if these are due tomorrow, we don't have much chase.

MR. SHULER: No, what is due tomorrow --

MS. MORIEARTY: Yeah.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Let's revisit a bit what we have discussed, that is, actually what is due tomorrow is going to be topic sentences of what we're focusing on for the council business about what we heard of discussions and everything going on at the meeting this week. We are not presenting full-blown recommendations of this kind of detail, okay? This particular recommendation is a council recommendation that is fulfilling a particular council function. That's why it has so much detail at this time. We've actually been working on this for several weeks, okay, and that's why it comes to us more full-blown, okay?

So we can note -- and perhaps we can ask Karen, maybe she can address the findability issue in terms of the capacities or the capabilities of GPO that might address Jill's concern. Does that seem reasonable? Okay.

MS. SIEGER: Can you hear me? Okay. Karen Sieger, U.S. Government Printing Office. I would interpret "findable" as in both in terms of navigation, searchability and accessibility of all content, whether it be via a web page point click, or either searching both on the FDLP desktop or through third-party search engines. Does that clarify at least my opinion of findable?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. So I just want to ask council, do they think we're on the right step here? I mean, the first one, basically we're trying to make sure that the depository library council section of the FDLP desktop has information about our current work, what we're doing, that it's up, that the
content that -- like for meeting minutes or whatever we
decide, draft documents that we want community input on, are
put onto the page.

And with that if you go back to the one sheet that has
your recommendation rationale at the bottom, there's a
bylaw. We're probably going to have to put something into
the bylaws, either adding to the secretary duties, that they
are the person who reports that web content to the web
content manager for GPO, or that we have a new position on
council of a web content person who's responsible for
distributing that to GPO.

The second one then is that we have a separate file
repository for the council recommendations. James and I
were envisioning an interactive database of sorts so that
the recommendations could be put up with the GPO responses,
and what actions had been taken and if those recommendations
had been closed out. For instance, today at the public
access assessments, I feel we closed that recommendation,
and it would be nice that on the page it was said it was
closed, it was done, we've discussed this.

And then the next payment is related to
community.FDLP.gov, which sort of goes into the page behind
that. We feel that it is not in council's best interest to
have a list serve that goes from institution to institution
based on who the chair is, and therefore has no continuity,
no institutional memory, no archive to be searched for
emails and discussions on the recommendations. So we would
like for community.FDLP.gov to be that spot, and it needs a
lot of enhancements to do that for us. And so after we're
through with this discussion, the next one on your agenda is
what can we do in the meantime until it is up to par.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
at Chicago. And one of the reasons we invited Karen to join
us in discussion is to give the council an ideas of how much
time it will take, how much time will we be in that
interregnum between a fully capable desktop environment and
how long we'll have to rely on third-party apps. So this
might be a chance for Karen when she's ready to give us some
feedback about that.

MS. SIEGER: I'm sorry, Karen Sieger, U.S.
Government Printing Office. You asked me to give some
information about?

MR. SHULER: Okay, thanks.

MS. SIEGER: I'm sorry, can you repeat what you
MR. SHULER: Yes. The question, if you can speak to what is possible, what is easily done and -- in terms of accomplishing this, and what's going to take a little bit longer, I think that would help the council understand, you know, this sort of intermediate strategy that is being suggested. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Is there a particular topic you want to start on, or do you want me to run through --

MR. SHULER: I want you to start with the --

start with the first recommendation.

MS. SIEGER: Okay. Karen Sieger, GPO. I have a list of recommendations which -- do you all have this copy of the recommendations with the GPO response?

MR. SHULER: I don't -- you guys should have that. We handed it out yesterday.

MS. SIEGER: Okay. Karen Sieger, GPO. Would you like me to read these out for those in attendance? And then we could talk about --

MS. MORIEARTY: Just give us a moment.

MR. SHULER: Since we have it in front of us, why don't you just give us -- let's do it this way since we're all not reading from the piece of paper. What would you suggest would be the easiest thing to do from all this? What would you do as the web person responsible for FDLP desktop?

MS. SIEGER: At present the web content section within library services consists of a staff of five plus myself, and at this time we have a number of priorities that we are going to go ahead and put in rank order after this conference to say, you know, what is our main focus going to be. So we're going to be taking our budget information for this year, our staffing for this year, as well the part of this that we get from the director of LSCM and GPO, and determine what we're going to be doing.

With regard to this list, when I was talking to Suzanne and James about it, there are a lot of things in here that I see that are very doable in the near future. Some of them, as Suzanne mentioned earlier, have been completed already. We went ahead and added the link to the depository library council pages from the bottom navigation, which is available on every page of the desktop. We also went ahead and -- there are two sections where materials from council can be
found in the file repository. We noticed that one of the links was not included on the council page, so we went ahead and we added that, so there's now a link to the section specifically about council in the file repository that is underneath the "about" section, and that contains right now the council recommendations, for example.

In the past couple of months what we've been doing is going through the legacy desktop, and we've been looking through all the content that was on there, and we found a mix of materials found across several directories. We found duplicate files. We try to make sure that the version -- we had to go through each file, make sure which one was the latest one, you know, do we keep all the drafts, do they all mirror each other, and what file format were they in, were they in a usable formal.

We found a number of files that were in non-compliant HTML, and we ended up taking the recommendations, for example, and put them in five-year chunks in design and converting those then to Word -- sorry, converted those into PDF, which are available both in a print and a web version. So we've been capturing all of those recommendations, and we added those to the desktop.

As of right now, we're also moving all of the council -- the proceedings from the various council meetings into the outreach area, and I believe we have about four years left to go through.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: Of those years, most of them are in non-compliant HTML, so we are going through and converting those into PDF documents to put into the file repository. But that does take time. It's very time intensive to go back through all those files. And once we finish that, there are going to be a number of files that we do not know what they are, they're not linked from any page on the legacy desktop, so if we can get council's assistance in identifying what those are and what the home for those are, we can go ahead and close out the -- that portion of the legacy FDLP desktop so that all the council materials are now on FDLP.gov. And from there we can go ahead and start looking into some of these other services, such as does the council page belong underneath about the FDLP, or do we want to go ahead and move that to a different section of the FDLP desktop.

One recommendation that GPO has after looking at the
material was to put it underneath of outreach, and so we wanted to get council's opinion about do you feel it's an appropriate home for the council materials, or is there another place that we want to go ahead and reexamine its placement.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: Moving materials within the desktop is rather easy, it's all controlled by a content management system, so we can move things relatively easy. It doesn't take a lot of web -- hard coding like it did with the legacy desktop. So based off the feedback that we jointly have on it, we can go ahead and move that to a more appropriate place.

There are other things near term that we can work on. For example, there were a number of questions about the search capability of the FDLP desktop. We have been currently testing a new search functionality, which at this point we thought we were ready to release the simple search version of it, however, we just found a bug between that and another one of our components, it actually interferes right now with our forms component. So we've contacted the developer of the forms component, and they're currently looking into a resolution so that we can get both running in tandem.

That new search will allow us to search all the content within the FDLP desk. It will also search within PDF files. So if you go ahead and you do a search, it will find the text within the PDF files and include those in your results. The advance search option of that component, however, is a little unrefined, and so it would take a little bit longer to go ahead and refine that. It would require some custom coding either through GPO staff, or we'll have to go ahead and contract those services, and we'd have to evaluate what would be the best path to accomplish that.

MR. SHULER: And if one had to put a time -- excuse me, John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. If one had to put a timeline on that, would you say much before Buffalo or after Buffalo?

MS. SIEGER: I would hope that it would be before Buffalo, because the search is a rather important component of the desktop.

MR. SHULER: Okay. So the council, if they understand what you're saying, pretty much have heard that much of the council's legacy documents have been moved over
from the old space into the new space, the tabs are available for people to click on there, correct?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. When we say the legacy docs, I would say only about 60 percent have been moved so far.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: There is a lot of material on there yet that we just don't know what it is.

MR. SHULER: And that 40 percent you would want council to look at --

MS. SIEGER: Yes.

MR. SHULER: -- to help sort out. Okay.

In terms of -- this is really beginning to feel like a Congressional hearing. In terms of -- in terms of timeline, do you think if we fashion an efficient process, looking around the table, we could grind through those 40 percent and get it done before Buffalo?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yes, I would like to go ahead and close out that legacy desktop as quickly as possible, so I would welcome any help. It would be -- Cindy was just saying that she could help, as well.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: I know other people on the GPO staff would be willing to help as time permits.

MR. SHULER: Cindy's reaching.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'm just wondering, these things that aren't linked from anywhere are probably not from this council, and so I'm not -- not that you're not helpful, but I don't know how helpful it would be in this instance. I would like to suggest that perhaps I work with Karen and do one pass-through, at least.

MR. SHULER: Council is council. I mean, we're responsible for our council, but we're also responsible for earlier councils, so I -- unless council wants to jump in and correct me, I think it is our legacy as much as it is your legacy. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. It may be worth doing the joint, because even if, say, Cindy and I sit down and make a first run, it may be that council wants to say we don't want this in PDF, we want this in a different file format, so it would at least save us as some time before we do the actual conversion to make sure that we're getting it in a format that works best for council. When we converted
the council recommendations, for example, we just did those
in straight text. Now reading this recommendation that
you'd like something more interactive where you can go ahead
and look through previous recommendations, say which ones
have been closed out, comment on previous ones, that will
require, you know, much more work to enable something like
that, but that's something that we hadn't considered as
something that council wanted when we converted those
documents. So, you know, if we go ahead and look at those
legacy files and decide now that, okay, these are fine in
PDF, these we want to go ahead and make into different file
formats for, you know, additional use down the road, at
least we can have that discussion before that work begins.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Ann, did you have --

I've lived through recently moving most of the regional's
website to the community site, and it's probably three
quarters of the way done, and I've had some experience
working with community and its quirks and what I expected it
to do as opposed to what it did and so on. I'd be willing
to work on this --

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SANDERS: -- with Karen because we've
already -- she's already been holding my hand through this
already, so I'm comfortable with saying I don't recognize
this, I need some help and asking, but I would be willing to
take --

MR. SHULER: John --

MS. SANDERS: -- responsibility for it.

MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of
Illinois at Chicago. How do the rest of the council members
feel about Ann taking on that role, and does anybody else
want to join her to help out, or just the two of you would

Um --

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. I
would help you out because I'd be curious, as a newer member
newer to the --

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. TUBBS: -- depository program identifying
documents, that might be more useful for the newer
generation.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. John Shuler, University
of Illinois at Chicago. James?
MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I almost said Jim. That's so funny.

As far as the FDLP.gov recommendations, Karen, are there -- are there any items on there that you -- that you would -- that you would see as being potentially difficult or impossible to do? I guess I'm thinking specifically of recommendation 1B, having third-party services on FDLP.gov. I'm not sure if -- I know that technologically it's probably okay, having used it before, but socially or administratively I'm not sure if that would be okay.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Technically you're correct, it's easy to do, either through plug-ins such as, you know, insert any code into this space or actual supported add-ons for the CMS; however, we would need to sit down and discuss what material and what plug-ins so that we make sure that we vet any of them for security purposes before we go placing any piece of technology onto the site, and also make sure that we -- make sure that library services as well as council are on the same page about the content that's being distributed.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. So you would find a powerful thing to have council say specifically that they want this a priority, to have this to happen as soon as possible to address, say, the third-party issues, and that would help in the discussions?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Of the ones on this list regarded to the desktop, I wonder if that is the one necessarily to focus on first.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SEARS: Would the search be the higher priority, as well as the navigation, where is the most appropriate place for the council materials on the desktop so that it's easily findable to, you know, various users of the site.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. What does council think?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I don't consider council outreach, but maybe I'm completely off there. If it's not under the about the FDLP, the first place I would look for it is depository administration, but Karen and I have had the discussion that GPO does not feel it falls under the scope of depository administration, so I think that about the FDLP may be the best place for it. I certainly do not consider it outreach.
and education.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. When we were talking about whether or not it belonged under depository administration, under its current definition, if you look at what we scope as depository administration, we do not feel at this time it fits that scope. If we need to go ahead and re-scope what depository administration means, it may well fall underneath depository administration.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I would suggest that we deal with search and findability before we deal with the placement of widgets and other technology in the text, because I have a great deal of trouble myself finding things on the desktop, and when I use the search function, I get a lot of extraneous stuff that just is totally irrelevant, and it's a little frustrating.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. That search is actually quite powerful. It's just a little finnicky, but we do understand that not everybody understands the way that we do as main users of the widget how it quite works, so we're fully aware that that search needs to go. And I was hoping before council that we could get up this at least basic new search, we just weren't able to get it in time. We identified the bug on Friday and said it was better just to wait than to try and put something out that was potentially buggy.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Other council members?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I would agree search is definitely a higher priority than third-party widgets, and it -- I just wanted to put that in there so that GPO would have that on their radar. So in the future if council decides that they would like to do live blogging or they would like to use Delicious or any of those third-party tools, that they would be able to do that in concert with GPO in dealing with the security issues and those kinds of things.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. I agree. It sounds like you're really close to getting the search and the navigation down and getting all of the documents uploaded, so I would concentrate on finishing up that project and then work on the third-party widgets and gadgets.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North 0209
Texas. Karen, can I just ask you if we -- when we go back and we start doing the wordsmithing on the recommendation, we have council further recommends that GPO work to enhance the functionality of FDLP.gov and community.FDLP.gov. Is that good for you? I mean, is there wording we're leaving out? Is there something you would suggest that we add? How are you feeling about that?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. I suppose my one item to consider would be the other priorities that GPO and -- as well as what we have at the moment, and assigning a rank for the desktop in accordance with the priorities that we get from the director of library services.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Any other questions about the priorities? Obviously we'll be giving a feedback, but it gives us an idea of what you -- what GPO is capable of in the next few months and what needs to be held off. Any other questions for Karen about the technological capabilities?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. I do have one thing to ask before you close that out. With regard to these third-party add-ons, would these necessarily be appropriate for the desktop, or are these also ones that we may want to use on the community site? So if the community site is enhanced with the ability to add content based off of the log-in privileges on the community site, would those be types of features you'd want included on there, and we put that on the radar for the community site, as well, or in lieu of?

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I believe what is good for the council should be good for the community. What does the team think?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I would agree with John, that anything that we've said about FDLP.gov searchability, et cetera, third-party tools, should be also enhanced on community.FDLP.gov.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Anybody else from council have any other thoughts about that? Kathy?

