MR. SHULER: Welcome to the spring 2010 meeting of the Depository Library Council. I think this is like the three thousandth council meeting we have had since '97 or '75 or so. I want to thank you all for braving the weather, such as it was, and arriving here and agreeing to join us in what I think are going to be a series of very important conversations. As I thought about my short opening sentence or two, I can not think of a more important time than the presence for the Depository Library System. In a few short months we are going to have introduced into our lives a new system to eventually replace the GPO Access, which we have been living with for the last 50 odd years. We are also going to have some changes in our leadership and as always, we always have technology biting at our heels demanding that we change and we change fast. And I think demands, not fear, not running from it, but I hate it say it, more discussion. So what we hope to do with this particular Council meeting is continue and foster and grow that important discussion along these lines. So in terms of the order of work today, I will be introducing Mr. Bob Tapella, the current public printer and he will say a few remarks about our future as well as our present. Bob.

MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, John. Good morning.

THE AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. TAPELLA: Oh, come on. Let's try that one again. Good morning.

THE AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. TAPELLA: Thank you. That's much better. Welcome to beautiful Buffalo, New York. Since John didn't do the usual calisthenics or else I missed them. I have one question and I'll tell you later why I'm asking that. Who here is from a university or college library, in any way, shape or form? We are here
in beautiful Buffalo at the Adams Mark Hotel. We are here because President Obama said that we can not go to Vegas and the original sight for this meeting was the Flamingo in Vegas. So we came up with a plan B and that B stood for Buffalo. When we booked the hotel, of course, it wasn't going to be at Adam's Mark at this point, it was going to be a Crowne Plaza and completely refurbished, but as we are all feeling the pinch of the economy so is the hotel business. But the reason I asked about the university students is -- I love this meeting room, by the way. Do you like the tables and setup? Is that more helpful? I guess GPO staff doesn't like tables, is that it? I understand some of the guest rooms might not be quite up to the standards of some of our guests and I apologize for that. We got a good laugh over here from Jill. She likes to steal the little shampoos and stuff like that. She was complaining about just having a single bar of soap. Oh wait, no, that was -- well, the reason I asked about the universities is when we found we were coming to Buffalo and you weren't going to be able to gamble, we thought we'd make you feel right at home with the lacrosse team that was here last night to entertain those of you who were out and about the hallways and pools and lounges following the beer cans around, but seriously, I'm actually very pleased to be in Buffalo. For those of us coming out of Washington, it was a quick hour flight and it's working out very well for me because our next order of business for me is actually going up into Canada to meet with some of our Canadian officials that we work with the Trust and Traveler Program with, which is pretty good.

Now, I'd like to begin by thanking Council for being here and we have the full Council, right? Except for Dr. Greer. So we are doing very well. Thank you all for coming. I appreciate it. And it's particularly important to see all of you here during such tough economic times because I know for those of you yonder, as well as the Council, everyone is facing a very tough year and it's no different at the Government Printing Office.

Now, as many of you know, if not every single one of you may know, President Obama has nominated my successor. His name is Bill Foreman and
I'm very pleased by the selection. I have known Bill for many, many years. He is no stranger to the Government Printing Office, although his career took him away from the GPO more than 35 years ago he has remained a strong champion of GPO and I hold him as a friend and I hold him in the highest personal regard. Now, Bill still needs to be confirmed by the Senate and I will remain in place or plan to remain in place, until his appointment. I'm working with him, as are all the senior managers of GPO, to make certain there is as smooth transition as possible.

Now, talking about tough budget years, it is appropriations time again and I have testified before both the House and the Senate and so I'd like to begin by sort of sharing what GPO is seeking. Our total appropriations request is $166,560.00 and with this funding we are going to ask for funding for the Congressional Printing and Binding Fund to make certain that we can meet all of Congress's needs and in addition to meeting all the current and future needs, we also are trying to recover a shortfall in funds from fiscal year 2009 and what's projected for fiscal year 2010.

Secondarily, we are seeking to fund the operation of GPO Statutory Information Dissemination Program and provide investment funds for necessary information dissemination projects, which I will go into a little bit more detail in a few minutes, continue the development of FDsys and implement other improvements to GPO's IT infrastructure, perform essential maintenance and repairs to our aging buildings, undertake necessarily continuity of operations, initiatives and provide funding for employee retraining and work force development.

Now, for the SNE Funding. Specifically we are requesting $44,280,000 for fiscal year of 2011. It's an increase of 3.297 million from the level of fiscal year 10. As part of the appropriations request for the SNE, we are specifically asking for four projects that I want to note. First, a half a million dollars for the modernization of the legacy computer systems, half a million supporting the FDLP and these programs are essential for meeting program needs and must be migrated to current and stable hardware and software solutions.
We spent a lot of time talking about FDsys and we've talked about our GBIs and our Oracle data bases which is our financial system that we have upgraded, but we still are at that risk for a number of programs. And the systems that we need to modernize are the shipping lister, the item lister, the depository distribution information system, the acquisitions classification and shipment information system and the automated depository distribution's system. Now, if anyone has any questions about those systems, please see Ric Davis because to be honest, I'm not certain what every one of those things do. However, they are all and have been high risk for quite awhile. You're laughing, Justin, do you know what they do? In fact when Ric first gave me the list and we are talking about the appropriations request and we were looking at the IT projects that we need to do, Ric has his whole list and he's going, he wanted to give me about a two day briefing session on how important these systems are and what they do. And I trust Ric and so I said, Ric, I trust you. I'll put in the money. Fortunately Mike Wash, CIO, also concurred and said, yes, those are some of our riskiest systems right now. So hopefully we will get the funding for that.

Third, we are asking for $200,000 for establishing performance measures and survey instruments for evaluating Depository Library access collection service and cooperative efforts, this data which continues to build a foundation for ongoing program assessments.

And fourth, we are asking for half a million dollars for special cataloging indexing projects, including completing the creation of the MARC 21 records and for current and historic serials and investigating a long term solution for bibliographic records distribution. As part of this project, bibliographic records will be distributed from GPO's integrated library system to Federal Depository Libraries.

Now, while I am pushing for full funding, this is going to be a very tough fiscal year. Both the House and Senate has told us that flat funding is a likely outcome. In fact, Senator Nelson, a couple of weeks ago required that I speak to flat funding for the record. So I want to tell you what I told him. I'm
asking for full funding for the Congressional Printing
and Binding Fund, which is $96,652,000 and that covers
the short falls and the projected work loads. For the
SNE appropriation, I'm not asking for full funding, but
we are going to get there anyway if he does what I'm
asking. And that is we are asking for $42,682,000. In
essence we have about one and-a-half million dollars in
prior year end spent funds. I believe it's from fiscal
year end 2005 that the committee could move forward for
us and then because of a math difference originally we
were anticipating that the President was going to
request 1.6 percent increase in salaries. He's only
asking for 1.4 percent. So that is roughly $26,000. So
with reducing the SNE by about 1.526 million, we can
actually get full funding. And so I have requested
that. And when it comes to the revolving fund, that is
where we are going to take the hit. Instead of the
6,000,000 for the FDsys, we are asking for 5.127
million. Instead of 2,000,000 for the advance printing
technology assessment, we are asking for 1,000,000.
Instead of 4.2 million for COO, continuity of
operations, we are asking for 1,000,000. And instead of
2,000,000 for continued elevator repairs, we are asking
for 1,000,000 and everything else we have asked for, we
have decided we are going to postpone probably until the
next fiscal year, but if we get what we asked for, there
will be full funding for this program and the SNE
appropriation.

FDsys. John mentioned briefly mentioned about
FDsys and some of the challenges and the opportunities
that we have. I want to talk about it briefly in a
couple of different ways. First, I want to sort of
highlight what our Release 1 main goals were and talk
about some things that we have done.

So first, there were five main goals to the first
Release of FDsys and these are sort of the broad goals
and as the public printer, I'm concerned about sort of
the broader picture and we'll let people get into more
specifics.

For Release 1, five goals. First, establish
the foundational infrastructure. Second, establish a
preservation repository. Third, replace the current
public access site. Fourth, perform a large scale data
migration from GPO Access, FDsys and five, provide
operational continuity for the system insuring uninterrupted access to federal publications. I think we have been successful with Release 1. We haven't done everything that I had hoped, but I think we have been successful. When it comes to foundational infrastructure, the foundational system is in place. The FDsys search component went live in March of 2009. The FDsys content management system went live in March of 2009. The preservation repository built on the OAIS model went live with the content management system launch in March of 2009. The public interface went live when the search component was launched in January of 2009 for data migration. This has been a challenge for GPO. As I asked all the people involved, both in terms of the folks in Mike Wash's shop, who have done all of the work as well as Ric, who represents the customer and John as the chairman of the board. We have now 29 out of the 40 content collections have been completed. The remaining collections are scheduled to be done, migrated by June 30th, 2010. If we look back on the system and the planning, about the only thing that we may not have anticipated was just going to be how difficult it was going to be in migrating the systems forward. And I think it posed a greater challenge than anyone imaged, but when we look at, even though it's taking longer and costing more than originally anticipated, what is going in there is really good and they've got the proper control.

So either I have to shut up or -- so do you want me to continue on? I guess I'm -- maybe I'm talking into the podium. That doesn't sound good. You know they haven't even replaced me yet. Apparently, all I need is new batteries.

Getting back on topic. Operational continuity. The continuity of access site should be operational by August 10th, 2010. And the full system fail over should be operational by December of 2010. Right now we are backing up the system, but it will be significantly improved by August and by the end of the fiscal year it will be full fail over.

The GPO Access FDsys transition is in full swing and once completed at the end of the fiscal year, FDsys will assume the role as GPO's electronic system of
record. That really can't happen until we have that full fail over capability.

Additionally, there were two other major FDsys projects that actually came about after we started the planning for FDsys and one of them comes directly from the Office of Federal Register. And I understand Mike White is here. Mike, are you here?

MR. WHITE: I'm here.

MR. TAPELLA: Hey, Mike. Thank you for coming. One of our other FDsys customers, the Office of the Federal Register.

A new publication, The Daily Compilation of Presidential Documents was released in February of 2009. And that replaces a printed document that we did once a week. I think for the general public it is a much more useful and pertinent document coming out every single day.

And secondarily, a pilot project for the digitized statues at large was development demonstrating converted content, preservation and access in FDsys. I think we are going to see a demo later on, aren't we?

MR. DAVIS: The FDsys was this morning.

MR. TAPELLA: Oh, was that this morning? I thought it was this afternoon session.

On Wednesday, April 7th I convened a public program review on FDsys and I hadn't done a program review really since I became public printer. That was one of the first things I did as public printer and with that we made a decision to change the course with how we were using the master integrator and actually assumed that responsibility which changed the project significantly and I thought it was time, since it basically was a year after the launch that we did another program review. Now, the objective of the meeting was to receive a program status update and to discuss program successes, issues and opportunities with key stakeholders, including library services and content management, Ric Davis and his group, the Office of the Federal Register, which Mike White was there for, and representatives of the Federal Depository Library Council, which included chair John Shuler and incoming chair Suzanne Sears. Thank you both for flying into Washington for that.

And in short we discussed the good, the bad
and the ugly. And I will let the customers, Suzanne, John, Mike and Ric, at whatever appropriate time, discuss exactly what they found in terms of the good, the bad and the ugly. However, we did publish a document, which is available on the Web site and I think we pushed it out or at least announced it through the LIS serve so that everyone could read it.

In addition to these key customers and stakeholders, we also invited observers from everyone of GPO's business units because to date we have spent a considerable amount of sums. To date we are in excess of $20,000,000 in appropriated dollars directly for FDsys and $15,000,000 out of our revolving fund which means that we have taken investment capital that would go to other business units within GPO.

And I want to make sure that everyone at GPO understood exactly that FDsys is and why it is so critical to our future. We also had -- I also invited our oversite committees as well as our appropriations committees. We had a pretty full house. The items that were discussed were Release 1 goals and status. Release 2 goals, cost summary and analysis, program risk lessons learned. It was quite a meeting. And I think representing the library community we did hear some of the concerns. And I think it was really important for the GPO folks to hear it firsthand.

Now, some of the key discussions at the review included the impact of the integration library system when GPO Access sunsets, apparently there is none. A continuity plan to recover data and rebuild the system in the event of a disaster. That is currently backed up off site at the alternate computing facility. And the August milestone will provide full continuity of access. And then a list of tasks and scheduled Release 1 completion activities. There is a detailed task list and schedule. They have been created. Once completed FDsys will assume the role as GPO's electronic system of record and sunset of GPO Access is planned at the end of this fiscal year. The full report is actually on our Web site and I encourage any of you who haven't read it to read it in its entirety.

I also understand that many of you have read the GPO Inspector General's IV&V reports. We did something slightly unusual at GPO, we actually
encouraged our inspector general to take on the IV&V responsibility. I wanted to make sure that we had an independent voice that was looking at absolutely everything and IG reports, they tend to be pretty critical and that is exactly what we want. We have taken what the IG has reported and we have turned it into a risk list and we are working right now and setting priorities for what makes sense to do. In fact -- I guess I didn't bring it with me, we compiled it down working with Ric and Mike Wash into some priority sections and I think if anyone has any specific questions later one, I know Mike is doing an open mike later on today and he'd be happy to address all of those risks.

Transparency and open government. In the fall I spoke with you about the letter I sent to President Obama laying out the ways that GPO could help support his vision for transparency and open government, as well as digital access so much more information from the government. I posed five goals that GPO is undertaking. I'd like to update you on those today. I'm going to first begin by reiterating what those goals were and tell you how we are doing on them. 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 documents. Fourth, participate in and lead efforts to standardize electronic publishing formats and fifth, link the White House Web site to FDsys for public searches of government documents. FDsys is based on the concepts of interoperability and reuse and because of that, GPO is now at the forefront of the open government initiative. FDsys is making a difference. FDsys's content is available in all major search engines now. In collaboration with the Office of Law Revision Council, U.S. House of Representatives, the yearly virtual main edition of the U.S. Code Collection was brought into FDsys in XHTML and PDF formats. In support of the Office of the Federal Register XML content was developed
and made available through data.gov. The Federal Register in September of 2009 and the Code of Federal Regulation was in December of 2009. Citizens are also finding new ways to interact with key public content through XML data which include sites like fedthread.org and govpulse.

Additionally, other government sites are relying on FDsys to enrich their user experience. Regulations.gov uses FDsys Metadata to power their public search, eliminating the need for the Office of the Federal Register to support it. Also, science.gov is now available to integrate GPO collections into the federated search gateway to government science information.

Looking ahead to the future, the Office of the Federal Register and GPO are getting together a working group for creating a point in time system for regulatory information. Additionally, early this summer GPO is planning to host a meeting of experts for an authentication workshop. Experts in the field of technology, academics and the federal government will join to discuss the future of authentication and assess future needs.

Now, GPO has worked with standard groups to create standard markup schema for government publications starting with agency strategic publications. We are also working closely with the law.gov groups where they are trying to define standard document Metadata for legal materials both legislative and case law. And we continue to work with government groups, the Library of Congress in particular, to develop standards for digitization and authentication.

So I'd say four out of the five goals are in full swing and GPO is moving steadily forward.

The fifth goal, the White House has decided that it may not be as high a priority as I thought it should be. And as for the White House linked to FDsys, the White House has lowered the priority for this initiative. However, GPO and FDsys are routinely cited by the White House for success in open government initiatives.

The federal judiciary's electronic public access initiatives. As you know, I have spent much time
16 as have Ric, lobbying the judicial branch to see if we
17 can get as much information publicly available as
18 possible. I have one fan out there. Thank you. It
19 must be a law librarian, uh? The judicial conference at
20 its March 16, 2010 meeting approved measures that allow
21 the administrative office of the U.S. Courts to explore
22 how they can increase public access to court information
23 and records. Specifically, the conference voted to,
24 one, allow the courts, at the discretion of the
25 presiding judge, to make digital audio recordings of
26 court hearings available online to the public through
27 PACER for $2.40 per audio file.
28 Second, adjust the electronic public access
29 fee schedule so that users are not billed until they
30 accrue charges of more than $10 of PACER usage in the
31 quarterly billing cycle, essentially quadrupling the
32 amount of money. Previously it was $10 any given year.
33 Third, approve a pilot in up to 12 courts to
34 publish federal district and bankruptcy court opinions
35 via FDsys so members of the public can more easily
36 search across opinions and across the courts. Court
37 opinions are available through PACER free of charge and
38 that will not change. The pilot's project to make
39 bankruptcy and district court opinion also available
40 through FDsys will enhance public access through these
41 opinions. More information on the opinion pilot will be
42 forthcoming as we work out the details with the folks in
43 charge.
44 Social networking and GPO. I can't believe
45 I'm saying this. In case you aren't socially connected
46 to GPO, we are actually up on YouTube, which is GPO
47 printer as well as on Twitter and USGPO. We have
48 launched a government book talk blog which is
49 govbooktalk.worldpress.com. Now, this new blog is a mix
50 of informational and first person reviews of federal
51 publications, discussion of past and present federal
52 contents, personal stories about encounters with
53 government information and updates about GPO information
54 dissemination activities. What's absolutely amazing to
55 me is people actually using this book talk blog. I
56 think that is just incredible. And again, Ric working
57 on behalf of the library community with Devita VansCook,
58 who runs the publication information sales unit and it
59 is incredible. Now, this blog has received almost
10,000 views so far and is yet another avenue in which we can provide information to our citizens.

Well, with that I would like to do a couple of thank yous. First, Lance Cummins and his staff. Lance, are you here? Lance? Apparently he is out working hard. And as you know, putting together this conference takes a lot of work. And Nick and Yvonne Ellis -- I think actually everyone I'm going to thank is out the door because I saw them all at the registration, which is Lance, Nick and Yvonne Ellis, Bridget Govan and Debbie Smith. This is being transcribed for the record and Ric will make sure that they hear it. I also want to take this opportunity, since this may well be my last Depository Council meeting, to thank Ric Davis for serving as the acting superintendent of documents for my entire tenure. My very first meeting of this Council, which was the very first public meeting I held as public printer back, which was the Fall Depository Library Council meeting, back in 2007. I said that I was going to do an open and public search for the next superintendent of documents. And I asked for recommendations and in fact the next month or two months later in December, I brought in all library organizations. We talked about what are the qualities, what I should be looking for in a superintendent of documents. And what was interesting is the person that best fit those qualities was Ric Davis, who was a career employee at GPO and running the business unit of Library Services and Content Management. I said, Ric, I'd really like you to become SuDocs and he said, no, and then I got even because I never filled the position and I purposely didn't. So he actually got to do two jobs for the last three years. And what's interesting is Ric is not a librarian and yet I don't believe there has ever been a SuDocs who has been more passionate about this program, who has been a better representative of this program in the interest of America's libraries than Ric Davis and Ric I really appreciate all that you have done. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you very much, Bob. I may -- I'm a very emotional person by nature. I'm going to try and hold it together and follow that, so thank you very much. I really appreciate that.

I have been giving speeches like this for
the last 18 years and I did something this morning that
I haven't done before, which is I woke up at four a.m.
and decided I really didn't like the speech I put
together last week and I just threw it away. So that's
about five hours before one of these meetings. The
reason I didn't like it was so much has been going on
since we have last met, I felt like it was too

service oriented. At lot of times I work on these
speeches with my staff and they make fun of me because I
come here and I take the speech and I bring it up here
and I turn it over and then I just, as they say, say
whatever I want to say. I'm going to do it a little bit
differently today because there are a lot of things that
are in your handout that I'm going to talk about, but
there are a lot of things that I'm going to publicly
speak to as well. So bear with me as I speak
extemporaneously, but also read a little bit.

First of all, I want to welcome all of you
to Buffalo as well. I want to thank you very much for
taking the time to come here. Lance tells me that I
can't say this definitively because it's still in the
procurement process of GPO, but let us say that we are
looking very closely at San Antonio, Texas for the next
out of town library conference. I'm happy to say that
to at least one person who is a sports fan in the
audience who sent me an e-mail last night who said, you
know, there is this great NBA playoff game on and if we
were in San Antonio right now, we could be at that game.
Well, for any baseball fans, there is a Buffalo Bison's

game tomorrow night. I guarantee it's not going to be
raining and it's going to be at least 55 degrees. So I
encourage you tomorrow night to go out to see some good
baseball. I want to start as well by thanking the
University at Buffalo, State University of New York
where we have a partnership to provide the enhanced
shipping list service. Is anybody from the University
here with us? Thank you anyway. Thanks for that.
We have a lot of things to cover over the next several
days, but at the same time, weather permitting, I hope
you all get a chance to walk around and explore Buffalo
a little bit. I felt like -- I went out late Saturday
afternoon when I got here and did a little bit of a walk
of the city and I felt like it was my first time in
Manhattan where the architecture literally took my
breath away. And it's not that far so I encourage you
to do it. There is also this thing called Niagara up
the street that is not too far away either. So please
enjoy your time while you're here and as I always like
to remind people, take time to network and talk to each
other as well as additional GPO staff.

I have a lot of things that I'd like to
cover today obviously. First I'd like to followup on
Bob's comments on GPO's federal digital system. I want
to reiterate that in terms of roles and
responsibilities, I am a stakeholder. Mike White from
the office of the Federal Register is a stakeholder.
You are a stakeholder. We are the customer. The FDsys
team, many of whom are here today, are responsible for
building this system and it's our job to tell them what
we want and that's what we need to do. If you guys
don't mind, I'd like the FDsys team, that has worked on
this system, to stand up for a second and be recognized
because the one thing I want to say as well, before we
talk about things, is to thank you for a job well done
and what you have accomplished thus far.

As Bob spoke about, we had an FDsys program
review at GPO and I think we almost made our council
chair and incoming chair miss their flight. We had
promised to a stop point after about three hours and it
just kept going because there was a lot of good
information and exchange in dialogue.

I want to speak to you today from that voice
of customer perspective and reiterate some of the
comments before I talk about business in my unit that I
stated at that meetings from the standpoint of
successes, some issues that I see with FDsys and some
opportunities that I think we can engage in for the
future.

First, in terms of successes, I think the
ease of search that has been empowered by FDsys and the
search engine is vastly superior to what we have on GPO
Access and I think the work of the team should be
commended. I think the addition of Metadata, most
prominently in MODS, descriptive Metadata and the
premise preservation Metadata, accompanying the MARC
records, that we make available through our ILS in my
unit, are a great complement and I think that is very
good additional information.
Additionally, the authentication effort that was begun in the library unit years ago with the budget has been greatly expanded by the FDsys team as they continue to authenticate more and more of this content. I think it's equally important that we continue to work towards establishing a full chain of digital custody of this information from the point that is ingested into FDsys to the point that it's disseminated so that we have provenance. Additionally, FDsys is more than a content management system. It's a search system and it's also a preservation repository. FDsys is being built to handle a variety of file formats for ingest for deposited content, converted content, harvested content and particularly in terms of being a flexible platform, I think we have been very lucky over the years of GPO Access in regards to a bit of stability with ASCII PDF, TEXT and HTML files. I don't know that we are going to have that luxury in the future and I think it's important to have a flexible system that can adapt quickly as we need to migrate and refresh this information going forward. Bob spoke about the work that's been going on as part of the Obama administration's open government initiative and I think the work on the Federal Register and CFR in particular in XML format is outstanding. Now, with that, in terms of building any world class system from scratch comes some issues and Bob spoke about some of those that came up in the program review. The two that I'd like to mention, from my voice of customer perspective that we have talked about and we will talk about more this afternoon with all of you is first schedules. I think that when schedules were first put out on FDsys they were stakes in the ground, but I think there is an importance to be able to adhere to deadlines for releases that are promised and communicated to the Community and I think that going forward it is going to be critical to adhere to those dates as they are released. Additionally, there is a cost element. I think it's important to have a detailed cost schedule as part of a larger project plan in terms of what is coming on FDsys and what the cost will be. In terms of my appropriation that I managed in the SNE appropriation,
in the last 15 years part of the appropriation I've used
to manage the daily operating costs of GPO Access. I
expect to manage the daily operating costs of FDsys as
it succeeds and replaces GPO Access. That said, with a
lot of the new automation technologies put in place,
it's also my hope that those daily operating costs over
time may actually decrease and more of those limited
funds can be devoted to other things we do for the
library community as well.

With successes and issues also come
opportunities and some of the opportunities I see as we
go forward with FDsys, is to go back. All this
information is out. I know the program management
office has it up on the FDsys Web site. I think it's
all important for all of us to go back and look at the
original requirements, look at the concept of operations
documents dating back to 2004, that have been undated
over time and continue to validate those requirements,
continue to validate that our needs are being met and
where they are not, we need to communicate them. I also
agree that as Bob mentioned, there may be issues that
folks are concerned about in regards to continuity of
services. We are going to talk a little bit about the
PURLs situation again that we talked about at the last
conference, but I think that there is always concern
about not having redundancy and continuity of
information and it's important to have that with FDsys
so that if anything happens, it can be restored and
fail-over in a seamless manor. Additionally, there is
the integration of legacy applications. FDsys is a
major infrastructure component of overall GPO systems,
but there are other systems that need to map to it
currently and going forward into the future. I often
think that wouldn't it be great in the future where you
went to a GPO.gov site and there is a single user
interface. Wouldn't that be great? I also think last,
but most importantly not least, some of you and some of
my Council members call is digital deposit. I call it
digital dissemination of content packages and enabling
that for libraries. I think have a repository of
content as we have done since public law 103.40
implemented GPO Access back in the early 1990's. Having
a repository at GPO is critical, but when I read title
44 I also see the word permanent in regards to
libraries. I don't want GPO to be the one stop system and I think having a distributed model is most effective. It worked in the tangible world. It will work in the digital world.

Next, I'd like to move onto some of things that are going on in my unit, Library Services and Content Management. Some of these are in your handouts, but some of them I want to expand on. First the biennial survey/needs assessment. The biennial survey was combined with the needs assessment as part of the work that we contracted with Outsell to accomplish. The needs assessment was developed to help gauge level of satisfaction with additional services we can provide in the future and I think it's also a good precursor between the Ithaca report that ARL conducted and the FDLP consulting report that I'm going to talk about, a good bridge between those two, to see where things are.

We've received a preliminary draft of findings from Outsell. I think some of that summary information may be in your packets and in the next week or so we are going to be releasing a detailed report of that information along with biennial results.

Next, I'd like to talk about the PURLs situation. We spoke quite a bit about that at the last conference. Back in 1999, GPO initiated the use of PURLs to provide persistent links to information through our Metadata. I mentioned at the last conference that I consider the PURLs server crash that occurred last year to be unacceptable and I know it was unacceptable to all of you. As a consequence of that, I told you that I was going to fix it and that's what we have done. Going back to the role of my unit, vis-a-vis Mike's unit as CIO, we defined the requirements and Mike works on the servers and executes the contacts. As a consequence of this, we worked together to award a contrat to Zepheria Corporation who has upgraded the PURLs server architecture and they are going to be on hosting the new solution on behalf of GPO. I think this transition is going to have many benefits. First of all, it's going to be a more robust system, architecture going from a flat data -- a flat text base application to a SQL data base, immediate system backup through synchronization, immediate system fail-over through geographically separated primary and backup servers. The continuation
of statistical reporting and improved speed and
resolution of redirects. In terms of timing, the
migration of this database has already been done. It's
been tested. We are having staff training for my staff,
with GPO in early May and we are looking to do the
switch over in summer of this year. I called this and I
referenced it this way at the last conference; I call
this a bridge of stability. We had a situation we
needed to fix it. We needed to stabilize it. I
recognize there are still requirements associated with
persistent name that are part of FDsys architecture and
it is something that I encourage you to go back and look
at in terms of what is going to be met for you with this
upgrade and may not be met as we continued to give
feedback as to what we want on persistent name
technology.

Next, I'd like to speak a little bit about
digitization. Could I see a show of hands. How many
people had a chance to see the -- to go to the FDsys
presentation this morning where you had a chance to see
some digitization work? Good support there. Thank you.
For those of you who missed it, I think that the program
management office is going to have a laptop out on the
table. We can certainly arrange some smaller group
settings while you're here. I'd like you to get a look
at that.

GPO, as we've talked about, is embarking on
several digitization activities, but they are pending
JCP approval. As we've said before, GPO does not have
authority to digitize. It's something we need approval
from our oversight committee to do. Since we last
spoke, we forwarded a letter to our oversite committee
asking for approval to do a number of things. I think
it's safe to say we have received a favorable initial
response, although we still need to do some work to
secure final approval. One of these activities is
working in collaboration with the Library of Congress on
a project to provide permanent public access to the
digitized statutes at large going back during the time
frame of 1951 to 2002. About 147,000 pages of content
have been digitized. The library has performed the
conversion to provide the files to GPO to look at doing
content processing and making this available through
FDsys. As we talked about in the past, the ability of
FDsys to do this is critical and I know we have the capability to make this happen. The process content that we make available will also be made available back to the Library of Congress. I think this type of collaboration will really jump start digitization and create a comfort level within government is something we really need to do. I think it takes advantage of the strengths of the Library of Congress in terms of a digitization activity. It takes advantage of the strengths of the Government Printing Office in terms of providing robust content processing and search capability. As I mentioned, a small pilot demo of this was available this morning and I would like for anyone who missed it to have a chance to see it because I think it's really important we get your feedback so we can take that back to our oversite committee and talk more with them when we meet.

I spoke about an FDLP consultant. This consultant was hired and in fact was hired to do future modeling for the future of this program and to look at practical and sustainable models for the future. We received funding for that last year. We've written a statement of work and this has been in terms of procurement activity. Before I left we passed this on to our procurement and it's now in a procurement sensitive stage.

Bob spoke about system's modernization. I have already talked about PURLs. In the last six months the WEBTech notes migration has also been completed, with recent enhancements to enable more efficient workload processing.

In addition, our Lighted Bins system that distributes our tangible publications, we have tested and enhanced our backup server capability for that. We have had cross training throughout our IT organization from the support of our mainframe based systems and we developed a concept of operations document and started the requirements process for the migration off the other remaining legacy systems. The one thing I want to add to that is, we did have funding last year for that, which enables us to start this. As Bob mentioned, we have asked for additional funding next year because I want to make sure it's completed. I
don't want to get halfway through and find out we are out of money.

Next, I'd like to talk a little bit our catalog and record distribution pilot. I'm not going to go into a lot of detail on this or the pre 76 shelflist because I'll take away Laurie's presentation tomorrow, but a lot of important things are going on with that regard that I do want to mention. We have contracted with MARCIVE for a pilot project for the FDLP. A selection of depository libraries are participating in this pilot program in which GPO bibliographic records are being distributed from our ILS to the libraries. This is something we have never done before, a lot of new process and work flow associated with it, which is why we are doing it as a pilot to start off with steps and then move forward. At the end of the pilot, the libraries participating may keep the records they received. The GPO is going to evaluate the success of the pilot and report back to you, our community and get feedback on lessons learned and then we are going to go forward. A brown bag lunch is also being held tomorrow for all of those who are interested in learning about the pilot. I encourage you to attend that, if you don't have lunch plans.

The pre-76 shelflist conversion project is just as critical, as we all know. We are continuing with the transcription of the historic shelflist. In January of this year, a couple of months ago, we brought on contract staff to begin transcribing the shelflist MARC records. The focus of the transcription effort is currently on the Y4 SuDoc classification numbers, which I believe is congressional, if my memory serves me. At this point over 4,500 to 5,000 shelflist records have been transcribed and are currently available in catalog of government publications and this continues on until it's complete. Additionally, we completed work on the initial start of a project to digitize the shelflist cards. So far 280,000 of the estimated 1,000,000 shelflist have been completed in recent months.

Linda Rezler, who manages our integrated library system, couldn't be with us today, but I wanted to give a few updates beyond your handout, or complementing your handout on the integrating library system and the great work that she and her team have
been doing.

New ILS hardware has been received and configured. Part of the reason that is important to me, a few years ago you'll remember we had a 1,000 record limit per session I think through the Z39.50 client when pulling down cataloging records. I told Linda that I wanted to go unlimited and she told me that I was insane. So I said, well, let's take a baby step. We upped it to 10,000 records that we are at right now and we haven't crashed. I think it has been working very well, but she told me to get to unlimited we needed to do some hardware upgrades so we bought it and staff in Mike's IT shop are working to install and I still want to get to the goal. We are also testing the Aleph version 20 on the new hardware, running parallel with existing hardware in Aleph18. The contract is also now in place for the Metalib User Interface. And we have completed authorities update processing of Library of Congress subject to name headings as well.