MS. LOHEIM: Not about that -- Kathy Loheim (sp), San Francisco -- but the email part that's on the community FDLP, it says choice of traffic distribution channels. I think someone said that's going to take a while, and that's part of our communication --

MR. SHULER: Yeah.
MS. LOHEIM: So how long -- I mean, is that a long
time or -- because we didn't want to have the emails go from
all these different chairmen, have a central place, so how
long would something like that take?
MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. There are a
couple of technological mechanisms we can use on the
community site for sending out messages, so whether it's
e-mail or -- like the forum, for example. The forum is quite
powerful when you -- once you understand how to -- how it
really works and all the capabilities that it has, and the
forum actually has the ability to have an open, a closed and
a hidden forum. So, for example, on an open forum, members
of council could be part of the group that moderates the
discussions, and then anybody from the community could post
their own threads or respond to threads, and so council
could have an open communication with the community there.
In a closed discussion, council could have its own
discussions that are available to the public; however, only
members of council would then be able to respond to the
messages.
There's also the ability to have a hidden forum where
unless you are a member of the council group, you would not
know that that category existed, and you could have
discussions in there, as well. And that would be
irregardless of anybody's institution, it would be housed on
community.FDLP.gov. With that system, you're able to watch
categories and threads and say, you know, let me know via
email whenever somebody responds back to this thread.
So there are a lot of powerful tools on there, it's
just a matter of is that something that council would like
to pursue. If council would like to pursue the mechanism of
posting material to the desktop in more of a web page type
function, there are ways to set up a mailing list so that
every time somebody adds something into those, it would
be -- everybody in the entire group would be notified that
new content went up.
So like I said, there are many ways to go about that
type of functionality that -- some of them can be done right
now. Some of them would just need a couple of conversations
with council to say what are your requirements, and
depending on those requirements, could say, okay, we could
do this in the short term, or this will take a little bit
longer. But until I know specifically, you know, how you
want that mechanism set up, I really can't answer beyond
that at this time.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Sanford University. I think on the problem statement two, all of the recommendations there, R4 community.FDLP.gov, so, for example, the choice of list traffic, list archives available, ability for groups to create and coedit pages and documents, including Excel or spreadsheet kind of things, all of these functionalities, I think, are things that we would want to use rather than some third party.

MR. SHULER: Okay. And John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Then as this recommendation evolves, we can give you a better timeline, perhaps, of what -- you know, what happened, how soon after Buffalo it should happen. You can give us -- we can sort of build a better idea of what's going to cost more money. It's going to be next to accomplish in anybody's lifetime. So we'll try to sort out the pieces according to that kind of priority. Is that what you're asking for, is what we wanted done immediately, what would be okay midterm, and then what can wait till what I'm calling after Buffalo.

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yes, a blank order of importance --

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SIEGER: -- would be preferable. Like I said, a number of these things, for example, looking at the community site, I know one of the things the council has asked for is the ability to dynamically provide the editing of documents, Excel, Word, those types of files. Within the CMS there are bridges to, for example, like Google docs, and that could be wrapped into the community site, and that could be a short-term, you know, solution so that the community site is being used in that collaborative nature. And then down the road we can say, okay, you know, the desktop having that native functionality is definitely going to take longer, it's definitely going to cost more money, you know, GPO doesn't have the money that Google has. But it does it mean that it can't provide us any functionality? It doesn't mean that. It just means it just might take us a little bit more time. We've got to look at other priorities at the same time.

So if we know that this is a must have or, you know, can this be wrapped in this current site, and then later on when we get to that capability, we'll move off of it, if we know it from those types of steps, we can make, you know,
certain strides in -- you know, based on that list.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. Does the council think that is a reasonable approach to reshaping its recommendation for its final delivery? Any objections to that?

UNIDENTIFIED: No, it has to be done.

MR. SHULER: It's got to be done. We have -- while it's being done, we do have the other aspect of this recommendation, which is to use third-party applications during the interregnum until FDLP is fully capable of handling the full load, so I think we got -- we got two strategies in my estimation. We got something that we can use to work between now and Buffalo, something to work with GPO in upgrading the FDLP, and a long-term plan about making the FDLP desktop much more functional in the end. Does that sound about right? Okay. Any other thoughts?

Okay, Karen, thanks. Any last thoughts, Karen?

MS. SIEGER: Karen Sieger, GPO. Yeah, just one last thing. Up until now we've had very few comments or suggestions about either site, and so this is kind of new to us that -- you know, that people have been saying, hey, you know, we can't do this, we can't do that. At any time we welcome suggestions and comments. We want to make the site as best as it can be, so if there are other recommendations that either council or the community has, we'd love to hear it because, you know, we want to make sure the site is successful and give it the tools that the community can really use.

MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I think what the council is trying to do is lead by example in this fashion to encourage other members of the community to take full advantage of that kind offer.

Yeah. So I think council -- John Shuler University of Illinois at Chicago. I think council is perhaps done discussing this particular recommendation. We know what we want to do with it, how we're going to discuss it tomorrow, okay? We have at least a topic sentence? Okay.

Do we think we require Karen's expertise for the other parts of the discussion? Looking around the table, no.

Karen, with the council's great thanks and for the effort it took, we really appreciate you come here and having a conversation with us, thank you. I think it's made a lot better recommendation.
MR. SHULER: Thanks. And also a thanks to James, Suzanne and Chris for taking the initiative on this and helping us walk through the forest. Appreciate it. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Since we do have members in the audience, and we have this technological pause -- okay, general thumb's, it appears.

MR. JACOBS: Sorry, I know I have it somewhere. Communication tools, I just had to put it in the right directory. Pardon me. Disorganized librarian, that's my new domain name. Shall I introduce?

MR. SHULER: Introduce.

MR. JACOBS: Okay. James Jacob, Stanford University. This next one is -- on my title it's called communication tools for council. This is not really a recommendation, but more of a suggestion for council to --

to use Google groups for their communication going forward, at least until such time as community.fdлp.gov is of -- on par or better than Google groups. The reason for this primarily, as you'll see at the top paragraph, is that the -- the tradition has been that the lists are what change to the organization of the current DLC chair, and so there's no continuation of list, there's no way for current council to search through past council's communication and work, and so this discontinue -- discontinuity, pardon me, gets in the way of council goals and objectives going forward.

So Suzanne Sears, Chris Greer and I looked into some options for some -- some better ways to provide for the communication and other things, other tools that council needs to do their work, including collaborative documents, collaborative spreadsheets, list archives, searchable list archives, multiple ways to receive list traffic, et cetera, and so you'll see that the benefits of a Google group there are that the list archive is available to subscribers, members can receive this traffic; however, they want via web, RSS or email client or all three if they prefer. List ownership can be changed annually to the current chair. Members can upload files and create group pages. Members can collaboratively edit Google documents and Google spreadsheets, and the privacy of the lists can be controlled and maintained.

There were a couple of notes there. We do consider this a temporary solution, as I said, until such time as
community.FDLP.gov is a viable option, which it sounds like
in the near to not so distant future it may be. And the
other note is that no cloud option is perfect, there are a
growing list of cloud failures.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, I was about to say that.
MR. JACOBS: And so I think on an everyday aspect
Google groups will give us tremendous power, communicative
power and collaboration power, but that we should also talk
about, you know, ways of downloading documents every once in
a while, make sure we save our communication on our local
machines or at our local institutions and things like that
so...

MR. SHULER: Thank you, James.
MR. JACOBS: You're welcome.
MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
at Chicago. To provide some further information about this
recommendation, I did talk to the superintendent of
documents, and I asked him about the issue of a public
advisory group using this particular tool, and to his way of
thinking, he did not have a problem with it. He felt that
the -- I'm not going to quote him exactly, but the way he
put it, if GPO cannot provide that particular function at
the moment, until it can, he is comfortable with council
using this tool in order to accomplish its goal and
appreciates the opportunity to at least have first shot at
it, and if they can't do it, then he's okay with us moving
to this temporary solution. So I think in that regard we
fulfilled that public record open meeting obligation as an
advisory group, that we have checked with our -- I don't
want to say hosting agency, but our responsible agency in a
good, ethical and proper fashion about that matter.

With that being said, I am fully -- since I get to be
the next one up in the slot to create a list serve, I gotta
tell you, I'm so happy this recommendation came up, because
me and list serves, they don't work. So if we can -- you
know, it could be that somebody else could create a list
serve that would manage it at their institution, but list
serves at my institution have a habit of going awry, and
especially if I'm in charge of them. So if we want that
further backup of these -- as was suggested in the footnote,
of these communications being backstopped by list serve at
one of the members' institutions, that might be advisable in
terms of assuring some kind of continuity in case of
disaster. I just put that out there. I mean, I'll work at
it, but I think it's time to share.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

Let's do it. As long as we understand, we've all been in
the condition, we're temporary. It's a year, two years.
When it becomes five years, it is not temporary. Yeah.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
at Chicago. I suggest very strongly when we post this
recommendation as final mode, we put a month limit on it,
within 11 months, 10 months, that that's as long as we're
going to carry this ball forward until -- in other words, we
reauthorize this decision in 10 months, let me put it that
way. Okay, is that acceptable? And I think that -- huh?

UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible 10:25:07).

MR. SHULER: I guess we could try it. We haven't
done anything with motions today. I move that the council
with that caveat addition, whatever, of putting a timeline
in the document, I move that council accept this particular
recommendation as it's submitted.

MS. MORIEARTY: I second, Jill Moriearty, University
of Utah.

MR. SHULER: Do we have any further language to
be added? No? Good, now we're ready to vote. All those in
favor say, "I."

(Response en masse)

MR. SHULER: All those opposed? Any abstentions?

Hallelujah, brothers and sisters, a step forward. Thank
you.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I
will -- if John wants, I can get everyone subscribed to the
Google group and --

MR. SHULER: Let --

MR. JACOBS: -- move that forward.

MR. SHULER: Let it be so, because we're going to
have a lot of work to do.

Okay. On to the next, I think, recommendation that we
can give full blessings to. This is the -- this is the one
labeled "council recommendation, background attendance at
council meetings/depository conferences is declining." It
sounds like -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago. It sounds like a depressing story. Does everybody
have that in front of them? All right.

UNIDENTIFIED: No.

MR. SHULER: Not yet? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED: I got it.
MR. SHULER: Okay. John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. I open the floor up to discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED: I have a question. How far ahead are these meetings scheduled? Like, you know, some associations schedule their meetings five years ahead. How far ahead are the arrangements made, just one year ahead?

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago, looks at Cindy Etkin of GPO, see if she has an idea. One, two -- oh, Robin, Robin hiding behind -- I didn't see Robin --

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Robin Haun Mohamed, GPO.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: We try and book them out at least two to three years ahead.

MR. SHULER: Two to three years.

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Dates, Lance Cummins has proposed dates for the next couple of years. We try not to put them opposite conference and other things that are going on.

UNIDENTIFIED: I have gathered that we're kind of booked into this hotel for the fall meeting for the indefinite future but --

MR. SHULER: No, we're not.

UNIDENTIFIED: No? But the spring meeting for 2011, still the location has not been chosen for that yet?

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: It's not been set.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay, so...

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago, that was it has not been set?

MS. HAUN MOHAMED: Has not been set.

MR. SHULER: That is a negatory on being set.

Okay.

MS. MORIEARTY: Yeah.

MR. SHULER: Jill is happy.

MS. MORIEARTY: Uh-huh.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I was the one who drafted this last night at 11:30, and it needs work. Dan has already made some very valuable comments to me privately. The intent of this came from an informal discussion that we had last night, and it probably results from the choice of Buffalo. Word on the street that attendance is predicted to be very low in Buffalo in April, and so we were exploring ways of choosing...
locations that are more affordable, easier to get to, more centrally located that would increase attendance at the spring depository meetings, realizing that the fall meetings are almost certainly going to continue to be held in the Washington, D.C. area. So -- is the text up there, John?

MR. SHULER: No.

UNIDENTIFIED: It's loading.

UNIDENTIFIED: This technology is perfect.

MR. SHULER: Don't look at the man behind the curtain.

MR. O’MAHONY: Dan O’Mahony (ph), Brown University.

Just to share with you what I've already shared with David, in the second bullet point, just a friendly suggestion that -- to reaffirm the practice really that GPO has employed over the years to try to geographically distribute the meetings around the country, since often it's the only time that some local folks have an opportunity to encounter one of these kinds of meetings. But as is sort of reflected in the current middle bullet item, maybe give double weight to the middle of the country so that as we move around, we, you know, spend a little more time in the rotation in the middle of the country than the edges. And then the other factor that I suggested was that in choosing cities in any given geographic area, to try to find those areas that have a critical mass or a high density of depository libraries within a, you know, short drive. So not to continually pick on Buffalo but, you know, if you were to draw a six-hour travel circle around Buffalo, the number of depository libraries, and therefore the full advantage of local folks to come to that meeting, might be less than if you drew that same circle around St. Louis or Chicago or pick any other city in the country. So -- so that was, you know, one of the other suggestions.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois at Chicago. It was -- Scranton was actually suggested as another possibility.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair --

MR. SHULER: Just kidding, sorry.

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I feel that I don't really know enough about how GPO makes its decisions about where to hold conferences --

UNIDENTIFIED: Lance just walked in.

MS. SINCLAIR: -- but Lance just walked in.

MR. SHULER: Yo, Lance.
MS. SINCLAIR: You know, I don't know how we ended up in Buffalo, you know, what goes into that. I understand that GPO has to pay for these things, and that there's -- you know, we come for free, so, you know, obviously there's an economic component that I don't completely understand.

MR. CUMMINS: First of all, Buffalo has wings, so we have to go there for those. But we actually started -- oh, Lance Cummins, GPO. I broke my own rule.

MR. SHULER: It was not a hard and fast recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED: It is now.

UNIDENTIFIED: Wings.

MR. SHULER: Very good, sir.

MR. CUMMINS: We actually had something else in line before Buffalo, and that was unable to be followed through on, so we had to scramble and make a quick curement. Our group is a funny-sized group, and actually going into a lot of cities, there are times they don't want us. We'll get no responses back. We went to San Antonio and went through the CVB in other areas, tried to find locations, and got nothing back from the hotels. We did San Diego, got nothing back from the hotels. So we tend to have to go to second-tier cities. My staff and I look at the fact that a lot of people can't travel, so, you know, when the meeting moves, it's an opportunity for first-time attendees or local people to come. And just because we do D.C. every fall doesn't mean we should ignore the Northeast and the Eastern Coast, which we were in Tampa last year, or April. Pardon, I'm still winded.

So when the last one fell through, we started looking to the north, because we haven't been there since Rhode Island, I believe it was, and Buffalo CVB came back, and they offer a great per diem, which is less than $100, I think, at this point, the hotel offered several incentives to get us there, and it's a location we haven't been. But we can start off looking at ten cities and try to get responses back, and if we don't get them, we have to keep moving. I have a short window to procure these so that people can know and make their plans for it. But we have been looking at trying to get the lowest per diem to help those who have to pay out of pocket to be able to attend.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I like that you're looking at the lowest per diem,
but in doing that, we also need to keep in mind that to get
to Buffalo, people are going to have to take more expensive
plane flights, so that's going to balance that back out,
too.

MR. CUMMINS: We looked into that, also -- Lance
Cummins, GPO, looked into that, also, and there are some
issues with West Coast coming in, I mean, but we also -- we
hit issues in a lot of locations, and when we do second-tier
cities, that's going to be a problem all the way around.
From somewhere in the country, somebody's going to have
problems. So, you know, if we can counter that by them
paying less to stay -- I mean, per diem is not the main
factor, but it's a good factor. You know, would you rather
pay $100 a night or $300 a night out of pocket? Because
what we're seeing in attendance is the people who are paid
to come and aren't paid anymore aren't coming right now
because they're not going to pay out of pocket. The people
who always come and pay out of pocket are still coming. So,
you know, we want to give those people a break as much as
possible.