Next, I'd like to talk a little bit about marketing initiatives. A document that I have for ready reference that stays on my desk is a document that I hope a lot of you remember. It was written, I think back in 2006 by another Council class, called Knowledge Will Forever Govern. I consider that a companion document to where we are going strategically. And one of the statements that was made by the Council at that time was, GPO needs to become more active in terms of creating awareness of the FDLP and marketing. We have taken that very seriously. We have launched the easy as FDLP -- or easy as FDL campaign, that I know you're aware of. But we have also been disseminating public service announcements to radio stations around the country. GPO staff have created two separate radio spots. One directed at radio stations on college campuses with a depository and also another for public stations on campuses that don't have a depository library. So far in recent months, over 50 college campuses have been airing these public service announcements. If your depository is on a campus with a radio station and you're interested in participating in this initiative, please write into AskGPO or e-mail me directly rdavis@GPO.gov and I will make it happen. Additionally, we contracted in the last
month, with North American Press Syndicate, NAPS. And
NAPS staff are working with GPO to disseminate
informational articles about the FDLP to over 10,000
print and online publications nationwide. And we are
also doing radio spots on about 400 FM radio stations.
Somebody asked me at the last conference if I was
spending a lot of money on this, given all the other
things we have. This entire campaign has been several
thousand dollars and that's it and I think we are going
to have a good return on investment as part of the
business plan.

Next, I'd like to talk a little bit about
additional social networking. I think all of you are
familiar with the FDLP Desktop that has become our
source to make information available about this program,
everything from news feeds to documents that you
download. We continue to use, of course, FDLP-L list of
announcements as well. The FDLP community site is our
portion of the social networking environment for the
library program that I think helps collapse the
geographic boundaries that we all operate under. At
present we have about 450 members and membership to the
FDLP Community is exclusive to librarians who are
participating in this program.

Based on the features and stability of the
site, that have been offered, the Depository Library
Council, the gov.kidsgroup, godworthio and others have
expressed interest in making this their site and we are
continuing to work to make that happen. Our Web teams
consisting of Karen Sieger, John Dowgiallo and I think
they are going to be our two other representatives, will
be here tomorrow and I encourage you to attend a session
that they are holding from ten-thirty to noon on
Wednesday to hear more about Web activities and social
networking.

A few more things to go here. Public access
assessments. We talked probably two conferences ago
about how GPO needed to revitalize public access
assessments from the old days when we used to use that
nasty word, inspection, which I think is still in the
law, but we have made it a bit more friendly. Public
access assessments I viewed more as a partnership with
all of you, not so much an inspection. The Outreach
section of the FDLP Desktop now includes information
about our interaction, communication and consultation with all of you on these assessment activities. Since we last spoke, GPO staff have been in states ranging from Arizona, Georgia, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas. I think we surprised Dan in New Mexico. We have been all over. If you are interested in having us come to your area, not just to talk about assessments, but to participate in an anniversary celebration, an event, please visit our fdlp-on-the-go page on the Desktop. Complete the form and send it in.

Education and Outreach stuff under Lance Cummins when we last spoke, in terms of folks doing assessments, assessments consisted of Kathy and Ashley. And I mentioned that we were looking to increase staff size. I think when I started at GPO in 1992, I think we might have had six to eight inspectors. I'm very pleased that we have had an additional person join our staff, Kristina Bobe. If you'd like to stand up. Welcome aboard and I want to be able to say that with a staff this small, we tripled the size since before she came on because last week Lance, Robin and myself selected three additional folks to join our staff and turn that into human capital, as part of the certification list so the three people that you see here now will now become six. Next, I'd like to speak a little bit about partnerships. Since last fall's conference, we've had some new developments on this front as well. We developed a new partnership with Cornell University Law Library for a year long pilot to evaluate a conversion process of the Code of Federal Regulations into XML. The Cornell Legal Information Institute is in the process of converting various titles into XML and will make them accessible on the university's Web site for research. As Bob mentioned, we have also done similar type conversion that we make through bulk data download through FDsys and also have made it available on data.gov. Part of this effort is to look at the variation as part of the open government initiative in comparing different types of XML schemas to see what Cornell can learn from us and what we can learn from them. I'd like also to thank you, my colleague Mike White, from the Office of the Federal Register to help facilitate this partnership and I appreciate your
efforts on it. We are also, of course, partnering with Southern Methodist University for the Historic Publications from World War II and the Library of Michigan for regional depository library information and that partnership was also renewed. The partnership with the Association of Schools of Public Health to provide electronic access to public health reports was announced and I believe now about 700 libraries have access to those journals. I'm also going to ask for a little bit of aerobics and calisthenics here if folks are in the room. I want to take this time to publicly thank several institutions that recently celebrated anniversaries with GPO as partners. Some of them might even be here on stage. University of Illinois at Chicago and DOSFAN, 13 years as a GPO partner. Louisiana State University and the list of Federal Agency Internet Sites - 8 years as a GPO partner. Oklahoma State University and Browse Topics, 7 years as a GPO partner. And last but not least, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and FRASER, 5 years as a partner. I want to conclude with three additional things. I think we have had really good success using the OPAL tool online programming for all libraries to do online presentations. That tool was procured at a hefty cost of $800 and I think it's fantastic. But I wanted to go further. I know how many libraries we have and even with six assessment people and GPO staff, I know we can't always be there, particularly when you need us at a moments notice for training. I think OPAL is good, but we need it to go a step further. We awarded a contract to create online, educational, instructional modules. And you'll see the first one at this conference during Laurie Hall's presentation on WEBTech notes, and I think you will like it. We are looking to do more. We are going to do FPLD Desktop. We are going to do the Community site and beyond that I want to hear from you on what you want. And I think online training is a good complement to in person training and we are going to continue down that path as well. Finally, I'm very pleased to announce for the first time GPO has hired a preservation librarian to
join my staff this morning at eight o'clock. His name
is David Walls formerly of Yale University and he's not
here with us. I thought it might be a little unfair
with all that he is going to have to do to bring him up
here and I didn't want to scare him off immediately. So
he is back at GPO getting acclimated to GPO culture.
Robin is there with him and they are getting setup. He
is not going to have much time to sit down though
because I think it's coming up in June, I'm sending him
over to the Netherlands to represent GPO at the
Archiving 2010 Conference. Something we haven't
participated in, but we need to be at.
Finally, travel after this, for all of you
who are interested, I encourage you to attend the GPO
Interagency Depository Seminary. It will be held back
in DC at the Government Printing Office July 26th
through the 30th. Advance registration is required, but
as always, there is no fee to attend. You can find out
more about this under upcoming events on the FDLP
Desktop.
I'd like to turn the program over to George
Barnum. I hope George is here. Is George here?
There's George. George is going to talk about our
upcoming agency anniversary celebration and George is,
of course, our historian at GPO. That's it for me. I
want to thank you all of you for attending. I want to
thank you for listening during my presentation. As
always I encourage you to AskGPO questions during this
conference and through our CRM afterwards, but likewise,
I'd like to hear from you, rdavis@GPO.gov. I'm pretty
much available 24 hours a day. So if you need help,
don't hesitate to contact me. Thank you all.
MR. BARNUM: Today I want to talk about
events that I'm looking forward to with great
anticipation and I think we all are around the office.
GPO will be a 150 years old next March.
GPO opened its doors as GPO on March the 4th, 1861, the
same day that the Lincoln administration began. And we
are planning a series events and activities to mark that
anniversary. Some of which will be visible to you and
will include you and others that will be pretty much
local in Washington, but I wanted to give you a sort of
overview about what we are up to.
We are going to start the celebrations
this June on the 23rd, when we will observe the 150th
anniversary of the day in which -- on which congress
passed joint resolution 25 that directed that GPO be
established. We have an event planned for that day and
we will be launching a lot of our other activities at
that point. We are going to republished our long
beloved agency history called a 100 GPO Years that was
published for the centennial in 1961. We have entirely
reset the book and added an index to it, which it never
had, and we will be publishing this sesquicentennial
edition on the 23rd of June and making that available.
And, yes, I expect it will be written for depository
distribution because I knew you were going to ask. We
have not discussed how we are going to do it
electronically, but it is going to be available.
At the same time we are going to be
launching a new section of the GPO Web site,
specifically devoted to GPO history and the -- I think
the thing that will interest all of you the most about
that, other than announcements of events and that sort
of thing, is that one of the things that we really want
to do with that Web site is make sections of our
photograph archive available. GPO has a wonderful
photographic collection going back the better part of a
100 years, documenting virtually everything that ever
went on in the place and we hope to make a significant
swath of that publicly available over the internet so
that you too can be fascinated by pictures of presses
and the binders.
Continuing on from that point, we will be
doing various kinds of activities through the
intervening months, many of them focus on GPO staff. We
have a number of annual observances and events that go
on within the office. And we will be tying many of
those like the Veteran's Day observance and the
observances of black history month and women's history
month and that sort of thing, to the anniversary
celebration.
Then next March we will again throw a big
party. The June 23rd event we are going to have a big
party for the staff at Harding Hall and invited guests,
Library of Congress and various other people. In March
we will again throw a party and we hope that at that
point we will be opening an exhibit of material from
GPO's 150 years that will tell the story of GPO's role and impact in American life. We want to look at the ways large and small that we have been involved with the American experience from the printing of major documents, like the emancipation proclamation and declarations of war to everyday life like your social security card and your census form. We are currently at work on a statement of work for an exhibit design expert and we hope to be able to open that exhibit in March at the time of the anniversary and that will run for several months.

Not missing the opportunity to tell our story, we are going to issue another book. A 100 GPO Years, covers a timeline fashion up to 1960. We'd like to bridge the gap between 1960 and now and also again make some of this graphical history as we have it more available. So we will be publishing a new history in March. We have a working title. I won't burden you with it. But it is in process and we are very excited about what that's going to look like because it's going to be very pretty and what it will contain. And we will -- as I say, we will be celebrating in various ways throughout the year of 2011. I want to encourage any of you who are having depository anniversaries in the coming year to be in touch with us. Let either staff in Library Services or me know that you are planning an anniversary celebration. We'd like to be aware of that and tie together some of these celebrations. There is a possibility that we will have some piece or part of this exhibit, some traveling kind of thing going around and so we hope that we could tie that in with depository anniversary if possible. But mostly we want to know if you are celebrating because we never want to miss a party either. So you can be in touch with me at GBarnum@gpo.gov or with Lance and his staff or Kathy and her staff and I thank you very much.

MR. SHULER: Over this last year I have thought about of lot of things and I have thought about being chair of Council and I think it comes down to being a personality being made of three parts: One part Martha Stewart, before she went to jail, one part Carrie Nation and one part Saul Alinsky. But I'd like to call on the Martha John to again give a hand to Bob and Ric for the fabulous job that they have done during this
year as Council and the gracious and the charity and the
resources that they have given us in order to do our job
properly. So could I get a big hand for that.
The Carrie Nation part of me is not as easy
because I like beer. But that Carrie Nation that I
remember is basically free public access to government
information, that is what this program represents and
what fascinated me three weeks ago when we were in
Washington, Suzanne and I participated in a PMO.
Somebody in the audience suggested that perhaps there
was a future for a federal register, for instance, that
god forbid, is print neutral. And I got to thinking
that maybe you could imagine a depository library system
that is -- here wait for it -- print neutral. And I
think the series of the conversations that we are going
to have this afternoon, as well as tomorrow, are a
critical part of that evolution as we move from a paper
and print universe to one dominated by Egovernment
perspectives.
The Saul Alinsky part means we've got to
keep coming to the streets and organizing and demanding
and insisting and as part of that tradition I'm now
going to ask if Council has any questions for our two
esteemed guests up here at the table. Come on, after
that sendoff. That's it? Anything?
MR. JAMES: Actually there are a couple of
questions. If you'd like me to propose them? So I'm
going through -- there was a question about -- James
Jacobs, Stanford University. There was a question about
PURLs verses DOI's and whether GPO is going to explore
DOI's for that system and maybe that is something that
we can talk about later, if readers are interested.
MR. DAVIS: I'm looking at our court
reporter/transcriptionist. We are going to do the name
first as we go forward as well, to make her life easy.
I mentioned during my talk that I
consider the contract award to Zepheria to be a bridge
of stability. I want to keep PURLs going. I think that
as myself and my colleagues have done quite a bit of
research over the years, PURLs are an outdated
technology and I found that is not really the case.
PURLs are a choice. And I think that handles and use of
DLI's and other things are choices. I think what our
job to do -- I mentioned that as a bridge of stability
it doesn't mean all the requirements were what we consider to be persistent name for the future and the FDsys requirements document. Now I think what we need to do is go back and revalidate what it is we want and tell the program management office and let them select the right technology for us based on those needs.

MR. SHULER: Jill?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Another for Ric Davis. I'm just so used to everyone hearing me. Ric, could you outline the job description of the preservation librarian, what you see their role as being?

MR. DAVIS: I think it's going to be very interesting. You know, Robin is going to be David's manager and I'm trying very hard not to tell her what I think. I sent her an e-mail last week and I said, what are the first five things you want to work on and she said, I want to talk to you about it and that's good because I've got things I want him to work on. I think it's a unique opportunity in that obviously GPO doesn't have a collection in the tangible world, but we do have a collection in the electronic world. I think when GPO talks about a preservation responsibility, I think when GPO talks about the fact it's an affiliate archive with the National Archive Records Administration, I think we need to give some more teeth to what that means. I think that questions have arisen about the preservation role of GPO on electronic data with the preservation repository of FDsys and whether or not it's gone through various types of audit processes itself using CLR and some other means. I think those are some very important things that we need to do. I always encourage regionals and libraries in general to have a state plan and a collection plan. GPO does not have a collection plan.

We need a collection plan and when I talked earlier about things like how we've been lucky in regards to data format, I don't think we can bank on that luck. I think we need to be ready to have migration strategies to move our content forward, in addition to management of that preservation repository. I think as, you know, if we look to do things associated with digital deposit and dissemination of files, what that means for access and preservation copy. I think as we look to do
digitization, what access and preservation level copy
are associated with that, and you combine all of that
with the next for technical Metadata, associated with
Laurie's cataloging unit, I hope he is with us for a
long time.

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you
MR. SHULER: Ric, thank you. Anybody else
from Council?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski from
California State Library. Ric, I have a question about
the shelflist conversion. According to the figures that
you have given us, there are somewhere in the
neighborhood of 280,000 total shelflist cards in the old
shelflist and these are being digitized. The first
question is, can you describe what you mean by
digitizing? Are these being OCR'd so they will be
searchable or would there just be images taken of them?
How will this digitization be made available? Second
question, there are between 4,500 to 5,000 shelflist
cards that have been transcribed and what -- assuming
that transcription is more robust than just digitizing,
what are the plans for doing further transcription past
that 5,000 number?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Government Printing
Office. To clarify a bit on the numbers, we estimate
that in total there are approximately 1,000,000
shelflist cards. To date 280,000 of the cards have been
digitized and about 4500 to 5,000 have been transcribed.
Do I have by numbers right, Laurie?

MS. HALL: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: Laurie is the expert on this, so
if I get in trouble come on up to the mike. Funny you
say that about availability of the files. They are not
being OCR'd they are being created as a TIF image file
with the plan to take the paper shelflist and transfer
it to the National Archives and Records Administration.
I sent Laurie an e-mail just yesterday and I said, how
are we using these digitized files and she said, for
internal purposes. And I said, do you think the library
community might have an interest in getting the TIF
images and she said, let's talk when we are back in
Washington. So I'm interested in knowing if you are
interested in those digitized files, in addition to
those transcribed records. I mentioned that for the
transcription, on your second part of the question, David, the contractors came on board in January. They have done 4500. When we talk about cataloging money, this is partially how we are spending it. When Bob talks about future money, it's what I'm asking for to continue it, to complete it. All parts need to be transcribed and made available through our Catalogue of Government Publications and the ILS. Does that answer all of it? Laurie, do you want to add anything to that?