Lance, we seem to have had a conversation once upon a time
about the economic or other advantages of possibly doing the
spring meeting in one place for successive years.

MR. CUMMINS: Uh-huh.

MS. SANDERS: Could you speak to that?

MR. CUMMINS: With an option, if we -- we can do
a three-year option with hotels in our procurement area,
which is what we do locally, so that we don't have to go out
to bid every year, which is traditionally what we have to
do. If we do a three-year contract on the road, you know,
for example, Kansas City three years in a row, we can
generally get a better rate from that hotel or better
incentives from them. It also helps with long-term planning
for you all or the attendees to come because they know where
they're going years out instead of waiting till fall to find
out, and sometimes we don't know at this meeting where we're
going the next April because it just hasn't gone through
procurement yet. So doing a three-year contract would
definitely help. We did get push-back from a lot of people
who said, well, we don't want to go to the same place three
years in a row. So, you know, we keep bouncing.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State
Library. Lance, can you -- do you have any estimate on how
much savings would be achieved by having a three-year contract?

MR. CUMMINS: I wouldn't --
MR. CISMOWSKI: What percentage are we talking about?

MR. CUMMINS: I wouldn't know for sure. The hotels really -- the size that like us really want us to keep coming back. So, you know, with being able to negotiate with that in advance, we may be able to get below per diem, we may be able to get receptions thrown in, we may be able to get more meeting space. You know, it's just not something -- I can't negotiate now because I can't make them think I'm going to do it to try to get a better rate.

Another option, if you're looking at meetings, is do we need two a year? Did they need to be in October and April? I mean, there are other options to look at, also.

MR. O’MAHONY: Dan O’Mahony, Brown University. One question I'm just wondering about is to not necessarily test the assumption that, you know, traveling around -- having locations around the country attracts or gives the opportunity for local folks to come, because I think intuitively we all believe that, and usually, you know, the calisthenics in the beginning of each meeting, there's lots of folks there that raise their hand saying that it's their first time in attendance. But I just wonder if you all have any sort of empirical sense of that, do we have numbers in terms of even attendance over the last three years, and of that attendance, what proportion are first-time or local attendees?

MR. CUMMINS: I have the statistics back on my computer in the office. I do a breakdown at the end of each conference, and there is a margin of error in it because people don't always check the right boxes when they register, but usually I give the council chair on Wednesday morning the tally quickly of, you know, the final number minus those who didn't show, and I try to give a quick and dirty breakdown by first-time attendees and regionals and such. So I do have that information.

I can tell you that similar in Seattle when we were there, we had 76 first-time attendees who had never been before, I mean, and probably haven't been since, so that was a good turnout and we got a lot of thank yous for that, but I can share that out once I get back.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State University.
Library. To follow up on that, do you have any idea how many of those 76 attendees were from Washington state?

MR. CUMMINS: I would have to go back through the registrations to pull that together.

MR. CISIOWSKI: Because I think that's what Dan's really getting at is how -- when you go to a new location, how many new attendees from that location come because it's within driving distance?

MR. CUMMINS: I would think that's -- I mean, an assumption on my part is what makes the difference, I mean, that they can drive to it. If they can't -- if they've never been to a fall or spring before, there must be a reason for it, and if we're in a local enough area, then there's ability for them to drive. We have people who come in for one day, based on what the agenda is, when it's local, so not all of those people are staying for all three days.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I can speak from a standard point of the Oklahoma selectives. I know that the Tulsa library comes every year, the regionals come every year, but the other libraries, when it was in Texas, they drove, when it was in Kansas City, they drove, when it was in Alabama, they drove for the one day or even to stay the one hotel night, because they can get funding for one hotel night and some gas mileage, but they can't get the funding to fly and to come. So I think that having it moved geographically is very advantageous. And if it can't move, if we needed to go to the three years, I would say if we could do it someplace in the center of the country to try and maximize -- or Dan was saying last night about where there are more selectives, if we tried to pick a place where there are -- it's a large concentration of selectives.

MR. CUMMINS: I personally like the idea of being in the middle. I mean, Kansas City, which I have to say right up front, I'm from there so -- but as far as being in the middle of the country, and as far as being able to get into the airport from anywhere -- and, you know, the Crown Center area worked out well for us with the shops there and everything else, and per diem was 120 a night. We had a decent turnout for that, and I don't -- I like the idea of the middle just because it's easy.

MR. SHULER: James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
Washington could have also been -- there's a large library
school there, and I know Cass Hartnet suggested to her
students that they go to DLC, and so a lot of those
students -- so maybe another -- another issue could be
library schools in the area. You know, Rhode Island would
be nice.

MR. CUMMINS: There's one in Buffalo.
MR. JACOBS: There's one in -- oh, that's true.
It's not a library school.
MR. SHULER: There you go.
MR. JACOBS: It's been absorbed in --
MS. MORIEARTY: Quite a large one in Buffalo, Jill
Moriearty --
MR. JACOBS: It's not a library school anymore, is
it?
MS. MORIEARTY: -- University of Utah.
MR. O’MAHONY: Dan O’Mahony, Brown University. To be
fair to the great state of New York, it also is the second
largest in terms of number of sheer depositories next to
California. Buffalo's probably the furthest away from all
of those selectives, but, you know, it is where it is.
UNIDENTIFIED: That's right.

MR. CUMMINS: It was unfortunate. We started in
Rochester, which I've been told Buffalo's much better than
Rochester so --
MR. O’MAHONY: Well, I mean, I think we all
appreciate the juggling act that it is to try to nail down
one of these things, and that, you know, no one of these
suggestions or criteria are going to sway the day unless we
go to a three-year set kind of a thing but -- and not that
any single council can forever dictate future things beyond
those three years, perhaps, but if we go with a three-year
approach, then obviously at the end of that three-year
cycle, that would be reevaluated again and see how that
played out and whether the next three years was rotated
before we then went back into another three-year cycle.
So...
MR. CUMMINS: At this point I believe the Public
Printer would value your input on that, because he's not
willing to make that commitment without some sort of polling
of the community or direction, and as we know how polling
the community goes, I wasn't willing to step on that land
mine.
MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
at Chicago. I guess that's what we're supposed to do so --
do we have any more questions for Lance before we continue
to discuss? It gives us a pretty good idea of the process
and form an opinion now.
We have some suggested changes to this draft. I don't
think we're ready to vote on anything because obviously we'd
need to see the changes. Is that acceptable to the group,
that we wait for the changes and then take the steps?
MS. TUBBS: Yeah. And Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law
Library. If we could see some of those previous
statistics --
MR. SHULER: Thank you.
MS. TUBBS: -- posted up to our Google page or
something just to get a sense as to attendees and location
and depository library participation?
MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois
at Chicago. Lance, is that possible?
MR. CUMMINS: Yes.
MR. SHULER: Thank you. I'll work with Lance to
see that that is done expeditiously. I love that term
"expeditiously."
Okay. We've come to a decision point. The court
reporter disappears at 5:30; however, since we still have
probably about an hour of discussion, and this seems like a
good natural break between that record and the record we
would keep after she's gone, may I suggest that we end this
portion of the recording of the court reporter, and we would
continue on our own devices? Would that be acceptable?
With our thanks, of course, we're very thankful this
afternoon so -- John Shuler, University of Illinois at
Chicago.
(End of session)
MR. SHULER: We're missing -- we don't have a quorum yet? Okay. Let me try this again.

All right. I call this particular session of the Council together. And for the members in the audience, this is a bit of a trick-or-treat. You saw on the schedule that we're going to be talking about "Master Teaching," well, not so much. Council still has unfinished business. And since that particular program was very much in flux, we made an executive decision to occupy this space with a working session.

So what you're about to experience -- grab some doughnuts and a coffee and think of this as "cloud council," because we're going to be discussing issues that we're going to be raising in our 10:30 meeting.

And we felt we needed this 90 minutes in order to do a good job then. So my apologies to anybody who wanted to be master taught, but we're going to -- we're going to continue on with our meeting from yesterday afternoon.

Okay. Council, again, we have the court reporter with us. So, for the record, please say your name and your institution. I have given everybody --
John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago.

What I'd like us to do is, your Chair still hasn't had a full meal since Monday night. And I would like to grab a chance again to make an attempt to eat before the 10:30 meeting. So I've asked Jill to be our timekeeper on the issues and try to be as efficient as possible.

And, furthermore, I have gone ahead and suggested some topic sentences that we can use since we are not talking about full-blown recommendations, but rather suggestions of where we're going. And as we look at A, B, C and D, I would ask, does Council find those to be worthy topic sentences for the issues involving those evolving recommendations?

MS. TROTTA: Can we talk?
MR. SHULER: Yes, you can talk.

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. As a -- these -- this is a great start. Thanks for putting this together, John.

MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.

MS. TROTTA: I don't think there's enough about the whole cluster of issues around the digitization of the legacy, the issue of -- all those -- all those issues. So I would like to figure out a way to get a broader sentence in to include more.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Does Council have a suggestion beyond this fragment that needs to be added? You can tell I included the failure of the Perl System, and an accounting of what happened. The issue over the remaining legacy systems, as well as further discussion about the FD -- FDsys implementation schedule. What else can we say? John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago. I'll get it right.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. As I recall the whole situation and the Public Printer's presentation, I think you -- you hit all the main points that I wanted to carry forward. Now, it's just a rough draft.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. MORIEARTY: But as long as we keep on point, these four points, I -- I think this is going to be a workable recommendation in the future.
MR. SHULER: Okay. And, again, still seeking further information we might want to add. Remember that these are topic sentences we're going to use with the community and GPO during the 10:30 meeting.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. So if I'm understanding you, it's an outline, and then these other papers we have would be further discussion points?

MR. SHULER: Yes. They will be further -- there will be further drafts of those other longer documents we've been using for the last two days. Okay?

So that -- we're not going to be wordsmithing those documents at this meeting or the next. Kathy?

MS. LAWHUN: John -- Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco. I wonder if we should title --

MR. SHULER: Okay. I'll -- late also, the recommendation is leave number -- the letter A should have the title "Technology Issues." That's been suggested. What does the rest of the Council think?

MS. SANDERS: I'm seeing heads nod, so I'm -- I'm -- Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. I think that we have consensus there.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Consensus it is. I'll begin the discussion at 10:30 with the general title "Technology Issues," and that the fragments that I have here speak to the way we want to get the conversation started. Ms. Greek? Dan?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. Yeah, yeah. Basically, and I don't want to wordsmith over the -- the caption. Technology Issues, though, is a pretty broad-brush statement.

MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.

MR. O'MAHONY: And I -- I don't want to false advertise in terms of what the scope and content of this particular recommendation will be, which -- which isn't going to cover all technology issues.

MR. SHULER: No.

MR. O'MAHONY: So that -- that broad caption statement with the points enumerated in your topic sentence should -- should --

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. O'MAHONY: -- hopefully reign in the scope of it.

MR. SHULER: Okay. It will be clear, then,
that this will be a guided discussion, that the
questions we will be generating from the council to the
members in the audience and with GPO will be focused on
general issues. That we will then use the court's
transcripts, court reporter's transcripts to mine after
the meeting and fully flesh out the recommendation.
Okay? And that actually will be done with each of these
as we go on. Okay? David?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
State Library. There -- there is -- there was one
request by the Public Printer specifically to us, a
charge that I'd like to suggest that we add to the
recommendations.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And that has to do with the
XNL enhanced photo register?

MR. SHULER: Oh, yes. That will become H.

Thank you. What was I thinking?

MR. CISMOWSKI: And in addition, maybe we
could add this under C somehow. There -- there was also
a request, I believe, from Rick during the opening
session for suggestions on a spending plan for the
$500,000 digitization allocation?

MR. SHULER: That is going to be part of F.

MR. CISMOWSKI: F?

MR. SHULER: Okay?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Okay?

MR. SHULER: GPO Funding Issues and Direction.

Since there were a number of funding requests, I wanted
to have a chance to have a discussion about that. That
was just one. Yes?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of
Utah. Out of the PAA outreach and assessment
presentation that we had, one of the issue that came
forward was updating the handbook.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. MORIEARTY: And I -- I think with the
implementation of PAA's now, having an updated and a
fully fleshed-out handbook is important. So I would add
that as an I.

MR. SHULER: Okay. We have now created
another recommendation, updating the handbook. Our goal
to be as minimal as possible is being challenged, but
that's okay. We have a lot of important work to do.
So are we done talking about A? Do we have anything to say about B? Yeah?

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. In terms of broad subjects, I would suggest we call this "Digitization of the Legacy Collection" --

MR. SHULER: All right.

MS. TROTTA: -- as a general topic, but it includes much more than what's noted here.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. TROTTA: So we had some issues. We were asked to advise the Public Printer on what our goals for those projects would be. We identified problems with the registry. We have a lot of ideas about that.

So I think it's also useful to have this one focus on digitization of existing collections, whereas D, other cluster of issues around the Borndigital issue.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. TROTTA: So I support that you separated those two.

MR. SHULER: Okay. So to review, we'll slug that one, Digitization of the Legacy Collection.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

May I suggest that we discontinue using the term "legacy" and use instead "historic"? I think legacy has some negative connotations, and it -- it kind of bothers me.

MR. SHULER: There's "heirloom."

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony. Brown University. Could we continue to use that with respect to older online systems? Because I think the negative connotation is useful there? One other slight friendly amendment to when these are presented out?

MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.

MR. O'MAHONY: Just a suggestion that perhaps A come after the other two technology digitization ones. Because I think it can underscore if we talk first about the important work needed to do to digitize collections and to -- you know, the infrastructure with FDsys, then that helps underscore the need for the -- the validity, the reliability, the -- the need for that all that rather than sort of start off with that.

MR. SHULER: So if the Chair understands what was just requested, we would like A to become D in terms of how to discuss? Okay. Understood. Accepted? Okay.
Let me -- let me do this. I'm channelling James here. I'm trying to learn this -- this heirloom librarian is trying to learn Google doc crap, you know? Hang on. I'm sure if I was using an Apple, this would go much faster.

Okay. So we have discussed what is now C. And now, we're -- we're now at the report, a Borndigital report, "Ingestion of Agency Documents in the Fedsys," that issue. What do we have to say about that?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
MR. SHULER: James, thank you.
MR. JACOBS: Sorry. It's FDsys, not Fedsys.
MR. SHULER: Oh.
MR. JACOBS: Sorry for the wordsmithing.
MR. SHULER: That's okay. You'd think after 26 years in the business I'd get these initialisms.
Anything else on that one? Do we want to slug it with anything? Okay.

All right. Can we then declare closed the discussion on the rough draft recommendations?

MS. LAWHUN: Can we go back to C then, Report of Borndigital? Are we saying -- Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco -- retention or catching, or I can't think of words of the Borndigital -- management? Something about what are we trying to get on the digitally born? Because we have two report reports.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Why don't we -- if -- report of managing Borndigital reports? A managing --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think what she's trying to say --

MR. SHULER: Oh. Take one of the reports out?

MS. LAWHUN: And substitute a more -- a more descriptive term.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Then somebody suggest that more descriptive term.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Content?


Is that right?

Okay. I am having a senior moment. Let's go back to the heirloom legacy historical. Did we agree that it was historical, and we're changing it to that?

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. To me the historical collection is the pre-'76. The stuff, we have a lot of print that's not -- it's just -- it's not current, but it's not historical. It's just in print. So why don't we. I could go with that.

MR. SHULER: Print?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears. University of North Texas. Can we say tangible so we include fish?


All right. Any -- any remaining discussion with these four points? Audience? Fascinating, right?

I think it's better than watching paint dry, personally.

Okay. Onto the new recommendations that have yet been drafted by any soul on earth. These are suggestions of where we can go. And I have some preambles on each.

With E, "Structure and Purpose of Consultant's Work through Various Means and Devices," GPO has asked the Council to give them direction on what does consultants want, should do, or ought to do. That's what this phrase contains.

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. The consultant's report vis-a-vis the reengineering of the FDLP?

MR. SHULER: Yes. That -- that money -- help me, GPO folk. How much money was set aside for the consultant? Hundred thousand? Okay.

Yes, it's -- it's to advise them how to use the hundred thousand and what to ask the consultant. I will make the observation that this same request was made to the regionals last night at their meeting. So I think we see a parallel action here that the Council's looking at it, and the regionals, and I imagine GPO in its own way might be asking other groups for advice and counsel. So we'll be one of several. Yes?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I'd like to ask a question of Cindy.

What kind of time constraints are we under here? How --
how soon do you need this input from Council?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin --

MR. SHULER: Is it on?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The sooner the better.

MR. SHULER: Sooner the better. Can you make that a simpler phrase? Sooner? Never mind. Okay. I'm going to write in "sooner the better."

MS. ETKIN: Before Buffalo.

MR. SHULER: All right. I have also --

MS. ETKIN: (Inaudible).

MR. SHULER: I've also added the requested phrase to "The Structure and Purpose of Consultant's Work and Spending Plan," sooner the better. I like that. Stephen King's got nothing on us.

Okay. Any other questions about E? Discussion? Going onto F. What? I think somebody's turned off the lights. It's like Christmas trees. No, I think this one's disconnected the end. Christmas tree lights. I can't believe that was censored. We will not stop talking about the issues. All right. Gwen?

MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. Because the amount of money for the consultants is so small --

MR. SHULER: Yeah?

MS. SINCLAIR: -- I am just wondering if we should say something in there about this -- should we throw in the scope of the work? Since I -- I'm doubtful that $100,000 would really cover what we originally intended in our recommendation?

MR. SHULER: Scope of the work to reflect size of budget. All right. Done. All right. Anything else on E? Moving onto F.

MS. SANDERS: John?

MR. SHULER: Yes? Ann?

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Are we assigning people to these various new ones or not?

MR. SHULER: Nope.

MS. SANDERS: Okay.

MR. SHULER: As we move along, and, in fact, we're just coming to that. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. SHULER: So -- and we'll work out the -- we have --
in our previous conversations from yesterday, we're --
we're starting to sort ourselves out. I'm going to have
the suggestion for the next one, and we'll work it out
that way. Okay?
F, GPO Funding and Direction. I love that it
-- it's nice and universal. I have one specific chair
directive, and that is I'm asking that myself and
Suzanne take the lead on this. But where I'm going with
this is that GPO specifically asked Council for
information on their budget priorities for FY '10 and FY
'11. And that is, of course, all the other stuff
outside of the consultant's report naturally and other
smaller issues.
But I -- I'm trying to suggest a way that
Council can efficiently organize itself over the next
four weeks because the if I understand the request
correctly -- and maybe GPO folk can correct me -- but I
think they need this sooner than later; is that correct?
MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Just one slight
clarification on that one, John?
MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.
MR. PRIEBE: So the FY 2010 budget's been
approved?
MR. SHULER: Yeah.
MR. PRIEBE: So the input we were seeking from
Council was more in terms of the spending plans and how
we could prioritize that money for 2010?
MR. SHULER: Yes. Yeah.
MR. PRIEBE: And then 2011 what we can
request, specific to that, we need to get a preliminary
2011 budget submission in in November. But I can follow
back up and reaffirm a hard date with you on when we
absolutely have to have that '11 or fiscal year '11
number in. Thank you.
MR. SHULER: Okay. And I -- I predict that
this will be one of those documents that will be very
heavily used on Google docs because Suzanne and I will
be reporting back to you much as a response to keep you
apace of what the discussion is. Okay? Suzanne?
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. So I'm looking down here at the finished
recommendations about the desktop and community. So are
we then putting the funding for --
MR. SHULER: No.
MS. SEARS: -- or the priority for that up under F? Or --
MR. SHULER: No. I think we've already launched. We've already had the conversation with GPO about that yesterday. And I believe that the group that is already working on that, you three, should follow through with the funding issues.
MS. SEARS: The only issue there is that we have been requested to make it a formal recommendation so that it was a priority for budget.
MR. SHULER: That is correct. And you would -- I think -- and Council can be corrected if Council -- Chair is wrong. God, I'm being influenced by GPO here. I -- I think Council would be fully accepting that if you break down the budget structures in your recommendation, it does not take away from what we're trying to do in F. It's just a small part of the universe, just as we separated out the funding issue from the consultant's report.
I don't see any reason why we have to stop the good work you've been doing for the last two months on the communications issues just because we suddenly created a topic for larger funding issues for FY '10 and FY '11. Is that okay? Okay.
Well, thank you. Jill was very good. She suggested I missed a word there, and that should be -- even though this may sound like a riddle, these are finished draft recommendations. So pardon me. It was a missing word there that gives everything context. Yes, the Council is only as strong as the weakest link.
Thank you. All right.
MS. LAWHUN: John?
MR. SHULER: Yes?
MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco. But I think back to Suzanne's point, yes, we finished part of the recommendation, but we don't want to get the budget things lost in the finished recommendations.
MR. SHULER: No.
MS. LAWHUN: We need to pull that out and put it up to F, correct?
MR. SHULER: Yes.
MS. LAWHUN: Okay.
MR. SHULER: And so, that's where using the Google docs application I hope gives -- this heirloom
librarian hopes it will be of great assistance to us to keep it all in track. Okay?

All right. My timekeeper reminds me that we are now at zero minutes, so I'm going to borrow from the minutes we saved in the earlier section. And we are now at "Regional Issues."

And I -- here, I simply am -- coming out of the meeting from the regional meeting yesterday, it was clear that there were still some issues remaining about item numbers and selection that I have asked David, Gwen, and Ann to look further into on behalf of the Council and on behalf of the regional librarians, and they will be working with GPO and will have a report between the meetings and a report, hopefully, for Buffalo to resolve these questions. Okay?

And these are specifically questions revolving around item numbers, selection, and classification. And rather than filling up the time at this meeting, I -- I feel that we should just let them do the work so we -- I have as much facts -- it's good language there -- as many facts as we have before we could discuss it fully.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: John, you meant to include "disposal" in there, didn't you?

MR. SHULER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. SHULER: Shotgun approach, yes. So let me get that in there. Disposal and selection. We'll just cover it with those two words. Covers a multitude of sins, I suppose.

Okay. And as I was reminded, the XML database issue, we do -- the team that was responsible for the recommendation number one, has agreed to be the group to work on that. And I hope you all still want to work on it. You still excited about that? Good. That's -- that's what I like to see. Yes.

And that is -- that is, again, to remind ourselves is from the specific request from the Public Printer of the Council come up with effective ways to evaluate and help plan for how a depository library's may use this downloading opportunity in an effective fashion. Any other issues about that?

I, updating handbook. I think -- Jill, did you -- just -- updating handbook's enough?

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.
MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Evaluating the handbook for discrepancies, I think.

MR. SHULER: Updating, evaluating for -- discrepancies. It's in there. All right.

Okay. Any other discussion regarding E through I? We're copacetic? Okay. I don't know how much we have to talk about "Finish Recommendations."

These are here as place markers to remind ourselves that this is what we worked on yesterday. Yes? Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. "Finish Draft Recommendations." So people know what we're talking about.

MR. SHULER: How do you guys put up with me? Finish draft recommendations.

MS. SANDERS: John, hang on a second.

MR. SHULER: Yeah.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Evaluate and Update the Handbook, is that Jill and Suzanne --

MR. SHULER: Oh, excuse me. Yeah. If you want to -- same group want to continue on, follow up on that? Yeah.

MS. SANDERS: So that's Jill, Suzanne, and Colleen. Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Yeah. I'm sorry. The assumption being that if these come from the former recommendations, then the same people continue to work on it. Sorry.

Okay. Now, these sentences I took directly from the documents themselves, probably the first sentence or first fragments. The only thing we acted upon yesterday to remind us is that we agreed to use collaborative web tools between now and the Spring meeting in order to accomplish our tasks.

And we agreed on what we called the "pragmatic approach to the necessary record-keeping and posting of relevant documents to the FDLP desktop from Council's deliberations." I was -- I think that's out of the Soviet Union somewhere.

And we've agreed Camilla -- Dan? Dan, you were going to find the missing documents, right? Yeah.

So that Camilla and I would form a team, and I think
this would be an example of the -- of the detailed
agenda I would provide her. Correct? And that she
would work from those notes. And that you agree, too,
then to also post the documents to our web space on
All the rest of it, I believe, is in process.
We have not come to terms on the exact wording of those
drafts. And, obviously, we have some more questions to
ask of GPO and ourselves before those can be finished.
Am I missing anything from what we discussed
yesterday? Okay. And to review and practice a little
bit, we are going to be letting the community know at
the 10:30 slot that we are working with GPO to enhance
the FDLP desktop with more effective web tools and to
seek a priority and other issues to make sure it happens
expeditiously.
All right. Now, this is the part I like.
We're down to the Spring, 2009 recommendations, and I
would really, really hope we could bring some closure on
this and actually say before the community that these
are done. Not all of them, but a couple of them. And I
made a guess here on which ones I think we completed, so
the first recommendation, let's start with that. Did we
meet that recommendation?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: John?
MR. SHULER: Yeah.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess a narrow
reading that the recommendation from the Spring said
"secure funding" or "GPO should secure funding" has been
done, but I feel real uncomfortable saying that
recommendation is done because nothing's been done
except getting some money which, as Gwen points out, may
not really be enough for what we thought.
So I would be okay if we put down that some
funding has been secured, but I -- I don't feel
comfortable saying it's done because what's done?
Nothing. Right?
MR. SHULER: Council?
MR. O'MAHONY: Dan -- Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University. And that directly relates to item E on the
previous page.
MR. SHULER: Yes.
MR. O'MAHONY: So it -- it implies that we're
not completely done if -- if there is the necessary
MR. SHULER: Okay. So anybody else? Somebody --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right, John, I don't want to burst your bubble, but --

MR. SHULER: That's okay. My poor heart. Is it the stance of the Council then that we maybe tag this with further action from Fall, 2009? Would that be more appropriate? Oh, man.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Just "Further Action Needed."


MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I think that we might be able to bring closure to this recommendation as it is written literally. And then we can simply open up the -- the other earlier draft to include a statement that we want something delivered at the end of the process so we can bring closure to that first recommendation.

MR. SHULER: So what you're recommending is we can have our cake and eat it, too? We can declare --

that technically we accomplished that, but by further study, we've opened up another agenda item based on this. I like that.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski. I -- I don't mean open up another -- another letter --

MR. SHULER: No.

MR. CISMOWSKI: -- in the draft here.

MR. SHULER: No.

MR. CISMOWSKI: But simply expand that word --

MR. SHULER: Simply refer to -- yeah. Refer to B.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.

I guess I would just suggest that in the spirit of the Chair's initial advice that, you know, the recommendations are means to an end and a part of an ongoing conversation with GPO. On this point, the conversation continues.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Second and third recommendations, I think, we can treat as one, since they were treated as one here at the Council meeting. I recommended that we are still working on those two.

Would that be about right? Okay.
The fourth and fifth recommendations technically are still being worked on as well. Okay? I mean, there was some closure on a couple of issues in that we had specifically asked that a session be offered on the process that happened, but there were other issues that opened up and are continuing and specifically related to the other group involving the regionals' questions. Okay? So we'll label those as continuing. Okay?

Okay. Here's -- here's another shot for John. The sixth recommendation, did we finish that?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Yes. Done.

MR. SHULER: Hallelujah. Everybody agree?

Let it stand here today that Council finished a recommendation. Of course, go back to our regularly scheduled program, the seventh recommendation we didn't even -- we addressed this indirectly at a smaller operations meeting that GPO hosted yesterday afternoon. But I have a funny feeling that we're not done talking about this. Okay?

Okay. Now, in terms of how we handle this at the 10:30 meeting, I suggest we start off in almost the reverse order. We started off with the recommendations from the Tampa meeting. We wrap those up, and then we move in to discussing the new items, agreed? Okay.

Any other comments from Council about all those previous items?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. John, can we just go back to the recommendation on the report -- let me find it again -- Recommendation Four says that we just recommend that they report on the disposal, which they did.

MR. SHULER: Uh-huh.

MS. SEARS: We've got the new recommendation on the front where we're talking about disposal under regional issues.

MR. SHULER: Uh-huh.

MS. SEARS: I -- I -- I'm just thinking. I mean, if our original recommendation was that they report at this meeting, that's done.

MR. SHULER: Get out. Really? Thank you, Suzanne. Can we get away with that? Number four?
Declare it done? Hallelujah. Thank you, sister. Wow. David? You going to break my heart?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I mean, as long as we're still -- I mean, the disposal is still in issue, but we've got that on the front page under the regional issues, correct?

MR. SHULER: Okay. So unless David -- unless -- this will be big for the team, David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Well, once again, if we just take the literal words that are in the Tampa recommendation, we have completed this. However, during the report session, there were a number of -- well, the -- the entire thrust, I think, of the session that we had on that recommendation was to engage the audience in brainstorming on how to improve the disposal process and also to automate the needs and offers process. And that is an ongoing discussion.

And so if we close out this recommendation, then I think we need to insert a new recommendation in the earlier ones that deals with this ongoing process.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Can I ask the three of you that have been tasked with the regional issue to include that as part of the portfolio to help continue the conversation on so that we can close this one off? Is that acceptable?

Yes. That's two done. Yes, we can raise our heads and be proud. All right. Anything else on the seven heirloom recommendations?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. John, I notice -- sorry to go back to number three -- I thought that I was working on number two and number three?

MR. SHULER: (Inaudible). I may have pulled this from --

MR. JACOBS: I don't --

MR. SHULER: -- this is not authenticated anyway. I just ripped this off what I thought was the latest one.

MR. JACOBS: So I only -- I only see Tori and you listed as the third recommendation?