MS. HALL: A little bit on the numbers. There is actually a million cards, approximately a million cards. Six hundred thousand of them approximately are the ones that are going to be transcribed because the shelflist didn't shut down until 1992, so we have a significant proportion that are CLC cards. The reason there is only 4500, all of the transcription is going on by the contractor. Then our staff, our cataloging staff goes in and quality control checks them as one valid Library of Congress subject heading and one valid name authority heading. So it goes through another process. So what comes out is 4500, closer to 5,000 that is in the CGP right now have that extra enhancement so that they are little bit more usable to everyone. Does that answer the question?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes.

MR. SHULER: There's only four more minutes left. Any question from the audience? We have one question in the audience? Nobody? Ric?

MR. DAVIS: If there are no more questions, as this may be my last conference with Bob Tapella as well, I want to publicly thank him for the work that he's done as public printer. He has made my life at GPO incredibly easy. He has trusted me to run my business unit and when I've needed help, his door has always been open, so thank you very much, Bob.

MR. SHULER: Any last opportunities here?

Then I'll now close on a Martha moment. We have this lunch choice today of a regional selective. So this is where the regionals find their selectives. And it's going to be an important part of our conversation this upcoming week so meet up with yourselves and start talking with yourselves. Let's celebrate that we have wireless throughout the hotel. And if anyone needs assistance, GPO staff can always be found at the
registration kiosk. And finally, certificates of
attendance, if requested will be available on Wednesday
after ten-thirty break. Finally law librarians dinner
tonight. Meet in the hotel lobby at five-twenty p.m.
and/or sign up on the message board before two p.m. With
that, I declare lunch and we will see everybody in two
hours.

(Break for lunch)

MR. SHULER: I want to call the Council back
into session for the first afternoon plenary and I want
to give you a sense of what these next three
conversations are about. What Council has done since
October is identify three basic themes involving the
Depository Library, the Community and GPO and we have
setup 90 minute sessions of open questions. We are not
going to see a presentation about these particular
topics per say, in any particular depository fashion.
Rather what Council has done is create a series of
questions they will be posed first to GPO folk and then
to the audience. What we hope to come from this
discussion, and this is where I move into my Saul
Alinsky mode, is we hope to generate a sense of where we
are going with these changes that the -- was touched
upon earlier in the morning session. So there is no --
I'm going to be sort of the traffic cop and the button
pusher for the slides of the plenary session and if
everyone goes quiet then I become the provocateur and I
will go in the audience and I will drag Dan out of his
chair and I'll make him ask a question. So don't make

me do that, Dan. I have my dignity to think of.
This particular session is on preservation
and access. And the first question is up on the screen
as you can see. So I turn it over to the Council folk
responsible for this conversation. If you want to
introduce yourselves.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
North Texas.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
University.

Ms. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valparaiso University Law Library.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington
University.

MS. SEARS: This session was sort of borne
out of a comment that was made by Ric in the October meeting for those of you who were not at the October meeting. He specifically directed Council to have a session on preservation and access and to discuss digitization. So that is sort of the introduction to the session and then this is our first question that we have open for discussion and we would really like to hear from the Community what are the appropriate roles of GPO vis-à-vis FDLP libraries in terms of digital access and preservation.

MR. JACOBS: The questions are -- James Jacobs, Stanford University -- the questions, all of the slides are up on -- you can get them from freegov and vote on the live blog. And what we are getting at with these six questions is not yes or no answers or not even, you know, answers necessarily, but just information and from the Community on what you think we should be doing, so we can start to have discussion about this and where to go from there.

MR. SHULER: I see one Ric standing up at the microphone. Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis. Is this one on? Ric Davis, GPO. I think this is a very important question as all of them are for many reasons. As I mentioned in my speech this morning, when I look back at title 44, it talks about the permanent role of libraries in terms of providing a collection of content. When I look at the law for GPO Access, it doesn't say anything about permanence, which frightens me a little bit in terms of future generations taking over this program. It says that there shall be a directory of government documents, correctional records of Federal Register as deemed appropriate by the superintendent of documents, has become this other wide range in collection. As we have been doing biennial surveys in the last six times we have done them, we have seen a steady increase in terms of library response rate of libraries that have expressed some degree of interest in having their own access level or preservation level files that some of you would like to hold at your institutions. And I say that from the government documents like (inaudible) perspective, but I also know I don't want to speak for directors that you work with because there is a cost obviously involved in doing this, but one of the things
that I would like to see enabled by FDsys, that I have talked to the program management office about as a requirement, is the ability to make these files available beyond what we traditionally did with GPO Access. So that for those interested there could be more than a copy at Washington DC and a remote backup. I think from where I am part of this question gets to that, you know, since 1993 and the digital world GPO has been doing this with this permanent public access, but in a mostly electronic environment, what roles do libraries want to play going forward that is not a requirement, but more on a voluntarily basis. I hope that helps a little bit.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. Anybody else from Council want to pitch in?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I just want to say to the audience members, we talk amongst ourselves all the time, so we have heard what we want to say on this issue. We really need to hear what the Community has to say so that we can -- so we can give solid advice to Ric and to the Public Printer.

MR. SHULER: So, you all see no possible future role between the depository libraries and GPO for this fashion? Basically by sitting down and not saying anything, you are basically voting with your feet. Is that true? Yes. Very good.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University of Iowa. My director has been one of those who has said, we will not put documents on a server so -- and there are -- so I would like to see GPO permanently archive all the iterations of those digital documents that -- that the PURLs no longer go anywhere because the federal agency that initially posted those has withdrawn that. So I'm speaking from a different angle possibly because our library has no interest in archiving those. So I would like GPO to pick up that mantle. Thank you.

MR. HERMAN: My name is Ed Herman. I'm from the University at Buffalo. As being a part of a state university within New York State, our budget situation is almost as bad as the budget situation is in California. If we were to agree to do, you know, to house digital information at UB, University at Buffalo, does the Council have any cost estimates that they can
provide to depositories indicating to them approximately
at least a ballpark figure indicating how much it would
cost to house an X number of terabytes of information?
Mr. Shuler: You're asking us if we have
those figures right now? Or are you asking us to
investigate that as part of this line of inquiry?
Mr. Herman: Well, perhaps if you don't have
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those figures now, perhaps, you know, investigating
these figures would be helpful to the libraries who
might be considering housing this kind of information.
The first thing that my superiors would ask me, if I
were to go back to the library this afternoon and give
them such a proposal is, how much is this going to cost?
Mr. Shuler: Okay. Thank you. So noted.
Mr. Jacobs: James Jacobs, Stanford
University. It's sort of a question of multicolored
answers. I mean the short answer of it is, if you just
want -- if you just want to store PDF's on hard drive,
that hard drive cost two hundred bucks for a terabyte.
If you want to join the LOCS alliance, it depends on how
large your university is, you could join the LOCS
alliance and then be part of the LOCS -- US.docs.locs
network which is currently preserving all of the content
that are harvested at the time from GPO Access from 1991
to 2007. That doesn't cost anything more than a
machine -- four or five hundred dollars for a machine
and a couple of hundred dollars for a terabyte hard
drive and the cost of being in the LOCS alliance. If
you wanted to build an institutional depository with all
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the bells and whistles, then you are talking thousands
of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars, so it
really depends on what level you're interested in.
Ms. McKnelly: I have sort of a two prong
question now. This question is about appropriate roles
and then digital access. We've had institutions for
years creating scan digital contact and asking to have
that made more broadly accessible through an umbrella
organization and if GPO FDsys can take materials from
third party LC and digitally assign and make them
available, you are going to clearly articulate why you
are not going to take that information from other third
parties who have created these large sets because that
would make it much more broadly available then they
currently are because we've got all this stuff stuck in
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all these different silos. I was very interested in the
fact that GPO staff is now digitally assigning this,
that it is as it is because I think that they could
digitally assign that. There are a lot of institutions
out in the Community creating a lot of content and we
need broader access to it and we need to clearly state
what can go in and what can't and now I see it got much
muddier for me this morning when you're taking something
from LC at this point.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I wanted to
respond to both questions from the gentleman of Buffalo.
I could also get a breakdown from us in terms of storage
costs. But in terms of running GPO Access in its
totality, it's somewhere between -- it runs between 1.8
million and 2.5 million a year, but that encompasses all
the processing and everything else as well. So I can
get a break down for storage as well.

Going back to Michelle's question, one of
the things that I mentioned maybe a little too briefly
in my speech this morning was I think the LC
collaboration is a start. LC certainly has money that
they received for digitization as has GPO and I think
the White House and others are looking for collaborative
activities where tax payer money is not spent in a
duplicative fashion. That said, when I talked to Mike
in the PMO staff as well, I would like the library
Community to approach GPO with partnership opportunities
with the goal being that I think we were asked about the
role of the preservation person, looking for the
government information within scope obviously official,
obviously complete, meeting certain standards like that
where we sign partnerships as we have always done with
libraries to further access by making that content
available in FDsys. In terms of recognizing the source,
where it's from, what standards it was digitized to, I
think we can handle those types of things in technical
Metadata. And at a time when we are often talking about
the value of the program and the value of partnerships,
I think that's a real opportunity that we should
continue to work towards. Obviously there are
sensitivities with the digitization subject. Given the
approval, we got to show something this morning in the
continuing approval, but I think having paper in hand,
showing that libraries want to partner that they have
digitized collections and they are saying in the
partnership agreement, I want you to make this available
through FDsys, make it happen; that's what I need.

MR. SHULER: Thanks, Ric. Yes.

MS. LASTER: Sharalyn Laster, University of Akron. I think that two additional roles that GPO can play would be to help facilitate training related to all
different levels of digital content maintenance whether
it wants to be a library that wants to participate in
harvesting, whether it's a library that wants to save
things on their hard drive in sort of an appropriate
preservation manner or whether it's a library or
consortium of libraries that really wants to go out
there and create their own digital library then that
would act as a preservation mechanism for the content of
FDsys.

Another role that I think many of us would
love to see GOP, possibly in conjunction with IMLS
playing, is to somehow secure funding for these
projects, both the beginning startup work that it really
takes to create a large scale project, and also funding
that might encourage libraries to work in consortial or
work in sort of ongoing projects to improve these
preservation capacities.

MR. SHULER: Thanks.

MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago Public
Library. We are one of the larger paper depositories
and we don't see that role going away. But we see the
same difficulties as everybody else does in digitizing.
Being a digital depository it would require digging
money out of something, getting -- working through the
local politics getting them to commit to it. But I
think for the same reason that we don't really envision
getting rid of our paper documents, that definitely the
depository libraries do need to somehow digitally
preserve these things because GPO is a single point of
failure here. They may have redundant servers, but all
it takes is an act of Congress to shut them down.
Whereas that's never been able to happen with paper
documents. Technically, why doesn't GPO explore a
distributed model of archiving? One library just
archives the department of agriculture, another library
archives something else, etc., etc.
MR. SHULER: Thank you. I think we have time for one more on this before we move on.

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. One part of that question is about digital access and sort of going back to what Michelle mentioned about the silos of already digitized content. Some of those digital files are probably not appropriate to ingest into something like FDsys. They may be too dirty, at too low of a level of resolution or sort of older material that would digitize under standards of an era. But until we have a complete digital collection, what I would especially like is Metadata records for those digital files that exists around the country to be available through GPO because discovery is an incredibly important part of this. There is an awful lot of digital content that we don't know about.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Ric?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One more followup on the previous question. I'm concerned too, what happens if GPO loses funding? That was part of the reason five to seven years ago I guess we signed an agreement with the National Archives to become an archival affiliate. I think at that time we might have been the thirteenth in the country. So there is a backstop there. In terms of digital deposit dissemination, I'm not going to steal the thunder because I think that's on the radar from some additional questions, but we have been working with Mr. Jacobs particularly in the last few weeks to enable some capabilities on FDsys that would enable LOCS functionality and I think that, you know, part of what I spoke about this morning in terms of content packages, is something that we need to enable through FDsys to enable what we are talking about as digital deposit.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. There was one comment posted to the live blog which if you don't mind I'll read. It's from Bill Sleeman, University of Maryland Law Library. He says one role that GPO has to maintain is that of a standards setting agency. When you look at the variety of quality in any scanning projects, even and particularly some of the larger scale ones, you discover that it's very
mixed. If we are to be in a position where we can
insure the long term future of joint projects, they have
to be up to a standard level. I know this was asked in
an open session in the fall and I made the point at the
time as well. If we are to partner with GPO to produce
digital products or if a vendor is, there needs to be a
requirement that the product is up to a viable standard.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. SCHOENFELD: Roger Schoenfeld with
Ithaca SNR. First of all to echo about what some of the
others have said about the importance of having multiple
sources for digital preservation, I also wanted to just
raise a question, maybe for the group, about one of the
roles that GPO has traditionally played in the print
preservation environment that I don't hear as much
discussion about in the digital preservation environment
which is the importance that GPO has played in
formalizing relationships, partnerships, however you
want to call it, with the regional federal depository
libraries to insure that there are libraries that are --
have a sort of publicly stated responsibility for
certain kinds of preservation. And I just wonder if
that kind of role of identifying partners, whether they
be libraries or groups of libraries, who would be sort
of assured or guaranteed preservation partners and not
just kind of optional or at will preservation partners,
might be an important thing to consider in some future
environment for digital preservation?

MR. SHULER: Thanks.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I wanted to
respond to the question that came up as part of the
blog, I guess. James Mauldin can speak to this much
more eloquently than I can, but I will try. I think
it's important to have access level content. I think
it's important to have preservation level content from
which you can migrate and refresh in the future. The
one concern I have, when we talk about the right
standard, and you know we have had meetings of standards
experts at GPO, probably 10 to 15 percent of James's job
involves meeting with various agencies throughout DC and
others to talk about digitization standards and where
they are going and where they are evolving to. One
thing that I have come to the conclusion on, that there
is no agreement. And the one thing that I don't want to
do or I hope not to see is that while we aspire to
achieve a certain perfect standard, we don't use it as a
reason for not progressing in the digitization realm.
And I guess my thought process is that as the standards
are evolving, we should focus on quality and we can
reflect standards in technical Metadata, but I just
don't want to use them as a reason to not pursue
digitization activities.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Council group, is
this enough for this question? Okay. Should we go to
the next?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
University. The question we have is what are libraries
doing to facilitate digital preservation and access?

MR. SHULER: So, John Shuler, University of
Illinois, Chicago, this is another easy one? We are not
doing anything to facilitate digital preservation and
access. Maybe somebody, slowly.

MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North
Carolina, at Chapel Hill. We are doing the same things
that we are struggling to ask GPO to do on a state level
in that we are crating partnerships. ECU is digitizing
maps and North Carolina is hosting them and helping with
the Metadata. Also at Carolina we have done
digitization of special collections that we have. If
anyone has ever looked at documenting the American south
slave narratives, that's a UNC homegrown project. And
we are sharing that at times with folks like the
internet archives and preserving it that way, so having
sort of a mirror image of the collections. So I don't
think we are doing any trailblazing in North Carolina.
I think some states are in fact further along with state
digitization of state documents then we are and so they
might very well have other things to add. I don't think
we are really trailblazing with what we are trying to do
with this discussion. I think if it's just going to
take somebody to decide, okay, I'm going to lead in this
area, but keep everybody informed. One thing that I
would have liked to have said on the earlier question
today was that the document's community is sometimes too
passive in that we are not informing the world about
what digital projects we are doing. So when a director
asks you what collection would you like to digitize of
the federal documents that you have or what piece, it
may take you a week or three weeks or a couple of months
to determine has anybody indeed digitized this? I'm not
taking swipes at the clearinghouse, you know, because I
know there are pros and cons about trying to capture in
one place all the projects, but I think we need to be
blowing our own horns as it were and say what we are
doing to every listener we can imagine so that the word
gets out there of what we are doing and we figure out
who needs a partner to either digitize the material, who
needs a partner to provide the materials, who needs a
partner to host the material and go from there.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford
University. You're raising the idea of the internet
archive. I wonder if anyone out there is actually
cataloging content from the internet archives government
document collection? Is anyone? They have a growing
collection. They have been digitizing content from
University of Illinois, from the Boston Public Library,
from other libraries.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
Michigan. We are doing it for Michigan documents, but
not for Federal.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: This is Mark Phillips of the
University of North Texas. One of the things that we
have been trying to do over the past several years is
really try to lay down a base level infrastructure for
all of our digital content coming in. And one of the
unique things I think that we have going on is a lot of
that digital content that is coming in is government
publications. So it's kind of leading our design
strategies, access strategies. What we are trying to do
is based on the content we get. So I don't fit in the
govdocs department. I'm one of the system's people, but
it is really based on what we are getting. So if we
weren't ever actually bringing in content saying this is
a very core piece. We need to be preserving this, we
wouldn't plan for it. So one of the things that might
be helpful is to actually start saying is we need to
bring this in. We are already downloading it. Now we
need to deal with it because it is bigger than just the
govdocs department within the university. It has to be
a system wide or at least a library wide infrastructure
to support this and it needs to be planned out over years, otherwise it's just not going to happen. It's not just one thing that gets done here and one thing that gets done here. It's being part of an overall based level set of services you provide for all digital content, otherwise, it's just one scale. I guess we are kind of in a good spot because we have been approaching it in that way and for us it seems to be working really well.


MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Thanks, Mark, this is great. It's one of the things I've been trying to raise more with the GPO staff and with Council and whoever else reads my blog, is that government documents are a unique collection and because they are largely in the public domain, libraries who are looking to build digital infrastructures, they could easily ramp up those digital infrastructures by using government documents as their test bed, as their original collections. So it's really a great thing that you can talk to with your directors that, hey, here are these collections that can help us help the larger library, the library in general build digital infrastructures, digital collections. I'm glad UNT is doing that in leading the way.

MR. SHULER: John Shuler, University of Chicago, Illinois. There are two what could be considered gold standard projects of interinstitutional cooperation going on right now. One is from the CIC and the other one I understand is still being aborn in ASERL, the southern states. I was wondering if anybody in the audience would speak to either of those about the experience or -- thank you, Bill.

MR. SUDDUTH: To be perfectly honest, I'm sitting back their doing collection -- collection measures that I have to submit to architects for a space study in our library. I'm supposed to be projecting out until 2025. So I'm listening to this and doing this at the same time, but I will talk about ASERL. What we are doing at ASERL, we are doing -- oh, I'm sorry. Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina. We are doing a pilot project. We actually have an IMLS grant and we are working on what's called a collection of
excellence. We have three libraries currently involved and the concept is that a library takes on a particular agency or set of materials and makes sure it has a complete collection. It's completely cataloged and if possible a duplicate copy. So that in the future there is always going to be an archival copy and that there will be a lendable copy or a copy somehow that will be digitized. Different libraries -- we are taking different approaches. Florida is going to digitize all of the Panama Canal materials and they have actually gone out and sought other materials. University of Kentucky is doing works progress administration and I'm doing education and only the education department from 1979 forward. So in some cases I've actually got three copies at this point, but I don't have a complete collection either. So that's where we are going with that project. It's interesting and lots of detail and we are just in beginning stages of it so. Questions?

MR. SHULER: Does Council have any questions of Bill, since he's in our virtual world as opposed to his paper one right now?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Bill, is that the ASERL draft proposal for managing FDLP collections? Is that part of that?

MR. SUDDUTH: That's part of that. That's kind of a draft guideline. Somehow we are going to work within it. I was lucky enough to see it about 10, 15 days in advance. But have just come out. I'm interested in people's reactions. We really haven't even talked about within the documents librarians and all that, but bottom line, what I want to say about that is, it's really nice to see that the deans within ASERL are as interested in the future of this program as we seem to be, as interested in the future of this program. What we are getting out of it is -- the biggest thing that we are getting out of it at this point is we are going to be able to go forward cooperatively in this. It is not going to be, we-said-they-said, kind of thing. We are going to be working together and I think that's the first big step that we are taking at this point.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. JACOBS: For those that are interested, ASERL, is A-S-E-R-L.org and right at the top there is a link to the draft proposal for managing FPLD
collections.

MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of Minnesota. I just wanted to talk to John's point on the CIC project. There is a handout in the foyer area. Basically I just wanted to point out what our particular project, what Bill is talking in terms of corporation, and it's very similar within the CIC. Also having the directors behind this project and wanting to go forward on it and moving forward on it and putting money towards it, which I think a lot of people have talked about it as being a big stumbling block. We are really focusing on access copies and with working with Goggle, that has been the point of the project. We are not trying to do the preservation piece, per se, but we want to get this stuff available and I can say the University of Minnesota was the pilot project. Our stuff is showing up on Goggle in HathiTrust and copies are available. I have been answering questions using it. So it has been a very good thing. We were the pilot. Penn State has some stuff. I believe Illinois is getting ready to send, University of Illinois, so we are working together within the CIC to provide these copies, but again for us we are really focusing on the access to them rather than the preservation.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. I'm involved in the Trail. I'm going to be nice for right now because I'm still trying to decide which foot I'm going to vote with on you, John. It will be a frozen boot. We are involved in the Trail Project, which is several different universities in the Greater Western Library Alliance, and we are partnering with the HathiTrust and it looks like we are going to migrate over to CLR here real soon. But we are collecting and digitizing federal government information on the science and technical side of things and we've got most of the -- what else are we working on back there, Esther? We've got Bureau Mindstone and we are looking at the fisheries, Mr. Phillips? Yes, National Bureau of Standards and things like that so, you know, the point being, as we have heard, there are a lot of different groups, lot of different consortia that have directors backing and things like that. I think it ties into real well to what libraries are doing and it's also what
other groups are doing with federal preservation or at least trying to facilitate digital preservation and access to information, whether its more digital than paper in trying to digitize it in bringing it out there for the general public's consumption. My thought is that GPO has done a really good job in trying to encourage partnerships and I know they will continue to do so. They have done a good job in trying to collect information, the various digital projects that are going on, whether they are just internally or externally with large groups of consortium numbers. I think that is what our future holds. This ties in somewhat with the last question. You asked what GPO needs to do. GPO was the nation's first aggregator and disseminator with information to the public. We all know that. And the second phase of that was the Depository Library System of which we all -- I assume all of you are participating in, am I right, to some degree? Okay. So it builds on that sort of foundation it's incumbent that we all continue to work together. But more importantly we continue to work with one another and not replicate the efforts of one another, but at the same time making sure that what is going on is still based in this kind of national sharing environment that we have had for over 150 years.

I hate to be the frog that boosts about its own pond, but I'm involved in a couple of different projects now with some of the national laboratories out in New Mexico, take the unclassified information. We either try to digitize it or -- and take electronic files. And Geoff mentioned something about Metadata. I think that is one of the keys to access right now, being able to have that Metadata available so we can all look at each other's stuff with open windows and not have to worry about trying to figure out what I've got versus what John's got versus what Joe's got, etc., etc. MR. SHULER: Those boots are made for walking, by the way. Gwen. MS. SINCLAIR: Gwen Sinclair, University of Hawaii at Manoa. Going back to the question, what are libraries doing to facilitate digital preservation and access? I'm one of those libraries that is not doing much. We provide server space for Trail, but we don't actually provide any content. We have made noises about
joining LOCS, but have basically concluded that we don't have any personnel resources to devote to that. Going back to what Marianne said about the lack of support from her director for digital depositing, I'm just wondering if ARL can help in this area. A lot of times our directors go to ARL meetings if they are ARL members, or even if they are not ARL members, they are still influenced by what ARL says and does. So I'm wondering if ARL can help to motivate libraries to participate in this activity more and jumping in with what Roger suggested about thinking in terms of digital deposit being analogous to regional depositories. I think if ARL and Ithaca SNR made more statements about what libraries should be doing, there might be more participation.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Laurie?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall from GPO. I wanted to address I guess Dan and Geoff's question. A couple of days ago Suzanne and I put together cooperative cataloging partnership draft arrangements to do just like you asked for, Geoff, to work on partnership cataloging for partnerships. Council has a draft. I have some copies of the draft up in my room, but it just sets some basic guidelines if what if you come in as a partnership what we will do. Say for instance you've got a collection of 200, 300 documents and you don't have cataloging. You come in as a partnership and we will do the cataloging for you and then provide copies of the catalog back to you or, you know, or display it in the GCP. So that document I have copies of. I'll pass it out tomorrow. We are going to post it to the Desktop when we get back and we'll have a comment period until like May 21st. So there is a lot more details about, you know, if you give us a brief Metadata we will upgrade the Metadata and some standard guidelines about exchanging Metadata.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything else on this question? Okay. I do want to make one observation though. I think we crossed Rubicon for Depository Library Council meetings in that I believe those two questions that came from the Web were actually the two first questions ever submitted online during our Council plenary session. So we should probably recognize that. And to give you the alpha and now the omega, forgive the
conceit of the stool, it's John's legacy systems that  
need help. Are we agreeable to the next question since  
that didn't get much of a response?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,  
Valparaiso University Law Library. The question is what  
could or should GPO be doing to capture borne digital  
material such as agency documents for ingestion into  
FDsys?

MR. SHULER: Probably shouldn't do anything  
more than what they have done, right? Stop it there,  
you know. James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford  
University. Oh, go ahead.

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: Carmen, Orth-Alfie,  
University of Kansas. I'm sort of showing my own  
naiveness here, but this question makes me wonder what  
the National Archives is doing in this role as well?  
And what GPO's relationship with the Nation Archives is  
in dealing with agency publications on the Web?

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Does GPO want to  
respond to that question?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall GPO. We are kind of  
refiguring the whole fugitive document process and  
that's in -- on the content acquisitions area of mine,  
technical services. We have been spending a lot more time  
with agencies. We are going out to agencies. We are  
taking a little bit more practical approach, instead of  
waiting for stuff to come in because only a very small  
portion comes into GPO anymore. So that's one of the  
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things that we are doing to try to find more things that  
are in the process of being developed. And of course we  
go online all the time on agency Web sites looking for  
ew content. But, once again, it's piece by piece by  
piece. I think we -- also we are working with Robin in  
her collection development or preservation library to do  
a collection development policy and practice. We are  
working on some of those things.

MR. SHULER: What specifically is the  
relationship between GPO and the National Archives in  
this regards?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The  
relationship is a close one.

MR. SHULER: Well begun.

MS. ETKIN: To be more specific, John, and
answer your question, NARA deals in records. We deal in
publications and there are a lot of publications and in
the work of an agency that goes to NARA in their
collection, but not always. And there is not always a
permanent retention that is attached to those things
that are sent to NARA as part of the records retention
schedule.

MR. SHULER: Does that make it a bit clearer
what the relationship is?

MS. ORTH-ALFIE: In that there is not enough
of a relationship.

MR. SHULER: Ah, now, you are talking about
quality of relationship.

MS. ETKIN: We recognize the relationship,
but we also do have, as Ric mentioned earlier, we are a
NARA affiliate for the materials that are available
through GPO Access.

MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago Public
Library. I would sort of echo as the people from GPO
are doing, because we are kind of grappling with this
issue in Chicago documents which is one of the larger
publishers of government documents in the US. And we
decided that in our role as a public library, and also
our continuing roles as a special library, we inherited
that role, we grappled a little bit with what we should
be collecting. Our objective was to collect documents
and put them in our catalog, electronic documents. And
we came up with the publication definition like GPO,
it's published. And probably the best definition of
published is if it's made available to more than one
person. The law libraries here might be familiar with
liable and slander and all that and if it's intended to
be made available to more than one person outside of the
originators, it's a published document and probably
belongs in a library. Otherwise, it's an archival
material which probably belongs with the archives. Of
course, we haven't solved who deals with the archives,
that's supposed to be a state responsibility, but as far
as we know, they are not doing it, but anyway.

MR. HERMAN: Ed Herman, University at
Buffalo. I have a question about the FDsys system.
Does the FDsys include a robot that goes out and crawls
feral Web sites the way search engines would crawl the
larger Web?
MR. SHULER: Very good question. Are they consulting?

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips, University of North Texas. One of the things that -- maybe not just a stop -- but one of the things that GPO could be involved with, they are -- but they can possibly continue to be more involved with, is the Web archiving community and going through and taking a very proactive -- having a very proactive agenda of active collecting -- just hold until we figure out how to go find the stuff that we piecemeal find right now. Whether it's through the International Preservation Consortium and making sure there is a strong membership there and strong collaboration and with things like we did with the term Web crawl where GPO was a partner in that and try to push forward and to take this real proactive stance in capturing this content and sorting out later.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. LANDGRAF: Matt Landgraf with the Government Printing Office. Just from the GPO to the technology perspective, we have done some pilots with harvesting in the past with two different companies to actually, you know, go in and sort of test some of those technologies. But I think sort of speaking back to Lori's point, obviously, yes, we do need to sort of further those technologies and see how well they can identify specific publications or Web sites. More of the point is to actually build those relationships with agencies to make sure that we can proactively get those federal publications from agencies. It's that partnership and it's that collaboration that is sort of what we need right now.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. John.

MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University of Delaware. I wanted to followup on Lori's explanation about the outreach to agencies. Since the word fugitive has been mentioned and there has been a lost docs program and an effort to apparently get some titles reported by depositories librarians and some other interested parties and I wondered if a clarification could be made as to what is the best method of getting them in since there are at least two channels through the FDLP Desktop and it's not clear as to which one is preferred. The lost docs reporting form allows the
people reporting to assign what they think would be the appropriate SuDoc number and item number to report a document which appears within scope of the program like its predecessors, but which is not in CGP and the AskGPO form doesn't ask for any of this, but I guess allows some of the same kinds of things to be reported.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. John, we are embarking on a big project to revamp the lost docs process. We've got some new processes mapped out and they all begin with submissions into AskGPO and we are working to create a more specific form for LosDocs submission so that when you hit the fugitive category a form that has those fields to prompt you to fill out the information that we need to process will be there. And then it will go into the work flow and have various decision boxes about if it's already cataloged then it's going to go here. Those kinds of things that you do when you work out work flows and all of that. So that is going to be happening, but we've got things mapped out. And at certain trigger points there will also be statistical reporting available so that we can also chart the progress and find out where our work flow might be a little off so that we can adjust it, etc., etc. Does that answer your question?

MR. STEVENSON: That's helpful. In the short term is there any recommendation, since people who are interested in doing this are probably using both forms. Is there one good or do you prefer one over the other?

MS. ETKIN: We prefer the AskGPO because that gets it into directly the right person as well as creating a record with all the steps that it goes through.

MR. STEVENSON: Okay, so we should use AskGPO, although it doesn't populate all the information the way you want it to yet?

MS. ETKIN: Yes, but you can make your own template of the layout and paste it. Just a suggestion.

MR. SHULER: Michelle.

MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls. I think that John Stevenson and I were some of the original that LosDocs collaborators and this has been around for quite a long time. The problem that I have seen with this is it's
piecemeal. It's not systematic. It's dependent on the
motivation of one person. My concern about this
question is two-fold. First of all, I really want to
congratulate, Lori, and the acquisitions people for
going out and making those connections with the people
at the agencies, but what they missed are the people in
the regional offices. These regional publications have
kind of always historically kind of gotten out of here.
My other thing I want to talk about is, when we do
LosDocs we they are doing their ingestion, that is going
into the catalog of government information and this is
talking about going into FDsys and it is my
understanding that those two systems do not speak to
each other, so I'm very much interested in seeing the
concept of the vacuuming, getting all this stuff and
deciding how to deal with it later. We can have those
two pilot programs and there was much material within
those that was considered out of scope, but the
materials that were considered in scope, as far as I
know, were never added to the government information.

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Going back to
the one thing first, Michelle, the first answer to the
question about our acquisitions staff going out to the
regionals, as a matter of fact, we started about I think
this is April, so early last fall we have the head or
content acquisitions going out specifically to target
working with our GPO regional printing offices to go out
all throughout the US, that's Joe McClain. He's on a
trip soon to San Francisco, not only talking with the
regional printing offices of the GPO, but also getting
coordinated with the departmental offices -- federal
offices out in those areas. He just came back from
Texas and those meetings have been with the depository
librarians, you know, the federal printing officers and
they have had these really good two or three day work
shops on GPO services, what the FDLP is doing. So they
are been very, very well received. And he is going out
on a few more trips for the rest of the year. So we are
trying to get out to those regional offices.

What was the other question? Oh, EPA
content. Suzanne can tell you a little bit about that.
She is shaking her head. She doesn't want to talk about
it. You're right, a lot of the stuff was out of scope.
A lot of the stuff was pieces of documents and we had
some of you all participated in helping us find the
missing pieces to parts of documents. That was
relatively minimally successful. So the material that
could go in, a large portion of it that were true
documents, complete documents, were catalogued, but not
the entire amount because it was very, very labor
intensive. In terms of a lot of the stuff that we did,
you know, a good portion of the stuff that we did get
through the harvesting was stuff we picked through our
regular acquisitions process.