MR. SHULER: Okay. I would -- I would use these names as suggestive. If you know you're missing, go ahead and reassert yourself. This is -- sorry. This
is like that movie, the movie "Sixth Sense." I see
council people. You know? You just don't know they're
missing.
Go ahead and -- this is taken from an earlier
draft of those documents we have been exchanging, so go
ahead and put yourself back in the picture if you're
missing. Thank God we're not doing this in front of
anybody in the public, you know?
All right. Third call on the seven heirloom
recommendations. Any further discussion? All right.
So at the 10:30 show, we'll be discussing what we've
discussed our next set of recommendations with the --
with the GPO and the public. Do we need to add anything
else to the 10:30 meeting? Take a moment.
MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
As we work to implement some of the new community-based
communications enhancements for Council, since a good
bit of our work will be done in between meetings, I
think maybe just some assurance to the community that we
will be communicating between -- you know, that Buffalo
won't be the next time that they necessarily hear some
of the progress toward -- toward the end.
Since we don't have definitive statements here
or even, in some cases, the full scope of what, you
know, we're going to be moving forward with, so it would
be nice if we can also, then, sort of have a interim
plan for communication, if you will?
MR. SHULER: Okay. What I'll say -- what I'll
say at 10:30 as we said at different times during our
gatherings, is that we all agree that we're going to
fill the time between Buffalo and here with this -- what
we -- what I'm calling the long meeting, which is going
to use the interactive tools of both the desktop, as
well as those other tools that we'll use, to communicate
with GPO, with ourselves, and with the community to keep
them posted on our progress. And if we feel risky, to
even at -- ask for their further questions through those
means.
So though we will physically adjourn from this
meeting in a short while, I fully expect if we stay true
to these purposes, we will be -- this will be an ongoing
conversation for the months between meetings. That's my
-- that is what my intention is as Chair. Yes. And I
will say as much as 10:30.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Do we have a timeline for when our formal recommendations are going to be presented to GPO?

MR. SHULER: As Chair, I would like to have the recommendations done that we want to move forward on quickly by early November.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Did I miss something yesterday, or did we discuss law.gov?

MR. SHULER: Yeah, I'll throw that -- that we can discuss -- okay. James --

MR. JACOBS: Or is that just a new recommendation going forward or --

MR. SHULER: I don't know if we have had -- can we throw it in as a discussion item, rather than a recommendation, since we really haven't had a chance to talk with about it with everything else going on?

Okay. So I'll throw that out and then maybe look to you to lead the discussion or just to guide people what the issues are? Okay. So I'll add that to the possible -- okay. What else?


MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. LAWHUN: The -- on the first page, then, you've got "Rough Draft Recommendations," and then you've got "New Recommendations," but both of those are mixtures of continuing issues from the Fall recommendations --

MR. SHULER: Mm-hmm.

MS. LAWHUN: -- with a few new ones.

MR. SHULER: With a few new ones, correct.

MS. LAWHUN: So do we want to just say "all recommendations?" Or do we want to make it clear there's some new ones, and then there's some continuing ones?

MR. SHULER: It may be -- may be between now -- I'm beginning to think that since we're really trying to engage the community on a continuous basis, distinguishing between new and old is going to become rather meaningless. So we'll just call this the stream of recommendations. And this is what we're fishing from it today. Okay? We'll just go with that.
MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. What about the strategic plan draft? Because we have spent a lot of time over the last two Council meetings discussing the wording of that draft, and also the Public Printer made reference to assumptions that are in that draft and brand-new goals. And I believe that he was implying that Council should do some work on those assumptions and goals, and perhaps move along the draft of the strategic plan.

MR. SHULER: What do people think?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii. I -- I think we should ask the Public Printer what he -- what his intention is for that.

MR. SHULER: Maybe -- maybe "to carve a path" is what I could say at the 10:30 meeting is that the Chair will ask specifically the public prayer -- the Public Printer to tell us what he wants us to do with this strategic draft. That will be our action, David, and that will guide our further -- any other further activity once we get more information. How does that sound?

MR. CISMOWSKI: For the record, since this is being recorded, and you asked a question, yes. That sounds fine.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, David. Chair will ask Public Printer. Okay. Let's see. Of course, there's always the tradition, I think, that has been in the past, but at different times I've been reviewing -- I've been reviewing recommendations of yore, as well as transcripts from previous time continuums. And I notice there's always a formal moment in the process about the 10:30 meeting where there is a formal recommendation, where the Council thanks GPO for the wonderful job it did in organizing the meeting. I suggest that I just say that in a formal way, rather than putting together a recommendation. I think they'll understand. Okay? Anything else?

I think the only other thing we might -- whether or not we want to discuss this at all is perhaps get some feedback on the arrangements that the Council hear. I think, most of what I heard, it was positive, and I hope that will continue. But perhaps we should,
maybe not today, but in our future discussions between
meetings, further implement the changes we made and the
arrangements of how we discussed things and the
furniture for Buffalo to make sure it's as effective as
possible.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. John, I think maybe in the 10:30 meeting, if you
could remind people to fill out their evaluations --

MR. SHULER: Yes. Yes.

MS. SEARS: -- and to turn them in, that it's
very important that we know how it went from the
audience's point of view.

MR. SHULER: I have a handwritten note from
Lance with exactly that directive, so I am -- I'll --
I'll properly do my job. You're welcome. Okay.
Buffalo meeting arrangements. All right. Anything
else? Gosh. Yes?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. If we're finishing early at this meeting,
perhaps we should go ahead and discuss law.gov because
the next meeting's going to be pretty full, and I think
that discussion is going to be pretty lengthy.

MR. SHULER: We got 35 minutes everybody --
okay with that? Let's get that discussed and
under the belt and get it into the recommendation
screen. James, lead us.

MR. JACOBS: Okay. James Jacobs, Stanford
University. So what I had suggested was that law.gov,
which is at public.resource.org/law.gov. It's a
proposed registry and repository of all primary legal
materials of the United States. And they will be coming
out with a report sometime in the first quarter of 2010.
That report will be -- and I'm reading from
their web page -- documenting exactly what it would take
to create a distributed registry and repository of all
primary legal materials of the United States.
And so my suggestion was that DLC request from
the co-conveners of this proposed registry and
repository that we request a copy of that report. And
that was -- that was all of the -- the -- that was all
that I was asking for.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. JACOBS: So, you know, when we get the
report, then we can decide whether we need to -- whether
we need to comment or anything like that. But I think
since they have already gotten a registry of responses
from several groups that want the report, including the
senate committee on Homeland Security and Governmental
Affairs, that it would be -- it would be a nice show to
have Depository Library Council on that list as well.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair,
University of Hawaii. That sounds great to me. Is this
something that we would want to have a council session
on in Buffalo?

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
I would prefer that it -- if -- if this is something
that we're going to take seriously, we need more
information than what is on that website and the report,
and I would ask that we have some sort of subcommittee
within the Council group.

Just because there's information, there's
other press releases out there that are indicating that
this is more than what is just on the -- the website or
the press release. So I would like more information
before Council makes any sort of recommendation or
considers this as an option.

MR. SHULER: Does anybody want to volunteer
for that group? James, obviously. Do enough -- okay.
So we got -- so four. So we got Justin, James, Sally
and Camilla, right?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
And I wanted to make it clear that I'm just requesting
the report. I -- I wasn't suggesting that -- that DLC,
you know, put their stamp of approval on this or
anything like that. I just would like to get an
official report.

MR. SHULER: Okay. So you four will birddog
that for us and then -- okay.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
Just a dumb question for clarification, despite the name
of this thing, law.gov, did -- am I correct in that this
is not a government enterprise?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs. I believe it is not
an official government enterprise. It is a suggestion
for having the domain "law.gov." But if you look at the
co-conveners, you'll see that they are largely
academics; Pam Samuelson from Berkley Law, John Pedesta
(ph) used to be a government official. Tim Woo -- and
so these are mostly legal scholars that are interested in this, as well as some commercial entities like O'Reilly Media -- yeah.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff. Val Po Law. From reading this though, they're seeking enabling legislation, so they want it to be a government entity. And there's some very misleading information in just this paper that James gave us that, I think, is contradicted by some of the things they're posting online.

MR. SHULER: Is Council still comfortable then? We have got -- you got four people that want to work on it. It's currently in issue.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. Well, certainly, it's good to stay apprised of activities in this field. And as James said, requesting a report is seeking additional information, and we'll take a look at it and see what happens. So, sounds good.

MR. SHULER: I did forget to mention that Sally and I are a team looking at our by-laws. I need to add that.

And there is another one I want to bring up. It's something I've been hearing about during the conference at different times, and that is the issue over the American Public Health Reports and access to that database and whether or not it truly meets the standards of depository access by the public. And that opens up a general issue of how these databases are -- might be restricted in other ways. What does -- what is Council's thinking on that?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I guess I need more definition. Were you thinking of that as a -- a rough draft recommendation?

MR. SHULER: I'm just bringing it up as an issue. It's not even reached the recommendation. I'm just talking about chatter that I've heard around the conference that people are concerned about this. That's certainly been the topic amongst (inaudible) people, as well as others. And there seems to be differing information about what is allowed, who's allowed to access it, and who isn't. And I think it is of such importance considering we're moving into a digital environment
where it's not just access to actual documents, but
databases. It might behoove the Council to raise this
on its radar a little bit, at least to give it some
focus. Perhaps by buffalo. Perhaps sooner.

Would anybody be willing to work on this?
Thank you. We can report to the community then at 10:30
that we're going to be looking into that. I think that
will offer some assurance that we're not letting it go
unnoticed.

Yes. Okay. All right. Any other issues? Is
it the sense of Council that we have used this 14th
session effectively, and we have no other things to add
to our 10:30 show? Looking around the table. John
Shuler from the University of Illinois in Chicago sees
none. I -- I hear -- I seek a motion to adjourn?
MS. SEARS: So moved, Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas.
MR. SHULER: Shall we have a vote?
MS. MORIEARTY: Second, Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah.
MR. SHULER: Let it be. How do we vote?

Let's get out of here. See everybody at 10:30. Thank
you, audience, for being patient.

(Brief recess)
MR. SHULER: We're going to start the program.
No, no. That's okay. I'm trying to remember what I was
about to do. No, something else. Something else.
That's okay. There it is.
We'll get started here in a moment. I'm
tweeting out to the community here where I am and what
I'm doing. I'll be done in a moment. You can blame
James really.
Okay. If I could ask -- almost there. We're
missing a council member. Hate to start without her.
Well -- all right. Here we go. Yes, that's better. I
call to session the last plenary meeting of the Fall,
And I have, again, by law -- by GPO law, I'm
required to announce things, so I'm going to do my best
here. And I got to say this with capital letters with
an exclamation point, please do evaluations of your
sessions. Turn them in. GPO values your input and
wants to hear what you have to say.
If you are being certified by any of these sessions, and you need to have demonstrated proof of that, they will be available at the 10:00 o'clock break if request -- if you had requested it while you -- when you registered. So obviously, it's 10:30, so if you haven't done that, get -- get to it.

Thanks Lance. Okay. The other thing I should say by law is if you have something to say, come to the mike. You know the routine. Name, rank, serial number. Okay? And to stand as a perfect example, John Shuler, University of Illinois in Chicago.

We are going to do something that we started doing in Tampa, which is to talk about the recommendations rather than giving you full-blown recommendations. We want you to help guide us, if you will, through the process. And we're going to have some specific ways to do that.

And what we intend to do because this work is important to us, we intend to continue the conversation through other means primarily through the Federal Documents Desktop, community desktop, seeking to get input from you, but also to give you the recommendations when we're done writing them. And hopefully, not soon after that or at the same time, responses from GPO.

We view this time, the six months between the Spring and Fall meeting to be part of these meetings. It's what we call our "long meeting strategy." So I started -- I -- I've been making different parts of -- about -- being Chair of Council is like being the mayor of Brigadoon except it lasts five and a half -- five days instead of one. And I'm hoping to extend that feeling of power a little bit longer before I have to give it up completely.

So we fully intend to use a number of opportunities and tools to work with you and communicate with you during those six months when we don't see each other. Okay?

So what I'd like to do, then, is begin our discussion with the -- bringing some closure. What the Council was very interested in was bringing some closure on what we have done. And we want to review the seven recommendations, five of which were the subject of the break-out sessions that Council managed over the last two and a half days. And we're going to tell you how we
And on the first recommendation which was "To meet the goals of providing no-fee permanent public access to government information, Council recommends that GPO seek funding to hire an outside consultant to deliver a range of models." That's the opening statement.

The Council feels that work continues on this even though funding has been acquired, and one of our new agendas will be new recommendations will be focusing on the work that needs to be done further on that.

The second and third recommendations which looked at the digitization possibilities of cooperation and collaboration among depository libraries and with GPO, specifically speaking to seeking funding sources to support that effort. We feel that some of that was acquired in the sense that we had a discussion about it, but we have further work to do on them.

The fifth recommendation and the sixth recommendation with -- excuse me -- the fourth and fifth recommendations which spoke to Disposal and Selection Process, we are going to continue part of that discussion. There were questions that were raised in the regionals' meeting that had some specific issues that we needed to gather more information.

So Council has designated three of its members, all of whom are regional librarians, who will work on those issues with GPO and come back and report to us when we have more and, hopefully, better information to resolve those issues. So until we can close that, we cannot particularly close those two recommendations.

Now, Council, help me out here. I think -- I think I'm using an old document, so I'm going to be a little embarrassed here for a moment. The sixth recommendation I think we declared done. Correct? Yes. And that recommendation was "Council further recommends that GPO continue the implementation of the new model of public access assessments, including site visits, et cetera." And we feel that the conversation we had at this conference has accomplished what the spirit of the recommendation has done, though we did notice there was a couple of other things we wanted to follow up on.
The seventh recommendation which involves control -- quality control issues in three areas; classification, cataloging, and tangible distribution.

There was a session hosted by GPO that addressed aspects of that, but Council feels that it is something we need to pursue.

Now, Council help me here because this document is not helping me. We had another done item. Which one was that? Was it the fifth? Was it? Recommendation Four? Okay. Good. Thank you.

We did close out Recommendation Number Four which spoke to the best practices of streamlining the disposal process and specifically having a long session about that, about the details and best practices.

Though there are other aspects, as I said earlier, that are being taken up by the regionals.

So as a new tradition, Council wants to begin by saying what it's completed. Not bad, huh? No, I guess, there's still work to be done. Now, does Council have any further remarks, observations they want to make about that? Those points? Yes?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Even though the fourth recommendation on the disposal process is declared closed, we're doing this because the recommendation was that GPO deliver a report at this meeting. That is the extent of the closure of this.

As you know if you attended that session, there are going to be ongoing -- there's going to be ongoing work on this. So the -- the closure is just about that report that was delivered.

MR. SHULER: Any other comments from Council?

Okay. We are now going to open up the -- where Council's going with ongoing recommendations that stem from the 2009 recommendations. And these are really going to be what are simply called "topic sentences" of the work that is really ongoing.

Council only met to work on these issues for about -- amongst the two and a half days, probably four hours total. And a lot of what is going on required a lot of other information we felt we should acquire before we really flesh out these recommendations and share them with GPO and then share them with the community.
So what we want to do is introduce each of these topic sentences, if you will, and the Council is going discuss them. We're going to open it up for conversation with GPO and then with the audience. So I'm going to begin first with the -- actually three issues that address the digitization recommendations, in that Council is recommending that in order to achieve some kind of coordination and collaboration amongst depository libraries to effectively digitize what we call "the tangible collections," we're seeking to have GPO work closely with the depository library so that there is a coordinated push.

Instead of people doing what they think other people aren't doing, there's going to be more information brought in to the conversation. And this -- part of this will also include some kind of listing of which libraries want to do what digitization. That's the -- the first topic that we're going to be looking at. So I open that up to Council.

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. Actually the task force, the Council task force that looked at the cluster of issues around digitization of the tangible collections was broader than the collaboration effort. It's just one aspect. For example, there -- we like to revisit the registry and have -- we have some ideas about how that might be improved, what kind of information could be there. There's a host of issues around the digitization, so it's not just the collaboration is one aspect of this topic.

MR. SHULER: Anybody else from Council? GPO? MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. It helped me in hearing Tori's clarification on that because one of the things I mentioned in my speech is, now that we move onto this next phase and given the fact that we have funding associated with digitization, we're going to need to work closely with Council to create a broad-based plan on what we're going to do. And I think as part of that plan, it needs to be very comprehensive. It needs to look at aspects of coordination. It also needs to look at what can be done with the registry to certainly promote it more, make it more inviting, do more to encourage people to come to
it, and also look at it through a gap analysis. Look at
what's missing from it.
I've heard some of the comments that you guys
have heard about things that we can do to enhance it.
And I think we need to look at it from that broad
perspective, associate it with doing the spend plan,
associate it with digitization.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North
Texas. James Jacobss and Tori Trotta and Chris Greer and
myself are all part of that particular recommendation,
and we have a whole list of -- that we've already
started to try and get that a little more comprehensive
for you, Rick. I just want to assure you that we -- we
have been working on that and hope to get that finalized
out for you as quickly as possible.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of
Illinois in Chicago. I should emphasize that these are
topics rather than the full-fleshed proposals. And what
we are seeking to do here is to get questions and ideas
from the audience so that when we continue to work on
the recommendations, we can use the court reporter's
transcripts to harvest those ideas and make sure that
they're part of the recommendations when we're done
here. And that the funding issues, too, Rick, will be
addressed and other recommendations we'll be talking
about shortly.

Anything else from GPO? Members of the
audience, do you want to offer observations? We're
looking for just general input.

MS. SMITH: You never should have put speaker
on my name tag because I can't shut up now. Lori Smith
of Southeastern Louisiana University. I'm hoping, but I
thought I better mention anyway, that somewhere along
the line there will be maybe recommended technical
specifications for those doing the digitization
projects.

I think, if not, those should maybe be created
so people will have some guidelines if they want to
start one. It's like here's some basic minimum
standards you may want to shoot for.

And in terms of tracking digitization, I'm --
I'm envisioning sort of a digitization map using, like,
a list of classes that would highlight for, you know, a
SuDoc range what institution had digitized anything in
that range. And you might have, you know, several institutions for one range and none for another. And that might help us start to get a feel for what had been done and where duplication had happened. So if that's useful, there you go.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I assure you that we took great pains to put as much as we could from the discussion on digitization. I do like -- the list of classes is new, so I just jotted that down. But we do have most of those that you were just talking about. They came out of that session. And if you'd like to look over it and see if there's something that's missing, you can see me after the meeting.

MR. SHULER: Geoff?

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. Since I'm part of the implementation team and the planning team for the CIC digitization effort, I just wanted to know, are you going to be looking at issues around ingest into FD sys of efforts in the community? Is that part of the mandate? I'm little unclear on what -- the kind of things you'll be looking at?

MR. SHULER: Yes. We can classify these three topics about recommendations that will be forthcoming under "Digitization of the Tangible Collections." And that will include an aspect of ingestion into the Fed Sys system, so yes.

MR. SWINDELLS: Okay. I -- and I just want to -- I'll -- I'll extend the invitation now. If you guys would like to sort of talk to the folks planning the CIC thing, even though it's not in many ways fleshed out yet, feel free to contact me or other members of the team.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. SWINDELLS: Thanks.

MR. SHULER: So noted. Dan Barkley.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of Mexico or New Mexico. I forget what my tag says. But I do live in New Mexico, New Mexico. Just to kind of echo echo what Geoff said, I would hope that, you know, John Phillips and I and a couple other people are here from GLOWA (ph). And we're doing, you know, the scientific and technical stuff right now. We've got quite a bit
done, and we're going to do quite a bit more. So networking, I think, is real important, so that even if there is overlap, we know what the overlap is and where it's coming from. And we kind of try to make sure we're all on the same page, particularly with standards, so that we can make sure that the whole community shares all these different efforts that are ongoing.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears from University of North Texas. Dan and Geoff, we were looking at doing at least one session, if not two, in Buffalo on ingest into FDsys and digitization. Can I see if both of you were going to be there? Would you be willing to help us out with that?

MR. SWINDELLS: I'll be there.

MR. BARKLEY: Speaking for Geoff, he'll be there.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne. And you, Dan?

MR. BARKLEY: Why would I miss Buffalo? I'll be there.

MR. SHULER: Yes?

MR. RAGAINS: Pat Ragains, University of Nevada, Reno. And what I have to say may -- may be obvious, but I -- I'd kind of like these ideas to be represented in the record of what's been said at the conference. And for all the digitization projects, I think it's important that there be an evaluation phrase to look at what's produced and look at the quality to -- to understand what we have once a project's been done. And I think it's -- that's important, in part, because we want to be able to represent what's been done and discuss this in our home libraries properly.

And the way I see it is this: It's that digitization does not replace print collections. It -- it may replace the need for selective libraries to hold print collections, but as we -- we've seen with the Trails Project and the -- the projects that have been working -- the libraries have been working with the Google Books Project, they're not giving up their last copies. They're giving up duplicate copies, and they're retaining depository copies in their collections.

And I think that there's -- there's good reason for that. Once the digitization projects have been completed, these will be new and very useful resources for the entire user community. But I don't
think we're at the stage yet where they necessarily replace the need for any print collections. And, again, that may go without saying, but I think it's important that that be in the record. And we can reflect back on that once more work has been done. Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Thanks, Pat. So noted.

MS. TROTTA: John, can I say something? Tori Trotta, Arizona state University. I'm glad you brought that up. One conversation that we started yesterday was the issue of permanent public access preservation copies versus access copies. And I don't think there's clarity yet, at least for me, about what the GPO role in that is. And I -- I think as a -- we need more input from the community and more dialogue with GPO so that we can be all clear on that arrangement because it speaks to what some of the speakers have been talking about. And so to me that's -- that's like a macro issue that needs to be discussed. And once that has clarified, then the priorities for helping all these other sub-issues in the digitization cluster will -- I think will be easier to articulate and decide on and plan for.

MR. SHULER: Also under this topic "Digitization of Tangible Collections," we've included a further recommendation "looking at requests for state-based grant program to encourage collaborative digital projects amongst libraries." And to speak to the issue that Geoff raised, that we look at digital content that is going to be ingested from -- of agency documents into Fedsys through these various digitization initiatives and efforts.

So you can think of those three recommendations as covering -- trying to cover the map about this whole vast entangled challenge of digitization. Now that the RFP has gone away, we are going to have to figure out how to do this as a community of librarians and libraries working with GPO, an effect a partnership and collaboration.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I do want to mention to the community that a lot of what we're looking at where digitization collaboration is concerned is to put that onto the FDLP community website, which we are also recommending be
upgraded. So if you're not a member of the FDLP community, you might want to think about becoming one. Because we are talking about maybe the best practices that we heard from that session that you would like if -- if you're starting a digitization project, you'd like to be able to contact somebody who's already done one. How did they face the copyright issues? Is this really worth doing? And all of that, we're looking at using community as the tool for that kind of collaboration.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. One aspect of the digitization world that I think is being missed is usage statistics. In the operational forum yesterday I talked to Ted Priebe about the possibility of FDsys being able to run some reports to give us the one hundred most popular used titles, you know, based on Perl usage. And I've come up with a whole lot of specifications, which I will be emailing him. I came up with four reports I want. But in these other digitization projects, if there's any way for us to get, like a title, level, usage information of some sort. Because with the digital documents, we don't really have the kind of circulation information that we've always had with the print. So I'm finding it very hard to do collection development for digital documents because I'm not seeing what gets used. With the print world, I always saw on the "to be shelved" truck what people had been using, and I knew what my patrons found useful. We're not getting that usage information with the digital documents. So that's just another aspect to keep in mind with all these projects is it would be good to have that.

MS. SEARS: I'm sorry. Can you stay at the mike for just one moment? Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Just -- I need a little more clarification because I mean, for each university, like the University of North Texas, we have an enormous set of digital collections. I can run you the top ten used from my collection.

MS. SMITH: Mm-hmm.

MS. SEARS: But -- so are you wanting, like, a page where each institution would put their top ten? I -- I'm just trying to see --
MS. SMITH: Or some sort of summary. I don't know how that would be done. But I -- I've tried to get this locally with our integrated library software. And the vendor does not give me much hope that we'll have local data.

So I'm just looking for some sort of national data of what are the most popular digital publications, and if it can be, you know, just based on the GPO Perl server, that's fine. But if we can get something more comprehensive from the other digital collections, that would be great. Maybe that would be something that the people who have those collections would report to GPO somehow like in the biennial survey or something.

MS. SEARS: Are you talking about just the digital publications or also the websites? I mean, it almost sound like -- because I know we had a session here that was put on about getting the statistics from your OPAC if those hot links are being used.

I'm not sure that it's technically -- and maybe this is why James is sitting here -- technically going to be possible for -- I mean, I don't know -- I can't see in my head how we would be able to get all of that data into one -- I don't know, James. You have a --

MR. JACOBS: Chris Brown? Is Chris still in the -- yeah. Chris Brown with his hand up had a -- had a very good presentation yesterday about how to -- how to get those statistics into your catalog.

MS. SMITH: Right. Well, we get the hot link statistics. We have statistical information. What I want is the title level information so I know what is being used. And I get the URL's that have been used, but to know what that is, I have to scan it and, you know, put it in my browser to see what title that actually is. I'm not getting that title and subject usage level information like I can with the print just by looking at the returned truck.

MR. JACOBS: Right.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Illinois Chicago. May I suggest that we make note of that? That we put that aspect of title into what we're looking through.

MR. JACOBS: I think Chris might have something to say on that.
MR. BROWN: Yeah. Chris Brown, University of Denver. The proceedings will be -- the PowerPoint from our six presentations will be up there, but I can get title level statistics for everything. I know Shane can get them for his and Liza and San Jose state, Suzanne Kendall. And I know -- I'm not sure what Louisiana's Lewis system. Stephanie is -- Bronstein, is she still here?

MS. SMITH: No, we can't.

MR. BROWN: You can't get title level? Okay. Well, talk to me later offline, and I can show you how we do it. But it's very easy to do. I can get SuDoc level. I can analyze by stem. I can do any kind of analysis. So --

MR. SHULER: But that will be so noted by the Council and make sure that that thread of conversation isn't lost. Thanks. All right. Nope. Dave?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I almost hate to bring this up, but I will anyway because I brought it up during the opening session. The RFP that failed, these disbursed digitization projects are obviously very important and are going to be an absolutely essential contribution to permanent public access to digitized information.

However, Tori's questions about preservation standards versus access copies is very troubling to me because I suspect that some of these projects are not going to be to the standards of preservation. And also because of that, they're not going to be able to be ingested into FDsys, which means that we will not have one-stop shopping for this digitized content.

So once again, I'm -- maybe I'm crying in the wilderness here, but I'm wondering if it might be possible for GPO to retool the -- the RFP to make it more attractive. To try to get some kind of process going where we can get a -- a very standardized digitization process going that we were told was going to happen in Tampa.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One of the things that I mentioned during my opening speech was that as the next step of this, we need to develop a plan working with Council. And a lot of that that David mentioned is policy, and I think some of it is assumption that we need to validate about where we go.
And where I think we need to go is we need to do another industry day, and from the industry day move on and do another RFP. I think the assumption that because content may not meet a certain standard, it may not be available in FDsys is something we need to talk about. Because I do think it's important, as many of you do and you expressed during the conference, that there be preservation level copy held at GPO from which access level derivatives are produced.

But I think as part of the discussion in the planning process, we need to talk about whether or not for the purposes of immediately expanding access having a rendition or some access derivative while we're working towards preservation copy is something that we, as a community, find acceptable for the purposes of near-term expansion of access.

So I -- I look forward to talking about this as we go through the planning process. But I think we need to validate some of those issues, and I think that's what's going to make a sound industry day. And it's going to lead to what makes it attractive or not attractive for potential bidders.

MR. SHULER: In the interest of moving on, this will be the last question. Okay.

MS. RHODES: Actually -- can you hear me?

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. RHODES: Okay. It's kind of a recommendation to the Council. This is Sarah Rhodes, Georgetown Law Library. The University of North Texas has this "web at-risk program" and has an amazing collection plan template that's used by the different partners who participate in that effort. They complete this collection plan, and it's posted on a website.

This template was useful for my library in our digital preservation effort. We actually took it down and adapted it for our project. I think one thing, if my library were to participate in a collaborative government document digitization effort, I would need to have a plan that I defended in front of our Digitization Initiatives Committee.

So a plan template that was developed by Council or by GPO and posted, made available, that I would complete. That would have, you know, I mean, like, a standards information could be there. But also,
I mean, evaluation information could be included. There are a number of things that would be very helpful for me to kind of make an argument at my institution. So that's my comment.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. I think these recommendations are working towards that idea that we would have shared resources of that type in this issue of coordination and collaboration.

Okay. I'd like to close off the conversation then on what we would call "The Digitization of the Tangible Collections" and move on to what we classify, this would be our next recommendation topic, the wonderful inclusive title of "Technology Issues."

And Council will be addressing in this particular recommendation, the -- in particular, it shall be part of this, the failure of the Perl System. Council is in unanimity about it was unacceptable and that we were -- we are looking to GPO as a result of this recommendation to give us an accounting of what happened.

And further, with the remarks from GPO personnel in different parts of the conference, mentioning that this Perl System was one of several legacy systems still in place, we want to work with GPO with all expeditious speed to get us out of the legacy world. Well, maybe we could call it the heirloom world and into the -- this current century.

And this also would include a specific request that we desire a FDsys that will happen within two years and not four to six years. Something that would happen within our lifetimes. That was John speaking actually.

So I -- I leave this -- I open this to the Council discussion and then the rounds. So, Council?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.

I -- I think the essence of the focus here is one of information gathering and wanting -- seeking clarification and some information and in the spirit of lessons learned and moving forward.

And with respect to -- just to elaborate a little bit on John's enumeration of the points with respect to the FDsys, I think a lot of the conversation was around wondering about and seeking clarification on the need for reliable and redundant systems. You know,
all of our institutions have probably experienced
something like the Perl failure, you know. And it's --
it's always good to take advantage of that awful
opportunity when it -- when it occurs to learn from it.
Do our best to make sure it doesn't happen again and to
-- so it's a -- it's a information-seeking request.

MR. SHULER: Any other folks from the Council
want to speak to the issue? GPO folk?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I want to
reiterate that I, too, am extremely disappointed in what
happened with the Perl process as I know others at GPO
are.

Let me elaborate a little bit on what we've
done since then without revealing too much in the way of
procurement-sensitive information. In the library unit
we define our requirements on behalf of you guys as
customers to our ITN S staff, and they're responsible
for implementing technology strategies.