MR. LANDGRAF: Matt Landgraf from GPO. One
thing to say from the technical prospective, as far as
automated scope determination of publications is I think
one of the things that we really clearly found out from
our pilot is that and rules that you try to write to
automate scope determination for publications are not
going to be perfect and you are going to harvest lot of
stuff that is actually not in scope. I think that
actually goes back once again to Laurie's point for the
cooperation with the agencies themselves before we
actually try and go out and harvest to identify hot
spots on their sites or to talk a little bit about where
their in scope publications are, so that that
determination can be made up front, as opposed to trying
to write a comprehensive set of rules that are going to
identify in scope publications which we know is going to
be a huge challenge.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. One thing
I just wanted to add that even though CGP and FDsys
aren't currently talking to each other, we are capturing
those documents and archiving them on permanent as part
of the cataloging process.

MR. SHULER: We have 30 minutes left in the
match. Anything else on this question?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm really excited to
hear that GPO is going out to agencies, talking to
agencies both at the fed level and starting to go out to
the regional levels. One of the things that you can
talk about, I don't know if you have talked about, but
it would be great if you discussed the need to have sort
of a publications subdirectory on their Web sites,
something that is not job escripte enabled, something
that isn't in a data base, but something that crawlers
could get to because then a lot of us who are
harvesting, whether it's, you know, NARA or GPO or individual libraries, we could get to that stuff a lot easier and feed into the LosDocs process.

MR. SHULER: Next question.

MR. OTTO: Hi, I'm Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University. The next question is, how might digital deposit with FDLP libraries be part of the effort to save borne digital materials which are at risk of disappearing all together. I realize that with our first question it prompted some discussion of the idea of distributed, you know, deposit with depository libraries, but I guess so maybe the direction we could take this question, please jump in, is just how hard it would be for people to implement something like this, if it was decided to do this, what challenges people see or for people who have more experience with it please share what you found through your institutional repository or something like that.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Just to clarify. This would be if GPO were offering us the opportunity to accept borne digital not forcing it upon us. That's not what we are talking about. We are just saying they make it an available and you as a depository choose to go get it and put it on your own server.

MR. SHULER: So again we have no interest in becoming volunteers for America in this fashion? Anybody out there in the Community?

MS. HORNE-POPP: Lauren Horne-Popp, University of Michigan. When I hear this my first question is, what are the incentives and I think maybe that is the conversation to have. And what I mean is I'm trying to imagine getting my director, and I'm sure many other people are playing this little experiment in their mind too, we need to go out and pull these records that we didn't make ourselves. We don't necessarily think initially that we need to have responsibility for to flip that and say, yes, we want these. We want to hold onto them. So I think here is a good opportunity for us to talk about that. How would you actually want people to say yes I want to voluntarily go out and grab that and maintain it? That's what I'm interested to hear what others have to say.

MR. SHULER: Before you sit down, what do
you see as the incentives?

MS. HORNE-POPP: Well, that's an excellent question. I'm sure we can always say something about the distribution of it, the fact that not everything is on government servers. But once you get past that conversation, I'm not sure. That's why I'm putting the question forward. Other than saying it makes us feel good to do it, I'm not for sure. I don't really know.

I don't know when you're talking about money and cost to do these sorts of things, how you argue that to an administrator to really want to participate in something like that.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I think she hit it right on the head. I suspect the hesitancy of people to come up and address this question has to do with thinking through not just the advantages but the liabilities of housing this information. You go out and you get it, you collect it, you're storing it and actively trying to retrieve it, but frequently, you have to keep justifying this every budget round and you to also make sure you have enough server space, have to keep the quality up, keep going out and meeting all the demands, increasing technology demands but use demands. So I can see there being a lot of liabilities that might offset your advantages.


MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs from Stanford University. It sort of gets back to my comment to Mark Phillips about government documents really being the gateway drug to digital depositories. If you can get your administrators to start thinking wow, if we do this with government documents, where we don't have any sort of licensing or copyright issues which are really the harder issues then the digital issues, you build these infrastructures that can be expanded out beyond documents. So I think that is a real incentive for administrators to -- here is an easy chunk of content that they can use to start doing more than they are already doing and, frankly, I think we will need to do in the future.

MS. LASTER: Sharalyn Laster, University of Akron. I think another way to incentivize specific libraries that are considering it is to say things like,
look who else is doing it. Look at our peer institutions, that has these projects going on now and this is kind of how we can support this -- this need that is out there by working at the same level as other institutions that we might compare ourselves with. I think another component to consider is that different collections of federal government documents have different areas of interest and relevance to different regions, which makes sense. For example it might be that those of us who are Great Lakes states might have a special interest in the preservation of materials related to that theme or that topic. So that might be another way to slice up the pie.


MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin at Government Printing Office. I just want to throw out a couple of figures from the biennial survey. This is from the aggregate report. There were 1120 -- you'd think after all these years I'd know how to speak into a mike. So from the aggregate data from the biennial survey there was one question about whether or not your institution was interested in digital deposit, whether or not it's been discussed with your dean or director and do you feel you have your administrative support for digital deposit? Now, this is aggregate data. I haven't looked at segmentation data yet, but overall more than 60 percent of the libraries that responded have discussed this with their director, but less than 30 percent feel they have administrative support and along those lines approaching 30 percent of the respondents are interested in receiving digital files. Again I have to look at the segmentation to see where those 30 percent are.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Steve.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame. Cindy, many people wished I had never learned how to speak into a mike.

I'm in the business library at the University of Notre Dame, formerly government documents librarian, perhaps soon to be the government documents librarian again. For me the hook is collection managers. Right now we are still in that period where I really want this stuff, especially if you are going to collect it and I can get at it when I want to get at it,
but you collect it and you maintain it and you house it. I think we are beginning to see, at least at my institution, the only safe way I know it is not going to disappear and it's key to the collection that I manage and develop is, we used to put it on the shelf. Now I have to put it on the server and I think that is where the hook is really going to come in, but it's not going to be for the general good of yes I'll collect everything. It's going to be what's in it for me and unfortunately it's going to be piecemeal, but I think that is the hook you are getting into. The other is the analysis is now becoming entirely different. I'm in an environment -- to use the example, in the library world you tell me the needle and I buy the haystack that contains that needle. The academics are saying, buy me the haystack. I will find the needle that will make my academic career. You can do that with this kind of content. You can't do it in the form we are traditionally used to. Not only is it going to be a collection that's going to drive I must have this and I must maintain it locally because it's too important to lose. It's also going to be, I have to have it locally because I'm going to use an analysis tool that it, as of yet, has not quite made its way into my discipline and that is what's going to distinguish me and my career. So, therefore, the director will go, we'll fund it. We want it because then the library is indispensable. See what you have done for me. Notre Dame is on the map for research and not just football.

MR. SHULER: David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I'm David Cismowski. California State Library. The money creates possibilities. And to library administrators money or the release of money or the allocation of money I think depends upon administrator's sense of what are we going to do with this stuff? What are we going to do with the product we are buying? And granted it's an over simplification, but I tend to look at digital deposit as having maybe three stages. The first is the ingest, is getting it -- getting it onto your servers. The second is migrating it forward. And the third is actually accessing it and serving it up. I think that I'm -- maybe I'm wrong. James is the expert. I think of the real costs involved in digital deposit, in those last
two things; forward migration and serving it up. We looked at the cost of FDsys, which attempts to do all of this, but a large part of FDsys is actually enabling searching, refinement of searching and viewing results and then further refining notes. The large part of FDsys is going into that. Now, if individual depositories receive this digital content and store it, I mean, that is important to a certain extent. But an administrator is going to say, well, are we going to continue to store this stuff for 50 years and not really do anything with it? What are we going to do with it? And it's that ability to do things with this digital content that is going to cost them money, so I'm a little -- I know that there is a value in preserving -- for preservation there is definitely a value for distributing content, but how long can that go on without a product coming out of it that an administrator can point to and say, yes, it's worth the money because we are able to provide that to our customers?

MR. SHULER: Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: I want to follow up the last sentence -- Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I think that when we collect something digitally it has to fulfill the same collection development, principles, policy guidelines, as anything that we pull up and so I agree with Steve and I'm sorry I see you, Laurie, thank you, when you are building a collection, a unique collection. My hook is always the special collections area. If we have parameters for existing collection development projects, the digital supports, that's your why. Yes, servers are expensive, not as expensive as building yet another vault to house all of the rare papers that go along with the project. In some ways it winds up being cheaper, but it fits in this project. It fits this niche of information that you are building that is truly unique to your area. In our case it's water. We ain't got enough. We used to have some, but it's the history of water, the politics of water, water resources that we used to have, we have now, we are depleting; that's our project. So as long as you setup this parameter, they're guidelines for the project, the digital slides right in and is a way to defend the servers, I have found, because you are not going to get in paper. We need to continue this project. This is
our rare and unique either IR or special collections or unique collections information. And so in order to supplement it and keep it current, keep it ongoing, that just defies servers. 

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I agree and we all agree that server space is cheap, but what a server does is just stores stuff. You attach Metadata to the stuff, so that you can find it, so that you can preserve it adequately so that you can migrate it forward. For instance, if you ingest a PDF file that was created with Acrobat Professional version 9, you want to put that into your Metadata so that ten years from now, when nothing can read that or Adobe notifies the world that they are no longer going to support Acrobat version 9 created documents, your Metadata will tell you now is the time to gather together all of the documents that are in the server, created with Adobe Acrobat 9 and migrate them forward. If you don't have that Metadata in there, you might as well not have even collected those documents in the first place because they are not going to be readable. And so the real cost -- not what I was trying to drive at was not the original server space, but the curation of those documents and the access that you provide to those documents now, 50 years from now and a hundred years from now.

MR. SHULER: Okay. We have ten minutes left in the match. We have one question left. Are we ready to move on? Last question. Suzanne.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. How could GPO utilize FDLP Desktop and FDLP Community sites to coordinate communication and digitization efforts of FDLP libraries? What information should be shared there? This goes to the point that was made earlier by Geoff Swindells about discoverability.

MR. SHULER: So basically librarians have nothing to say about discoverability. Actually, no relationship to what we do.

MS. HORNE-POPP: Laura Horne-Popp, University of Michigan. I brought this up several times, so sorry for being redundant, but one of the things that I would like to see, several years ago when
we did the survey, what were one of the first things that we want digitized from the collection to be up there because I think in a lot of libraries, when it's a matter of where to start, we have a list right now of who is doing what, but we don't have a list of what could be done. I think for a lot of libraries that there is a sense of paralysis because they don't know where to start. This is a great opportunity and it also again helps people to divide and conquer. Because there are a lot of smaller institutions that would be happy to do something. We can't digitize all of the serial set, but we can do part of it. So I think anything like that where we hear the things as a community, we agree are the first titles to tackle would be excellent. And have that some way with the directories we have it now because I think it gives a lot of people some ideas for partnership and just again where to start.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. I imagine what is being asked in this question is some kind of coordinating role from GPO as was just pointed out. I think depository libraries that are willing to work on this material need to know what and when as much as how. And so the question could be put to GPO directly, is there an imagined role for GPO in this kind of coordination?

MR. DAVIS: This is Ric Davis, GPO. I think this is something that GPO shouldn't be shy about asking for Council's help on because I think this question came up at the last conference as well. And channeling Robin, who can't be with us, she told me that she's struggling a bit with it in terms of what that coordinating role is. I think from my perspective one of the things we still need to do is I think the registry of digitization projects is very good, but we get that question still often. What can I go to help and where do I go next? And I still think it goes back to understanding what is in the registry. Do we need that more granular title by title breakdown to say this is what is in here? This has been done. This is what we need to do. Haven't looked at the digitization page in a couple of months, but I think there was a priority listing of titles as well, but what does that mean? Does that mean because it's on the priority list should you start with this and you start with this? I think we
need to do a better job with that. Do you have anything to add, James?

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SARE: Laura Sare, Texas A&M University.

One of the things I'd like to see is part of -- I think as most libraries, we are trying to gain space, so we need to know what to weed. I would like to see this list say, you can really trust -- we made a partnership with the department of agriculture or something and you can trust their digitization and they are going to maintain it so that if I pull all my ag stuff, which is not going to happen, we need to know who we can trust and what is going to be there 10, 15 years from now, rather than just having a list of people who have sites, or have information, digitization projects now. But like David was saying earlier, that they are not preserving it for the long term and it goes away and we are lost with, we don't have any electronic and we don't have the print anymore. I think that is what we'd like to see.

MR. SHULER: Cindy, bring it home.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I wasn't going to do a followup to that. I was going to do a followup on the previous one, if that's okay.

MR. SHULER: Still bring it home.

MS. ETKIN: Still talking about what is it that my library can digitize and a list of priorities. As we mentioned, we do have a priority list for digitization that was devised by the Community for GPO's priorities. You in your libraries may have very different priorities, based on the needs of your users and different topics, as was mentioned by Jill with the water topic for Utah. You only have similar kinds of topics that are of interest to you and your users and more beneficial for you to take that route and include your topic in the registry so that people know about it. Just a suggestion.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Susan.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I guess I was just thinking of having GPO having some kind of site similar to what many of us are familiar with that live in large metropolitan areas for getting a community partner so that you can share a ride to work. Basically you have somebody who has a project
and they would be able to input in there and somebody says, look, I can digitalize this small amount and they can put it in there and GPO somehow matches those people together so that you have this collaboration of working together on a project data. Maybe.

MR. SHULER: Sort of like micro lending.

Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin GPO. I'm going to bring it home again. Suzanne, that's what the registry does. There is an option in there if you are looking for collaborative partners for your project, that's an option in there in the registry entry. Unless I'm misunderstanding what you were saying.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I'm looking at registry FDLP.gov and I don't see a list of priority titles on there and I don't see what you just mentioned about -- is that part of the apply to contribute or where is that?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The priority title they are on the Desktop.

MR. JACOBS: Oh, they are on the Desktop. They are not on the registry site.

MS. ETKIN: Right.

MR. JACOBS: Wouldn't it be a good idea to put a link to then on the registry site?

MS. ETKIN: That's a good suggestion.

MR. JACOBS: Thank you.

MR. SHULER: With that advancement in knowledge, we will close this particular match. I want to thank everybody for the first drama free plenary session ever. Thank you. We will be take a half hour dessert break. We will open up the second match at what time, four, four o'clock. Thank you everyone.

(Break in proceedings.)

MS. SEARS: We just want to make a point of clarification that came up in the last session about GPO and getting funding for the digitization project. That was brought up in October and other meetings as well and GPO has investigated that and Ric may want to speak to this more and Ted. Ted was the one that originally gave us the response to that. And GPO does not have the authority to do grants, so they can't do that.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I'm just going to echo what you said there. I was part of the
group that did some initial investigation and put

together a preliminary list at the time of grant

opportunities that was a document that we put forth that
could be used and updated as needed by Council. And in
terms of the grant authority, it's absolutely the case.
We do not have grant authority and based on that, beyond
sharing as we are aware as you do in the Community, of
opportunities, that really is not a function we can
entertain.

MR. SHULER: Did that answer the question,
Suzanne?

MS. SEARS: Yes, John. We just wanted to
clarify so that question doesn't keep coming up.

MR. SHULER: All right. Now, welcome to the
second match of the afternoon, which is about FDsys and
what you have here is the first slide of this group and
I'm going to turn it over to them to start posing the
questions and getting the conversation started.

MS. MORIEARTY: Hi, everyone. Jill
Moriearty, University of Utah. And these questions are
intended to supplement that information that we received
this morning and I hope everyone had a chance to attend
that excellent presentation of FDsys that was provided
to us by GPO. How many people attended? Look around
guys, that's a fantastic turnout. Well, we are going to
supplement some of this information with our questions
and at anytime please feel free to come up to the mike
and ask any followup questions you may have. First,
FDsys is defined as a content management system with
many planned releases. Have GPO goals for FDsys changed
since the project was initiated? GPO?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I was wondering
if someone else was going to answer that. Speaking for
GPO, no, the goals have not changed. The one thing --
actually a couple of things I'd like to add to that is,
yes, it's a server content management system, but it is
also a bit more than that. It's an advanced search
system as well and it's also a preservation repository.
I think that if you look at your handout there is a
system map also showing where FDsys also relates to
other systems at the agency. And back in other public
documentation that we have off of the FDsys Web site in
our ConOps and also in our requirements document, it
shows visually and also in narrative format how it's
really those three things and more than a content management system.