I think that as a customer and as our partner
in the process, our IT staff has agreed that we are
certainly having some trouble supporting this Perl
process. And the way we're having trouble is not from
the hardware side, it's from the software side.

And I -- I think GPO did a very good job
going the hardware up and running again, but there was
definitely a problem with finding quick turn-around on
application support associated with the scripting
process need today run Pearls.

And as a result of that, I've made the
recommendation that we also examine potential
outsourcing options for what I'm calling "a bridge of
stability" until persistent identification requirements
are fully addressed by FDsys.

I do not think we can run the risk of having
something like this happen again with this system or any
of the other public facing systems. And for that
reason, I've asked this to be opened up to all options.

I requested and have received funding
associated with doing this as part of the FY '10 budget.
And we're going to move ahead with either another
internal option, or if we can't do it, an immediate
outsource. So that's where we are right now, and
we'll have certainly more to report along the way.

MR. SHULER: David.
MR. CISMOWSKI: Ric -- David Cismowski, California State Library. I think it was a week ago or a week and a half ago there was an hour or two failure again or inaccessibility. Could you -- my -- my sense of that is very unclear. Was that related to the previous, or what -- what caused that? Could you inform us on that?

MR. DAVIS: I don't want to butcher this in my comments because I'm not the -- the -- certainly the most technical person in the room. But what occurred a week ago for approximately an hour was that there was a -- a problem again on the primary server. It failed over to the backup, and there was an issue with the IP address thinking that the primary and the backup server were using the same IP address.

That was corrected, so it was a completely different situation than what occurred during the period it was down. But it further eliminates that even being down for an hour, to me as a customer, is unacceptable. I think it's unacceptable to you as a library community. The words that I used, and I think it's words that our predecessors have used, is that in the digital environment when you can't access Pearls, it's equivalent to having a padlock on the door of a library.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. I think those sentiments are very much appreciated. Members -- sorry. James.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Rick, would -- would the GPO also be interested not only in outsourcing options but partnership options?

MR. DAVIS: I know we're meeting at 12:00, and I'm open to those discussions as well.

MR. JACOBS: Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Anybody else on the Council? Audience members? Do you want to contribute? Are you satisfied that GPO and the Council are making positive steps to make sure we understand what happened and steps toward resolution, that it doesn't happen again? Okay.

(Applause.)

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Okay. Those four recommendations are the -- what we would call rough -- rough recommendations that are basically in process. We are now moving to five further
recommendations that are even more rough. And it
reminds me of that famous phrase we use as government
documents librarians, there's two things you don't want
to see, how they make sausage and how a Council makes
recommendations.
So we're going to give you a bit of the
seasoning we're using in fashioning these food stuffs.
Yeah. I've been a vegetarian for the last day and a
half. I think something's happening to my meat brain.
All right. First one states that "The
structure and purpose of the -- Council is seeking to
work with GPO to inform the structure and purpose of the
consultant." Okay?
And we realize that with $100,000 is a lot of
money to a lot of people, but obviously for the
challenges we have, it ain't much. Therefore, we would
like the scope of the work to reflect the size of the
budget, that we set priorities on what this consultant
should or should not do. Council wants to work with GPO
on that. And further that it be sooner than later. So
we're interested in a very quick speed dating. Council
members?
MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.
I'll just state the obvious, in that since right up
front, you all invited our participation in this and saw
that quickly after the meeting since you have a fair --
as I understood it, a fairly quick turnaround or how you
want to spend that $100,000, this is one of our ways of
saying we stand ready to work with you in that regard.
MR. SHULER: For the members of the audience
and the community out here, this will be one more thing
for you to go to the that Federal Depository Library
Community Desktop because the conversation will not stop
here. It will be going on. Rick?
MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I greatly
appreciate Council's willingness to work with us on
that. As you probably heard during the meeting, the
omnibus dollars that we received back in June, we had to
award all of that money by September 30th.
And, you know, thanks particularly to the work
of the staff that we have at GPO, in both of the library
side and in procurement, the last one was awarded at
4:00 p.m. on the last day. Very quick turnaround when
you -- you get a significant budget increase, and you've
got two months to execute all of the contracts.

Obviously we have more time on this, but I --
I don't want to wait six months. I want to do it more
in three months. The first thing that we need to do
immediately after this meeting is start creating spend
plans for all of the appropriated items that we've
received approval on in FY '10, and I want to work hand
in hand with Council on each of those. And certainly
the consultant one.

I think as John mentioned, it seems like in
some ways a lot of money, but with the task, it's
probably not a lot of money. I think we really need to
focus on an outcomes-based effort as well. What are we
looking for in terms of results from working with a
consultant and also thinking about what does it lead to?
What do we actually want to do with it in terms of what
we get?

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Members of the
audience? Do I take that as somewhat of an assent that
you approve of the direction we're taking on this? Your
Council working on your behalf? How do you like this
feedback thing going here, huh? Kind of cool, I think.

Okay. Second item, "Seasoning Level. GPO
Funding Issues and Direction." Council has designated
two of its members to be take -- to lead a small task
force to work directly with GPO, taking in input from
Council as well as from members of the audience and the
community on how GPO can best organize its work for the
community, the Federal Depository Library community, in
regards to the funding requests for '10 and '11.

And some of this will happen sooner than
later. Obviously there was a greater demand in the next
three or four weeks, which is the reason why we're
making it a small working group so they can move faster.

This will involve a series of phone calls and
other communication devices to take advantage of the web
technologies to make sure this happens very quickly.

Council members? Rick?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I do want to
reemphasize the priority on that one. We're looking at
a date of November 15th to have not a tremendous amount
of detail, but line items and associated justifications
for the items were looking for for FY '11.

And I think the thing we need to think about
is we're working together to finalize the wording on the recommendations. We need to look at the amount of money we've received from the FY '10 appropriations that maps to things like legacy system replacement. I have it for pearls. I have it for DETUS (ph), but we have other legacy systems, item list or shipping list or the system that runs our distribution line and powers that others.

We need to think about prioritization of those things for additional funding requests for FY '11, as well as other Council recommendations whenever the word "money" comes up. And we need to map it to it by mid-November.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Suzanne and I will be taking the lead on this, and I know right now Suzanne's going to cancel her flight home, this afternoon, and stay here and work with us for the next two days.

MS. SEARS: Seeing as how the -- the weather in Dallas is so bad, that may not be a bad idea.

MR. SHULER: We'll work on that. Audience members? My goodness. I think we should come up with something contentious. I'm kind of missing the old days. Okay. Oh, my God. Regionals are up next. What was I thinking?

Then -- Mary Alice. Thank you very much.

MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, American Association of Law Libraries. And, Ric, what can we do to help you? You know, we worked hard over the year -- past two years, specifically, to get money earmarked for the federal digital system which is so crucial, as we all know, to the future of your agency.

And what can we do to help you, for example, justify a line item request annually to fund the federal digital system, particularly, as we talk about ingesting materials that are digitized by all of our partner libraries?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Speaking on behalf of GPO, we certainly appreciate your support and the testimony that you guys have given on behalf of our appropriations and, specifically, FDsys. I wonder if Celine is in the audience? No.

I need to speak with her about what their request will be for FY '11 because, of course, FDsys is a separate activity from what we do in the library unit. But I know, certainly, we're appreciative of the fact
that for the first time that was funded in FY '10 as a separate line item.
And I think that in -- in mapping to the request about the need for -- for speed associated with the continued rollout of FDsys, we need to work with Council about prioritization and look at what funding is going to be needed associated with that. And I know certainly, we'd appreciate that support in the future. So that's something we need to dialogue about.

MR. SHULER: Anybody else from the audience?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think it's important to do that. I think that when GPO came up with a list of items, the list of items that we came up with associated with what John is referring to is things that we saw as actionable items from the -- the regional reports from last summer. What ended up occurring in the interim is some of those things have clearly overlapped -- council recommendations from Tampa. I think there is a bit of overlap with some of the things I'm hearing about today. And I think we need to look at where we have overlap, where we have other prioritizations associated with regionals that need action that, perhaps, extend beyond the Council recommendations, but have Council involvement with GPO.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Rick. Members of the audience?

MS. HORNE-POPP: Laura Horne-Popp, University of Richmond. Could you clarify what these issues are? As a selective, I'm -- I'm -- you know, many of us
didn't participate, and I'm assuming in the meeting that happened yesterday where some of this came up. So if this could be articulated a little more clearly for the sake of --

MR. SHULER: Well, the best I can do it because a lot of the issues, a lot of discussions focuses on just what the hell we're talking about. So people are debating back and forth about what the hell they're talking about.

So rather than recreate -- don't -- don't get me wrong, guys. We got time. We've got about an hour left. We can recreate the "what the hell you talking about" speech, but I strongly suggest, rather than try to recreate that very difficult moment and maybe add one more dimension to that hell, I -- I strongly suggest that these three people are very capable. They will work with GPO, and I think when their work is done, we won't have to worry about that more difficult discussion we had. Okay?

And if you have any questions, go ahead and submit them to the Council, and they'll make sure it is part of their discussion. Yes?

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. Related to disposal, I had mentioned an idea to Rick yesterday, but just to get it in the written record, during yesterday morning's presentation on the Ithaca report, this idea sprang into my head of creating, like, a GPO used book store.

Where, after a major set has gone through the entire disposal process, prior to throwing it in the Dumpster, which we all hate to do, we would put it in a box and mail it to the GPO used book store where they would then sell it. They would reimburse us for postage.

They would have, you know, the online site like the Ebay. They might have a store front where they could sell these, and they could do print on demand. If people are doing digitization projects, if they find one in this used book store, it's a depository. They get that copy for free. Everyone else would have to pay. So that was just my thinking outside the box of how to not throw things in the Dumpster that might be important, and there might actually be a market for out there. I don't know if it's reasonable or possible but
there was my idea.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

(Appause.)

MR. SHULER: We could -- we could bring back the old grange cooperative idea, huh? I like that. A food co-op.

Okay. Anything else from the audience? Going on to the next one then. Two weeks ago, three weeks ago. Doesn't note. Chair time is becoming immaterial right now. But the Public Printer issued a news release about a cooperative effort with the White House to be able to access massive data sources and download raw data and manipulate it to your heart's content.

And, specifically, he asked Council to work on the effectiveness of this initiative and to report back to him on how depository libraries can do this. I think you saw from sessions from yesterday, there are aspects of this being deployed by depository libraries as we speak, but the Public Printer considers this as part of one of his initiatives, and so he wants us to take a look at it.

We've appointed a team to look at that, and they will be reporting on it during the long meeting in preparation for Buffalo, but have some fairly good turn around on this. Does Council have any expansive remarks?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. Only two. Enlist the cooperation and support of all the folks out there using this kind of stuff. That if you know of or have ideas about how -- how various products or services might take advantage of XML GPO-supplied data or government information on XML generally, you know, just share those instances or ideas with us so we can, you know, take a look at them and track them.

Thanks.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: And us would be Dan and Camilla and myself.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso Law.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think that both GPO and the Office of the Federal Register have been pleased thus far with the reaction to the availability of the FR data in XML. I know we're --
we're looking at going back prior to 1990. There were
discussions about public papers of the President, so
also the Code of Federal Regulations has on the horizon.
I think in doing this with Council, something
that would also help and benefit GPO and the library
community is Mike Wash and I have been appointed to
serve on this cross-agency team as a result of the
language that came out in the CRS report about bulk data
working with the Library of Congress, working with the
house and senate staff, looking at definitions
associated with bulk data and what it means for the
future from a governmental perspective.
I think having a Council member involvement in
that to a degree would benefit as we're sharing
information.
MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso
Law. I also wanted to say we were really pleased to see
the disclaimer that was added to that on Fed Reg XML
announcement or the -- and hope that future things that
if more files are made available in that way, that there
would be that disclaimer that this is not the official
authenticated version. It's just data that -- that --
and that FDsys is the place to go for the official.
MR. DAVIS: Thanks for pointing that out as
well. I think that certainly there is a long-term plan
to provide authentication with that data. The
technology certainly is not there yet. So that -- thank
you forgetting that on the record because the -- the
official repository is still associated with the FDsys
information.
MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre
Dame. The only thing I would put in there, being the
person who the cup is half empty, and it's leaking,
harkens me back to census when this did this wonderful
thing and gave us this data in dBASE, so that we could
do all sorts of wonderful things for ourselves.
So in -- in this addition, and that's -- how
we have to characterise it. This is an additional
opportunity to have information useful to the community.
Does not act as a substitute or allow the agencies to
go, well, we've given you the raw data, we no longer do
any processing, any enhancement, anything else. That
all goes to, you know, thou shalt not compete with the
private sector nor, you know, the opportunity for the
library to do it all themselves.
So I -- I think we want to make sure we're balancing this and not giving them the opportunity to shift everything into, well, you have got all the data. If you wish to make a workable product, you may do all the manipulation, and the agency no longer has to do such.
So it's an additional opportunity. It's not a substitute to give a -- a reduction in their costs.
MS. BAISH: Mary Alice Baish, American Association of Law Libraries. Thank you, Steve. You took the words right out of my mouth. We were delighted to see the disclaimer go up. And one of the nice things about it, it does at the end of it provide a link to Fed Sys, noting that Fed Sys has the official authentic version of the online Federal Register.
I also want to point out to those of you potential users on data.gov, to use the XML you have to download the entire year of the Federal Register. But if you go to Fed Sys, you can download a daily edition. And beyond that, I just wanted to say for the subcommittee working on this with Council, yes, it's important to get the feedback of how depository librarians are using it, but a lot of other people are going to be using it, both non-depository libraries, non-profits, the commercial sector. So I think it's very important that the task force look beyond just our community in terms of potential benefits of usage for developing new tools. Thank you.
MR. SHULER: Thanks. Okay. Last one in this group. It's called "Updating/Evaluating for Discrepancies in the Handbook, Depository Library Handbook." This came out of the discussions on the -- the PAA which escapes me right now. What's the -- thank you. Public Access Assessments and making sure that the most up-to-date information is correct and in there and available for libraries that will be submitted to public assessments. Council?
MS. MORIEARTY: I want to let the community know that we'd like any feedback. By we, I mean Suzanne Sears and myself on the handbook. Please send any comments, any inquiries, any pertinent bits of
information to us.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Just to echo what Jill said, if you know of a
discrepancy, if you found a discrepancy and you see one,
let us know about that. I mean, if you -- if you have
issues with something in the handbook, we'd really --
because we've been hearing, oh, there's discrepancies.
We'd like some specifics, if possible, so that
we know what it is the scope of this project needs to
be. And I know several times today we've asked you for
feedback, different members of Council.

If you're not sure how to get ahold of us, in
your handouts, you got -- you have every one of our
emails. Also on the FDLP desktop there is a Council
page, and there is a contact form on that for each of
us. And we are also on the FDLP community where you can
reach us that way.

MS. MORIEARTY: I -- I urge everyone to take a
serious look at the handbook. We have PAA's coming up,
and this will help it go much easier we all know what's
going on. Good. Good.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. If memory serves
nine recommendations that are in various versions of
being prepared. And oddly enough, when we started this,
we said we were going to be very serious about being
very focused and, obviously, we need to work on that.
So I imagine you might see some mash-ups in
the end, but in the interest of time, I'm going to skip
ahead to other things that have come up on our radar
that we will be discussing, if not directing the full
recommendation muscle at.
One of them is -- and we have said this
several times during the conference and during this
particular session, we are moving to Federal Depository
Library Community Desktop. We're setting up. You guys
can follow us, you can ignore us, but if you really want
to pay attention to us because we're important people
here, you got to follow us to the community.
That means you got to register. That means
you got to get used to it. As part of this bargain, we
are going to work with GPO to upgrade that community to
take advantage of tools that are already there that may
not be clear -- organizational issues, finding issues,
searching issues.
And what our goal is is to make that where our
business takes place for the future. And that includes
stuff that we have done so we don't lose our memory. So
you don't have to scratch your head two weeks before a
meeting and say, what the hell was -- where -- where was
that document?
Our goal is to make it as rich an environment
as possible to facilitate that long meeting between our
physical meetings.
Council? I don't know if we're looking for
GPO responses, and I just want to let you know what
we're thinking about.
Members of the community, you want us to stop
that and just go back to the old ways? Anybody? Last
chance? Okay.
MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.
MR. SHULER: Damn it, James.
MR. JACOBS: Sorry. I did want to let folks
know that -- that we have a list of items to make
community.FDLP.gov better. But if you out there know of
any that -- that you would love to see, if you -- you
know, if you're a Google docs person or some other -- if
you're a Facebook person, and you have a particular hat that you really love and think it would be useful for the community, do let us know. And we'll -- we'll see that that gets added to the growing list.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Thanks, James. The other issue that we have put on our radar involves a proposed registry and repository of all primary legal materials of the United States. A report of this is going to be issued sometime in early next year. GPO -- not GPO. Council has decided to take a look at it and report back on what Council thinks.

And it is not in any sense an endorsement. It is merely an examination of an interesting project that we should probably be aware of. James, Justin, Sally, and Camilla have agreed to be the group looking after this.

Not to leave the old strategic plan out of the discussion, it is clear from the Public Printer's remarks the strategic plan is still dear to our hearts. So Council has asked the Chair to ask the Public Printer, what are the next steps that we need to do in partnership in regards to the strategic plan?

There has been a number of interesting discussions about the upcoming meeting in Buffalo. And what it interesting is that it engendered a discussion on Council about how the Spring meetings are organized and chosen, and I expect you'll see some more developments coming out of that discussion.

The American Health -- American Public Health reports -- am I getting that right? Public Health? Okay. Whatever they said's the right way to say it. Obviously, that has come up as an issue on gov. (inaudible) and other forums, and the Council feels that this is serious enough that we're putting it on our proto agenda to begin to explore these restrictions that may be involved when we move from single publications to databases. And whether or not these trends actually restrict the public's use of these databases as opposed to expanding them. We're not sure where that conversation's going to go, but it seems important enough to us to put it on our radar screen. Council? I sort of ran through those. Forgive me, I -- GPO? Audience members? Dan?

MR. BARKLEY: Good job. I approve.
MR. SHULER: All right. It's Dan-approved.

All right. Now, there is another set of recommendations that are much further along and probably close to being served. And I'm just going to run through these quickly.

As part of our effort to build the -- to continue to build our life in the community desktop, we have allowed ourselves, as Council members, to take advantage of social networking tools ourselves, and this will be pretty much invested in our life between here and Spring.

And that will include the ability to work on documents together online. It would include more telephone conversations and other direct interventions in order to stay on top of the many issues we're involved in.

Let's see. We have -- we're looking at some bylaw issues and how the Council works as an organization. And though it's probably endlessly interesting to us, we'll just -- we'll just put this under housekeeping responsibilities, and we're being responsible. How's that?

That pretty much takes care of the agenda as we have laid it out here, except for what's going to be pointed out to me in a moment. Ah. Thank you. Thank you.

There -- there was a further recommendation that comes under "almost served" that is attempting to have a better conversation and implementation ideas of how to use social networking tools at the physical conferences -- blogs, streaming. Thank you. Being an heirloom librarian, I'm really challenged by some of this. So I'm -- I'm sort of mimicking. But taking advantage of all that fancy tool stuff. That James talks about all the time and could speak to better.

MR. JACOBS: Ad nauseum?

MR. SHULER: Ad nauseum. But we want to be part of that utopia that the rest of the 19-year-olds seem to share. Or maybe that's a mid-life crisis for Council. I don't know.

But we want to work -- we're setting up different means and task forces with GPO on how we might be able to do that. That conversation started yesterday. And I got to tell you, GPO was really
enthusiastic about it. They were really looking forward to take care of those advantages.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I just want the community to know that GPO wants to help us do this as much as we want to do this. It's not a matter of, you know, yes, the technology is there, and we can do it. It's a matter of cost. It's extremely expensive.

So we're -- we're looking at what is most cost-effective and can involve the most participation from our community. Because we do want feedback from people who don't get travel funds and want them to be able to submit questions and be able to be involved in the conversations.

MR. SHULER: It's -- it was -- it's really different. I've been doing this for 26 years. And I remember some seasons where we just got a flat-out, no. Drop dead. What are you asking us for? And I got to tell you, it was very refreshing to actually get a positive response and really an engaged discussion. This is a good thing. This is a good thing.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

In addition to using some of the new technologies, in the past we've had kind of a comments bucket where people could write on note cards and submit comments to Council during the meeting. If that is something that you're interested in seeing started up again, please let the Council know. It doesn't all have to be fancy technology if you don't want, John.

MR. SHULER: I think -- I remember Brigadoon only is so many days. I don't know how much more brain I have here. Especially if I stay on this vegetarian diet.

Okay. So that is what Council wanted to talk about. That leaves us, I note, 15 minutes for anything you want to talk about that is important to you. That is Dan-approved. David? Wait a minute, Dan. Don't go there yet.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski from the California State Library. One -- one of the recommendations that is coming that we didn't ask for audience input on is this Spring meeting location issue. And I would be very interested if any of you have any comments about the direction or some of the questions
that we're discussing on Council, which I don't think are out there in your consciousness yet.

The first is the possibility of weighting locations to the central portions of the country. Not to the exclusion of the two coasts or the extreme north and the south, but more Spring meetings would occur in the central part of the country than in the others. The theory being that it would make it easier for people in those coastal areas and far north and south to travel to a central location more often than not.

The second is the possibility of having -- of identifying one location for a number of years, up to three, which would save GPO some money and would also provide some stability for planning for you so that you know that next year it's going to be in the same place.

The disadvantage, of course, is that selective depositories with limited travel funds would not have the opportunity to travel to the various locations, which happens when, you know, we get people -- you know, in that location who have no money who are able to drive there because we've decided to locate it in Buffalo.

And I -- I'd be interested in your -- if you have any thoughts about that. Would -- would those two directions be -- make it easier for you to attend the Spring meeting?

MR. SHULER: My bad. That was on my list of things to read out here. So thank you, David. Rick?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The one thing I want you to factor into the thought process on that as well, and I know -- see, Lance is here, and I don't know if he wants to address this. Sometimes when we approach various cities given the size of the conference, the average attendance size, we're told to go away. We don't want to bother with you. You -- you need a thousand people. You need 2000 people. And that sometimes makes it challenging.

We have had a comment made before by GPO about the, perhaps, central location of the United States, too, as being a possible preference if we could get that to work to try to make it easy on travelers as best we can. So I -- we welcome all comments and thoughts on that as we go forward.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

Related to you all sending us your comments as to the
decisions that -- the reasons why you decide to come to the Spring meeting, if you could go ahead and ask the people that you know, the depository librarians that could not make it to these sessions, what are the -- what are the factors that they consider when deciding whether or not to attend a conference.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. And also just in the spirit of -- you know, nothing sacred, and everything's under discussion, the -- the point was raised, do we need to continue to have two meetings? Is the most -- is a better, effective use of both GPO's dollars and travel dollars from the community that are concentrated on a single meeting where -- wherever that may be.

So, you know, input on these and other questions regarding the meetings, the locations, the logistics would be very much appreciated.

MR. SHULER: I'm sure nobody has any ideas about this, but --

MS. MC KNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University of Wisconsin River Falls, and I would like to come up and speak briefly about other technical considerations.

I heard a lot about the digitization efforts, and I'd like to go back and request, kindly request, that the Council find partners to assist the GPO in the capture of Borndigital items. Our future legacy collection is disappearing.

And I -- someone agrees. And part of the reason I'm thinking about this is a question that James Jacobss asked me just a week or two ago about looking for, you know, lost docs and capturing materials.

We've had some efforts on the part -- you know, on this area in the past and hearing about the XML and the data.gov, okay. We can send it out, but we have got to get this material back in before we can send it out to the public again.

The other -- the other point I'd like to make about these digitization efforts is that we need to encourage our partners to include the underlying metadata to make these work with virtually every system, particularly with serials for capture or for discovery.

There are a lot of new discovery material -- new discovery systems launching, and we need to make this go in and come out very effectively, so that
libraries within this program and libraries outside of this program can make this material move to the public in a seamless fashion.

And finally, my third and last point is Public Health Reports. I would like to harken us back to the Schizophrenia Bulletin and think about that, when that was kept in the program and let you know about a little experience I've had negotiating a license with Oxford University Press. Where they were attempting to charge my institution more money because they could find Schizophrenia Bulletin sitting in our OPAC through WorldCat that was a FDLP product and a depository item.

We ceased that publication once it completely went to Oxford, but you all need to be aware as these things creep out to the private sector that they're going to come back and try to charge you yet again in another way to access this material. That's all. Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. SHULER: Steve?

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. Thank you, Michelle. Going back to the topic just before Michelle, I would rather have Council working on something other than the location of the meetings. You're going to get who you're going to get because they can afford to get there. You know, I have people that if it's not within the greater South Bend area, it's too expensive to go anywhere else. You've got a lot on your plates. Skip that one. I mean, you know, you can get a lot of wonderful little things in there. It's -- you know, it should be a major airport.

We all have major associations have who been very successful at always picking locations that please us all. You know, I have a favorite slogan of, you know, Death Valley was not available for annual, so we're going to go to New Orleans instead. And Nome, Alaska was all booked, so we're going to go to Boston in the Winter.

I understand. It's wonderful. You're very conscious of trying to maximize your attendance. You have better, more important things to do.

Final, if the Public Printer says, I want to go to here, who is Council or even us to say we don't
want to go there? We want to go here because of all these recommendations.

So, you know, you're busy. Protect your time.

Work on something that really, really is important, not the locations.

MR. SHULER: Thanks, Yoda.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. With all due respect and affection, Steve, what we're really concerned about here is not so much the -- the attendance. It's the input we're not getting. It's the fact that an increasingly small number of voices are being heard, and that's why we're also talking about all the other technology actions. Really, we're not obsessed with location. Honest.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Again, with all due respect, it's not -- it's not just the quantity of input, but who is giving the input. Because the well-funded institutions are able to send people to Nome, Alaska, but it's the other voices that we're not hearing.

MR. SHULER: Go.

MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County Law Library, and I'm sure I'm going to get some all due respects, too. But I want to agree with what Steve just said, and also put a plug in for Death Valley, since a good chunk of Death Valley is in San Bernardino County. Well, it's not necessarily driveable. Keep in mind, San Bernardino County is the largest county in the United States, and it's bigger than many states.

I -- I just wanted to point out a couple things. First of all, I think there's a -- there's a -- some people in the audience are getting the idea that Council is maybe down-talking Buffalo for lack of a better term. And, you know, I -- I -- I don't necessarily go to Council because of where the location is. I don't have a problem coming from Southern California going to Buffalo in the Spring. I -- I mean, that's just the way it is.

And I will also point out that two of the off -- outside of D.C. conferences I have gone to, which one would think would be in good locations, Newport, Rhode Island and Clearwater Beach, Florida were two of the worse attended Spring conferences I have seen. And one of the reasons we moved around the country is to get
input from people from that area.

In the years I've been going, I don't remember
going to that section of the country. Newport Beach and
D.C. are the two closest areas we've gone to that area
of the country. And maybe they should be represented at
Council, and we should look at moving Council around
with the standpoint of, let's get input from other parts
of the country. Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Dan?

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of
New Mexico. There are a lot of factors coming into
this. I agree with Steve fundamentally that I -- I don't
think this is an issue that Council needs to spend a lot
of time on. Because you guys do have full plates, and
there are a lot more important things than whether we're
shuffling to Buffalo or grazing somewhere in the middle
of Crib Death, Kansas or something like that.

That being said, David's point that trying to
get voices heard from other places, it doesn't matter
where you are. People are either going to participate,
or they're not. And with the technology tools being the
way they are, it's a lot easier for people to provide
input through whatever social networking venue they
choose to do. So it doesn't matter whether you're here,
there, or someplace else.

I find it kind of interesting that barroom
talk from 12 years ago now makes its way to Council
trying to determine where we're going to go next.
Frankly, I'm looking forward to Buffalo for a number of
reasons. They have a baseball team, okay? So, I mean,
I do have alternative reasons for going there. But --
they -- they have hockey in April.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Actually, they will be
playing in April.

MR. BARKLEY: But -- but the point being here
is that if -- if you want to solicit input from those
who are seldom heard, it's not a matter of where you
are. It's how you reach out to them and get their
input. Okay? So we could be on the moon shooting
things back at Earth, and if -- you're either going to
hear from folks or you're not.

Now, the idea that Dan broached about maybe
meeting once, that's kind of interesting. And we've had
discussions about that back and forth over the years
about having one big meeting. My only concern is that there's so much happening, that to have one big meeting and then to try and maybe have smaller meetings through whatever the technology is available at the time, still precludes a lot of people from participating. So --

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Dan. I think we'll hear more on this issue, and Council will take it under advisement. It is now 10:56.

MS. WALSH: Come on. You got to hear from the survivor of the blizzard of '77?

MR. SHULER: You're right.

MS. WALSH: Mary Jane Walsh, Colgate University. Dan, we play in April in the International League. I -- I iterate, yes, but say if you're going to consider anything in deciding location, it's not the matter of a major airport, it's the cost of flying out of a major airport. From Syracuse, New York I can fly cheaper to Death Valley than I can to Washington D.C. So that would be my only consideration if you're really worried about people being able to afford to come. But Buffalo, fortunately, blizzard of '77 was in February-ish. It was 1993 we got hit with four feet of snow in April.


MR. DAVIS: Yeah, just one more comment.

Sorry. I'm standing between people in lunch here. Ric Davis, GPO. I want to close out by thanking Council for all -- the hard work. All the work that you see up here today, as many of you know who served on Council, a lot goes in to making this happen.

I also want to thank Lance Cummins and his staff for all the logistical work.

(Applause.)

MR. SHULER: Absolutely.

MR. DAVIS: Trust me, without them we would not be here, so thank you all.

MR. SHULER: Exactly. No matter where we are, we're nowhere without them. All right. In the interest of time, I close this Council in the ancient country song, how can we miss you if you won't go away? See you
guys in the Spring. Oh, wait a minute. Wait a minute
let me hit the gavel. Dismissed.
(End of session)