We talked this morning about how my unit defines the requirements, works with you, the Community, to define your requirements and we give them to the management office to build the system. I can tell you my goals have certainly not changed. I think the thing that we have seen expand at GPO, the Public Printer talked about this morning, is that perhaps wasn't anticipated years ago, was the open government initiatives, the work that is being done with the XML as part of the open government initiatives data.gov and things of that nature. So there is an expansion, but not a change of what I view as the goals. I would be interested as well with hearing from the Community about given goals for this system initially whether your goals have changed or whether they are still the same.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. Anybody in Council want to deliver a volley? Seeing none, how about out in the audience? So are you all set in that meeting this morning and you thought it was just the bee's knees, hey? You're ready to rush into the great arms of that digital future with no regrets, with all hope and charity? Going once. You have no goals whatsoever with what you saw this morning? My lord.

MS. MORIEARTY: Perhaps I can tempt them with the next question, John.

MR. SHULER: Perhaps so, Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: Could GPO give the Community an update on the actual functionality of the program as reflected in the major capabilities of FDsys document, particularly for Release number 1.

MR. WASH: I am Mike Wash, the GPO. There is a page in your handouts that has discussion of Release 1 and Release 2 functionality. It's a two pager. Bob Tapella this morning answered I think pretty well, but let me put it in my words. What Release 1 is, it's a lot of work associated with creating what we call the foundation system of FDsys. So it's the core functionality of the content management system and it's also responsible for providing the enhanced access to the data in the content management system. Plus it is the migration of GPO Access content that is currently in the WAY systems into FDsys, add to that the presentation
depository and the authentication tools. That is what Release 1 is. Also in this document is a description of what will be included in Release 2 of the system which is really focused on submission. Opening up the system so that it goes beyond the type of submission that is capable of being supported today. Today's submission, within FDsys, because we needed to have some form of submission in the early stage of the system to be able to ingest GPO Access content, but it's a limited level of submission. It's limited to GPO's plan operations to be able to put forward content into FDsys, as well as the submission of actually the team to be able to migrate content in. And the other examples of submission that we support today is the office of the Federal Register. They provide content directly to us and it goes into the system, particularly the daily compilation of presidential documents, but we need to go further than that so the rest of the federal government agencies and Congress can do direct submission into the system. In this document you can see an analysis of what will be left. It's in bold on the simple list on the back. What will be left after we are done with Release 2 that has not yet been completed in some of the original scope. So there is some things you can see that won't be included, but those don't include the core functionality of submission, content management, access, preservation and authentication.

MS. MORIEARTY: You might want to stay there.

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Ross-Blakely Law Library, Arizona State University. Thanks for all this, Mike. When you refer to submission, is that the same as the migration or the ingestion of the collections that have been under discussion, I think the 40 collections? Are all those terms interchangable?

MR. WASH: Not really, and we probably use them a little too sloppy. Submission in the content management system is really the activity of moving data into a content management system, so it's submitted. For example, if you saw the presentation this morning, Blank went through a submission activity where it was federal register from Friday -- no, it was the Blake's fake document, I think it was. He actually went through the work flow process of preparing the data and actually
pushing the submit button so it goes into the system. Migration is really different because it's an activity of transforming data from one form into something that is compatible with a new system and so that doesn't mean changing it necessarily, but on GPO Access today in many of the files that are included in that system, they are in various formats and some of them aren't even accessible any longer. So migration is actually moving them up to a new form so that they will be accessible. And then particularly for FDsys, it's putting them into a form that we can submit. So migration is the activity to move it from one type of format, if you will, to another. And then the submission is actually moving it into the content management system. When we say we are ingesting content into FDsys, it's a submission activity.

MS. TROTTA: Thank you.

MR. WASH: There's a document in your packet, entitled "How Does FDsys Improve My Life as a Librarian?" I think if you go through this document you will see some of the things that are different and hopefully enhanced. What has been done, as we have been developing the system, is we have looked in the day of the life today and listened to the feedback from the Community of what needed to be done differently or better or etc. And hopefully what you will see in September, in the scenario that you described, will be the realization of many of the things that you discussed are indeed there, but many of those things are there today in the stages of FDsys. As we have been moving from January of last year through today, there is continual increases in either the content that's in the system or in some cases some functionality as well. So certainly the access elements are enhanced substantially in FDsys and that will be seen in the September time frame.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Something I want to add to that, that I brought up this morning, was more of the, let's tell them what we want. I think particularly while Release 1 is in this beta stage, I know everyone has certainly used FDsys and has used the search capability, but I think it would be interesting to take this document that talks about how life improves or changes on that date that John put out and go back
and revalidate that and say, well, this is nice. What
is missing? What else do I want in terms of what they
are releasing through this first release? What else do
I want that I'm not getting?

MR. WASH: This is Mike. Maybe one followup
to that. When we did what we call voice of customer,
it's the market research working very closely with Ric
and his team. There are several passes to this. We
have done this for the last five years in the prior
systems. Basically the first thing you'd like to do is
have a conversation and find out what are some of the
unmet needs in an information system. So what are the
things that you think you would like? You have that
conversation and then, you know, a team goes back like
the IT team and the PMO, and says, this is what I think
we heard. This is how I think we can fix it. A key
part of that activity is validation. Go back and have
another conversation and say this is what we thought we
heard. Did we hear it right? And many times we didn't
and we have to correct. So here we are five years,
almost six years down the road on this project and we
have delivered major functionality within FDsys and this
simple page and-a-half document are some of the things
that you will see when you go to use the system today.
What Ric is really talking about is it's a macro type of
validation. So now here we are through a major release
of the system, how did we do? And I think that that
path of validation say, this is what you said you wanted
us to do and is this is what we have done? Have we hit
the mark? How far have we missed the mark and those are
things that we can do in the future to slowly close
those gaps or hopefully there are not that many. But
there is that continuous validation. What is it that
you want? Help us understand as a project team. We
deliver it in different conversations and hope the
course is corrected to get to the final conclusion.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: Don't move. We have seen
this document, something that I had not read before and
it's our next question, when will Release 1 be out of
beta?

MR. WASH: Beta is kind of one of these
fuzzy words and let me try to describe that. This is
Mike. Beta means it is really still in an evaluation
stage and the last thing that any project team wants to do is have a system in beta forever or what feels like forever. But in January of 2009, when we were faced with an opportunity to launch the early stage of FDsys to deliver access to eight collections, we had a lot of serious discussion inside of GPO, whether or not to launch with only eight collections with substantially better functionality than WAYS or wait until we have all of the collections migrated so that we could immediately move to a new system. And the conclusion obviously was that we wanted to launch with the functionality with a limited number of collections. But at that same time we said, let's define what it's going to take to get this system out of beta, so that we would no longer refer to it as something in test or in the evaluation stage. Which is what you naturally think of when you see beta. And we set a couple of criteria that we had to achieve in order to move out of beta. Number one was to get all the content out of GPO Access that is currently in WAYS, so that we could move away from WAYS which was one of the key voice of customers we heard repeatedly, was get us off of WAYS, so that was number one. We had to get all the content out of GPO Access and into a new system. Number two, which is very critical for all of us, hopefully nothing that we never have to experience, but nonetheless. Number two was that we had continuity of access so that if something happened to the main system in GPO headquarters on North Capital Street, whether it's a power failure, which we have experienced, whether it's some sort of problem in DC, there will be no interruptions in access to the information in GPO for the federal publications. So to us that meant, from a government agency perspective, continuity of operations or COOP and for GPO's FDsys, that means continuity of access, so it would mean absolutely no interaction of the ability to access regardless of what happened at 732 North Capital. If the data would be automatically switched over it would be accessible. So those two things were our criteria. So we are now on a path to complete the migration of data off of the WAY servers to be completed in June, June 30th, which is good. We are in group five of all the collections where we just released group four two weeks ago, is that right? So group five is the final
documents in a collection to remove the last of the
information from WAYS and then by August we will have a
fail-over capability of continuity of access and it will
be fully tested at the point in time where we will
actually break connection to the production capability
of FDsys and demonstrate that it works in a fail-over
sense for access to our alternate computer facility.

And at that point we will be happy to say we remove the
beta's.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MS. MORIEARTY: All right. I think we had part of our next question answered and that is when will the sunsetting of GPO Access go forward or be rescheduled for some future date? I think you have answered part of that in your last statement.

MR. WASH: I'll take part of it and then Ric can take the mike. The sunsetting of GPO Access is an activity that will extend beyond August because there is a lot of activities associated with sunsetting a system so the two criteria are the things that are going to remove the beta and we have a high confidence that we will be able to get that done by August. The sunsetting of the GPO Access in being able to retire the infrastructure that really supports GPO Access includes some other things and probably Ric can better state them.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think that the date that we are sticking to at this point is end of the year, December. I think that also gives us several months to look at this, the COOP capability that Mike described where they -- technically they break the snap with the production environment and insure a fail-over. We've got a system of record that has served us well for 15, going on 16 years. So you don't want to jump and do this too quickly, which is part of the reason we have been running in a parallel environment for sometime. At the same time as the program management office has been identifying collections of content, what we commonly refer to as data sets, like the congressional record and reports, etc., I think it's also important that together GPO, Council and the library community go back and make sure that nothing gets left behind because you don't want to find that you're in a situation where you have a big oops situation and there was something on GPO Access
that was critical or relevant and it got missed. So I'm conservative in approach about pulling the trigger, turning off the servers and powering down which is why they have been running in this beta position as long as they have. I want to make sure when we do it, we are as certain as we can be.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. One collection I can tell you for sure that lawyers and law librarians love is the ECFR. So if that could, from GPO Access make it's way to FDsys, it would be great. MR. WASH: I can respond to that briefly and just give you an idea of what is going on there. Bob mentioned that this morning, I think a little bit, as well. The ECFR project is a pretty big project in itself. Mike White is our customer to provide the requirements and it's a topic of your conversations on regular about the ECFR. ECFR today is a fairly simple system, when you boil it down, to provide that snapshot of what the ECFR looks like on a daily basis. What we want to go, and Mike can correct me if I'm wrong here, we want to really create a point in time system. We want to create a point in time system that will really serve as a replacement to the current ECFR and that's going to be a lot of work, but I think it's something that is achievable, particularly with the great work that's been done with creating the content management system of FDsys because each of the elements are structured pieces of the ECFR today or the Federal Register as it's creating the effective sections in the ECFR are unique and identified objects within a content management system. That is a step that we had to go through to really look at creating a point in time system that would work effectively as an ECFR. So I think we are really positioned nicely now. We have a lot of work ahead of us to do that, but we are positioned nicely with the foundational system of FDsys, federal publications and particularly the Federal Register and the code of federal regulations that will allow us to create a good point in time system to meet the needs of the Community, as well as the federal register.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mike has it right about the structure of the ECFR, but I would have an
additional question. Is there a remnant of GPO Access
that will stand in place for ECFR while we do the
development work that is necessary to get it into FDsys?

MR. WASH: The answer is yes. Seriously,
al of the systems of ECFR is going to stay until we
create a replacement for it. So it's not going to go
away. It's not going to change. We are going to
continue to support it, so we know how critical it is.

MR. WHITE: As somebody on the Council said,
there are a lot of lawyers that are dependent on it
everyday. It is really our only system that was built
outside of WAYS per se. So I think the architecture
probably, it doesn't have to be extricated as much from
WAYS, but it is still a very challenging project. And
if I may pitch it a little more, when it was first
released in beta about 2001, we were meeting the two day
turnaround that will we set for it, so the editors at
the FOR are reading the amendments in the FOR today.
They are putting them into the ECFR. GPO takes and data
processes that material and it's posted. So there is a
two day update span. When we started it was beating
WesLaw by sometimes a month or more. Even today I can
look on WesLaw and not see it updated two weeks. So
when we talk about it being a revolutionary system for
free and open access to information, that's the heart of
it. You know, we are providing a service well beyond
what the high cost providers are giving us and that's a
big deal to lawyers and other practitioners.

MR. SHULER: Do we have an amen from the
audience for that?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff from
Valparaiso University Law Library. I just have a
question about the point in time. So what you are
saying that will exist then like every time it's changed
there will be a version of it saved because like what
access and WesLaw have now, is just as current through
this issue of the Federal Register and that's when they
change it. They change the date there. I don't know --
I'm not sure what the point in time -- what the
reason -- reasoning for doing that is. I mean
practically why?

MR. WASH: I mean -- but you understand what
the point in time system means or no?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Well, I think I do. So you
MR. WHITE: Well, we are under some restrictions that WesLaw or LEXIS doesn't particularly have to worry about. Everyday at ECFR is a unique data set. People make decisions about their businesses, about their legal liabilities everyday based on that material. So if you have an accident two years ago, it would be useful to look at the ECFR from two years ago and pin down exactly what the laws and regulations related to that were because that is a law that will govern. So, from our prospective we also have to worry about the freedom of information act and the federal records act. Right now the content of the ECFR is not preserved in a manner that you would call truly accessible. We do some data backup, but we lose the illustrations and we have a lot of scrambled text. It's not publicly accessible in a way that up-to-date content management system on top of a sophisticated data base would provide. So that is what we are hoping that FDsys will do for us. So, yes, you're right, it's tremendously useful right now as a point in time system to note what does it say today, but it also is important for access to prior legal information.

MR. SHULER: More questions from Council? Okay, next slide.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. Our next question would be, is the full implementation of FDsys relying upon funding and if so does GPO have a plan if further funding is curtailed what functionality would remain?

MR. WASH: This is Mike. Yes, it certainly is dependent upon funding. The last part of that question -- it is dependent upon funding. What we have plans for right now in the current appropriated funding is to allow us to complete Release 1, which is that core foundational system, all of GPO Access migrated into FDsys with the access capability preservation, framework and tools for authentication, that is Release 1 and we have the funding to complete that. We also have the funding to get us on our way to the development aspects
of Release 2 which is the submission piece. Our estimate is to complete full functionality which is Release 2 from that earlier document that we talked about. It's an additional $8,000,000. And that $8,000,000 is the costs for us to do the development, testing and launch of that functionality and have confidence that it is going to work.

If the funding is curtailed or constrained it's going to affect the schedule. It affects the schedule as well as the total cost, to be real honest. The $8,000,000 assumes a certain amount of contractor activity that's currently in place. Over the last three years, I think GPO has done a really good job of finding some of the best contractors that are skilled in a system we are building. So we have a core team and we understand it very well. We understand the cost profile and we understand the productivity that we can get out of those contractors. Given that and an understanding of what we need to do to finish Release 2, our estimate is $8,000,000 and that $8,000,000 will allow us to complete Release 2 in 2011. If the funding is constrained, therefore, less than $8,000,000 that's available, we have to lose some of the resources. So that is one of the benefits of working with the contractor community, you can easily ratchet down some of the number resources that you have on the job, that saves you money, but it is also skilled resources that you no longer have available. So that when either more money becomes available or more time becomes available, which would be required, you have to either develop the skill that you reduced or go and find it back and hire it back and restart it. So the net of it is, you can do a simple algebra and say, well, if you only have $4,000,000 it is going to take two years instead of one. It's not quite true. If you only have $4,000,000 per year it will probably take two-and-a-half years just because of the productivity of the resources and the development. So long answer again, but our estimate is $8,000,000 to complete the core functionality, if we can do it over the course of a year in calendar 2011. If it's curtailed, it delays -- if it's completely eliminated, we stop until we figure out within the agency how to extract money out of our revolving fund to be able to get enough money to
continue the development.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. I think that I heard Mr. Tapella say this morning that the actual request for FDsys has been reduced for the next budget. And I seem to remember a reduction of less than a million dollars. Did I hear that correctly?

MR. WASH: Yes. What Bob said this morning was that in a flat funded year-on-year, which was one of the requests that we had in preparation for the appropriation meetings that was really just completed in the last couple of weeks. FDsys or FY 11 was reduced to 5.7 million dollars. One million dollars for advance print technology and one million dollars for elevator repair. I probably have those numbers a little bit wrong. But if there was reduction in what we call the revolving fund for appropriations which was the method that was used to do flat funding year-on-year. So 5.7 million dollars is not 8 million dollars, but we need to self fund the remaining from our revolving fund and that's internal challenge that we have to find money to do that. Some could come from SNE appropriations or it would come from our revolving fund, so we've got to work to close that account.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think sometimes it's easy for us internally in the building to understand the different types of funds and where they come from, but I want to elaborate that the day-to-day operating costs of running FDsys come from the salaries and expenses of appropriation, just as they have with GPO Access for the last 15 years. For those of you who were around back then, you might remember that the statement was made by congress that there would be no additional funds to run GPO Access because there would be cost savings because of print elimination and I'm here to tell you that didn't happen.

MR. SHULER: Any questions from the audience? So we got all that? I'd ask you a question, you'd answer it? Anything from Council? Next question?

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Ross-Blakely Law Library, Arizona State University. How will GPO notify stakeholders when features are deferred from FDsys release? And does GPO have a plan for involving stakeholders in setting FDsys implementation and release
MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. In some ways I feel like we have been doing it for years through conferences. I think that as Bob mentioned, the program review where we also had a variety stakeholders together in the room, including Hill staff, my unit, other business units, the Council chair, the incoming chair was critical. I don't know, as none of us know, whether Bob will be around at the time of the next Council meeting, but something that he suggested, that I think is a good idea, is for October we were talking about, you know, taking that program review to a broader scale. We are obviously doing somewhat of a program review right now, but we did a three to four hour one that GPO really drilled down into the details and perhaps having all of Council there, since you'll already be in Crystal City, or Arlington, anyway but having that back at GPO and having everyone there. So I think that those types of things we need to do on a more regular basis. We have the social networking capabilities obviously to communicate outward dissemination on what we are doing, what is being deferred, what is changing, but I also think where we are talking about Council involvement with the FDLP Desktop and the Community site and to social networking, I think we have more collaborative opportunities to engage there on a regular basis with you and with the Community beyond having simple lip serve type technologies where we are pushing messages out.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything from Council? The audience, how are you? I hope you're sitting easily, comfortable in your knowledge. Your boldness of answers. Nothing? It's only going to get sharper as we go along. All right.

MS. MORIEARTY: Okay. As we look -- I'm so glad.

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. I think it's particularly important that we look at releases and release priorities and we look again because I think that a lot of those priorities were set when we were in a different era. So I was late getting here because I was on the phone in a conference call with our vendor and we are looking at new tools to bring in data sources into our
primo discovery tool. And one of the resources we would love to bring in is the data and FDsys, Metadata, and that requires OAIPMH. It doesn't necessarily require it, but that's the easiest and best way for us to get a lot of that data and that's how we are defining that data, kind of data we prioritize to get in. So I think that many of us may be in different places and although OAIPMH was certainly around then, a lot of us are looking again at some of those (inaudible) as being more important then we might have thought before.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I know these documents are not like that type of reading, however, I encourage all of you to go to the FDsys Web site and click on the link that says more documentation and if you look there, there are the various versions of the concept of operations document, the requirements document in particular. As we were talking this morning about PURLs, for example, where we talk about it, I call building a bridge of stability to get to an FDsys of the future for persistent name, part of what would help me, and I think help the PMO, is to go back and look at those requirements for persistent name, look at those requirements for ILS integration and answer two questions, are they still valid yes or no and what is missing? Because as Geoff mentioned, there has been a time delay since those requirements were development and is that where their focus should still be.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Name and serial number.

MS. DALECKY: I'm sorry. Selene Dalecky, GPO. Just to followup on the requirements, what Geoff presented was an excellent use case and that is just as important for us or more important because knowing what the requirements, what would be good to have is one thing, but knowing how it is going to be used, not only by one person but reused multiple times, that helps set priorities and helps us to find what the actual functionality is going to be. So I think that one thing that we have learned over this whole development process is to be smarter and to understand not only that you need the technology, but how it is going to be used. That was just an excellent example, in really to help us define what comes next.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.
Wouldn't it be helpful for the rest of the Community if on the Community Web site we actually had a thread going where people could post what they are using the information for from FDsys and what they would like to see in the future in releases? We could pose what they are using the information from FDsys and what they would like to see in the future.

MR. SHULER: I think that's an excellent idea considering our earlier endorsements of using the FDLP community Web site for more further communication and social networking amongst depository librarians.

I'm going to ask any pointed question of the Community and this is leading into the next questions and it surprises me -- frankly, it surprises me your complacency about this coming system. I don't think you really understand what a major change it is in terms of the relationship between GPO and the content creators as well as what that relationship would mean for federal depository libraries. I'll use as exhibit 1, the loss of the weekly compilation of presidential documents to a digital counterpart and there was not one disturbance in the force when that happened a year ago. I'm so choked up about it. I would imagine that that is only the first that will be lost, if you will, to the great digital uplift and I put it to you, as the empire in the chair, does that not shake your complacency? Michelle.

MS. MCKNELLY: I didn't want to run and interfere with the force. Michelle McKnelly, University of Wisconsin, River Falls, a very small place. I have been listening about FDsys for a number of years, for a really long time and I think that I want to come and talk about this IG report, that came out in March. A lot of the information that's coming out seems to be directly answering some of the criticisms that came out of this report. And in what John has been talking about some of this was, what do we expect and how will we be in Peoria in the future once this system launches? When this concept was introduced, when the library community and other communities got behind it, there was a great expectation it was do all. It was sold to us that way. Everything would be in there. It would ingest all of this material. This report points out to what I think our, you know, problems with that concept and if that concept is no longer valid, then this needs to be
rescoped out to the Community. Because I think there are a lot of institutional administrators out in the depository community who are expecting to be able to remove materials from their shelves, based on the idea that these historic documents were going to be ingested and available and authenticated in the system. But at this point when you look at the materials for Release 1, we are not even seeing basic ILS functionality. And I think that this is very concerning to me because I believe that we are going to have trust issues going into the future because we were planning on this functioning in a certain way and we are not seeing that functionality, so if someone wants to address that or you can throw fruit at me later.

MR. SHULER: GPO?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. A lot of parts to that that we can delve into. One of the things that I'd like to talk a little bit about because it spun off of what I mentioned early, let's talk about ILS integration. Going back to the requirements and looking at what that entails, what is mentioned there beside crosswalks to the ILS and what are your wants from the system because I believe in the requirements document, and I think it's listed on the What's Coming Release 1 and 2, there is discussion about where ILS functionality fits, but when you go back and actually read the requirements, it was a discussion of integration. FDsys currently produces MODS and PREMIS Metadata files. The ILS produces MARC. I know that the PMO staff right now is using some the Metadata fields associated with MARC to help populate those MODS Metadata files. From a voice of customer perspective in the library unit, what I'd like to see is a future in which those automate together and by crosswalk I mean that you are able to get to that information, but there is no loss of functionality. ILS continues as we wait for that enhancement. But that is exactly the kind of point that I think Selene was making about hearing more about what is not happening and what it is you want and part of that is looking back at the requirements to say what is missing? What are we not getting right now that we need?

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. So to be absolutely clear, come the magical date in September,
MR. WASH: This is Mike. That is correct, but they will be interfaced together. This is Mike from GPO.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Could you expand on that just a bit?

MR. WASH: Ric called it a crosswalk. You have independent systems. We have a number of systems at GPO and this is an IT technology. If the requirements are for systems to talk to each other, our job is to make sure that they talk to each other. ILS is a completely independent system, but some of the Metadata elements associated with information and ILS are shared with FDsys so we interface them together. On the sheet, this one, Discussion of Release Functionality 1 and 2, item number 11, ILS integration. ILS integration doesn't mean that we subsume ILS into FDsys. It means that ILS is there and it's integrating with FDsys. Item 12, Enterprise Service Bus is the tool that we use to do that. It was listed as a requirement. It's not really a requirement. It's not a functional requirement. It's a tool that we use to integrate systems together. We do it all the time at GPO. It's part of creating functionality without creating one mega system. You keep the best of the systems that you have, maintain them and integrate them together. And this one follows to Michelle's comments and questions. I think you know we have talked about it, FDsys, for quite sometime, but we have been focusing on creating the functionality and this core functionality of the capability to ingest or submit content into the system. The capability to be able to use existing data, as well as day forward data. Like our daily feeds of the Federal Register of the Congressional Record. It happens almost automatically everyday. The demo this morning showed that we can except converted content back to 1951 and the statutes at large. We demonstrated that. So our job has been to create a system that has the capability to do certain things. What we do next really is input from you. What is the priority of the data that comes into the system now from the retrospect aspect? Do we go after the harvested? Do we go after the converted? The system is
MR. SHULER: Council? We are into the last question. We have about a half hour left of the match.

MS. MORIEARTY: But we have one more slide.

MR. SHULER: We have one more slide? What?

How did that happen?

MS. MORIEARTY: We snuck it in. As we look forward to an even more robust FDsys or -- by the way, GPO, we are going to have to have only one name for this thing sooner or later. What are the problems or challenges that GPO faces? Are there ways in which the Community can help address those changes?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I'm going to step out of the policy realm and go over to the technical realm for a second and speak to what I know are some of the challenges thus far. The big one being, of course, the normalization of the data. I think that you guys can tell me technically where I'm going off kilter here. I think there was a hope and an expectation that early on in the data migration process, that data sets would be similar and that parsers created to work with one data set would work with another data set. And I think that in normalizing the data from GPO Access and migrating it over, having the appropriate tagging to offer the advanced search capabilities that you see, filtering, etc., there was a lot of additional work and expense that had to be associated with that. I don't know if there were other issues or challenges you want to address.

Speaking to the second issue, I'm sounding a bit like a broken record here, but in terms of how the Community can help address challenges going forward, I can't emphasize enough to go back and reread the ConOps and reread the requirements document and tell us, as these releases go forward, what you're not getting, what unmet needs there are, what else needs to be delivered. Working with Council, what are your priorities so that we make sure that is what GPO is doing.

MR. WASH: I'd like to just add onto that a little bit. The requirements document and the concept of operation are living documents to us. The other thing that I think would be really helpful would be to really experience the system, use it and tell us what you'd like to see differently. There are new
technologies coming out. We talked about the social media aspect. We've talked about the possibility of RSS feeds for notifications. We've talked about the need for an API, for interface to the system to be able to do other things. We demonstrated both data with the Federal Register, and Code of Federal Regulation with many if not most of the bills. How much of that type of functionality is needed? There is a lot of things that are changing very, very rapidly. So it's experiencing today and also what do you want to see in the future for this type of system to be able to do the things that you need. Help us understand that, prioritize those things, as well as the type of data that you would like to see in the system and that's the type of information, working with Ric and his team, we can then prioritize and figure out how we can slide it for the functionality to be released.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything else from Council? James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. There has been some discussion on the live blog about a new name for FDsys and some of the names mentioned were Franklin and Madison and the last one that came up, which I would personally sponsor would be Adelaide.

MR. SHULER: Anybody in the audience? Good.

MS. MCKNELLY: I would like to compliment Council on these questions in really getting to the heart of many of the issues here and thank you for your hard work.

MR. SHULER: Don't go away, but I want to get back to your comment where we are going from here and what we are promised. I'd like to have as chair a singular moment of reconciliation, okay? What you have heard over the last hour or so is a way that we can walk away from what happened before and accept that the Council working with GPO and the Community will provide that document on the releases that would explain to the Community well enough that they know what is going on. With the understanding that the Community will get on the damn Web and use the system and start tearing it apart and sending in the comments.

MS. MCKNELLY: You know, John, I have been using the system --
MR. SHULER: Agreed.

MS. MCKNELLY -- and I have to tell you, there's some problems, like when the system goes down for maintenance at five o'clock eastern time, it is not the time off where many people are. So we have been using the system, but we need to have the realistic expectations of what the system is going to do.

MR. SHULER: If we can agree then that this moment starts, we get a do over. Let's give a do over to ourselves.

MS. MCKNELLY: I'm not taking a do over. It's GPO that takes the do over.

MR. SHULER: Forgive the vernacular. Never mind. If you guys don't want to reconcile and still assign the blame then we will need to keep walking this walk for a little while. What I'm saying is simply, if the mechanisms exists, if GPO can tell us that they hear our observations and criticisms and they assure us they will react to them, will that be a step forward for the Community?

MS. MCKNELLY: I don't speak for the Community.

MR. SHULER: But you are a member of the Community.

MS. MCKNELLY: I think that is a good first step. We need to have realistic expectation and we have to work on the trust issue because if GPO is not a trusted party to fulfill these -- to fulfill what they are promising us, that is probably not the right word, then we are just going to be back at the same point again where we have our expectations built and then people feel disappointed. So we need to have them to become a trusted party. So, yes, we should start over.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame. I was on the group that selected a company called (inaudible) for RILS system. This sounds real familiar. I mean, they promised us it would slice. It would dice. It would control absolutely everything we can in the most seamless way possible. And, yes, we bought it and guess what? When we had it the first week, it was alpha. It wasn't even at beta. I think that we have to cut GPO a little bit of slack here in terms of this is, you know, you wrote the expectations listening to the Community and I think you move forward as best you can.
Actually it works just perfect at Notre Dame now. If you believe that, I have property for you. So it's in there. But the one thing I want to highlight it goes to that last question and, Mike -- I don't know if you heard it the way I did, but Mike dropped a very important bomb in there that I'm not sure everyone heard, you know. What do you want to go forward with and we had two buzzes going on in here. My director wants -- you know, it's all digital. Get that old stuff in there because then I can dump it off of my shelf. At the same time I'm hearing it's borne digital and we are going to lose it. If I heard Mike correctly, and I hope I did, Mike, there is some direction. If you are like my library, I want it all and I want it all now, instead of, which is better? Do we make the ERL, my director, happy, old stuff, off the shelf. Do you make me happy going, you know, fugitive has been a problem. It is going to continue to be a problem. Do we have one chance of maybe, maybe taking a little crack at stopping a fugitive and then we will work on the other one. But hopefully GPO is going to have all the answers and we will give GPO their wisdom, based on channeling all of us to give the priorities that are on there.

MR. SHULER: Thank you for --

MR. HAYES: But look at what you did, are you coming close? What limited knowledge I have, they are coming real close. Is it's perfect? I don't think so. Will it ever be perfect? I don't think so.

MR. SHULER: Council?

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

I kind of have a question, it's probably a stupid question, about being able to take the content into FDsys. So right now you are almost ready to fully release the statutes at large. You are just awaiting congressional approval on that. Moving forward, are you using the example of the statutes at large as an example that this is easy to do and looking forward it will be easier and easier to be able to upload the content or will things get kind of trapped in that approval process more often and if so what can we do to help push that, whether it be community starts writing their congressman? What can we do about moving forward?

MR. SHULER: Maybe I can pose that as a hypothetical at this stage. If I were, as chair, to
pose a question to the Community, that if the JCP
allowed for the experiment to take place at our Council
meeting this morning, would folks in this, by the voice
vote naturally, so the recorder can hear, would the
people in this room who are members of the Community, if
JCP were in this room say to them give us the rest of
it, what would you say? Would it be a yes, a complete
yes?
THE AUDIENCE: Yes.
MR. SHULER: What you saw in that room
indicated go for it, would that be a yes?
THE AUDIENCE: Yes.
MR. SHULER: It's in the official record.
Ric.
MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think they
answered the question. I think that's good feedback.
As I said in my speech this morning we need approval.
There is no approval, as we have been told, no authority
for GPO to digitize, but there has been a sentiment of
support expressed. So we need that first, something to
jump start this to show a couple of things; number one,
that GPO can do it, number two, that it's not going to
break the bank, and number three, and more importantly
is the question of by doing it doesn't delay other
things that we want from FDsys. Does it put other
things on hold? Where does it fit in the priority
chain? I think those are the big questions and answers
to take back to the oversite committee and I think the
resounding yes shows the support for that. When I look
back at the 2004 vision documents created by the PMO,
again, I don't see it as taking something away. I see
converted content in there as something that was
envisioned from the beginning, so I don't view it as a
tradeoff.
MR. SHULER: Council? All right we are
ready for the next slide.
MR. SCHOENFIELD: Roger Schoenfield. We're
at a point of transition with the GPO, with the Public
Printer. I was curious if there was a good way to not
just think about this as an advocacy to the JCP, but
also to make sure that the new Public Printer sees the
importance that the Community seems to see of this issue
as well.
MR. SHULER: Okay. So noted. We have
reached the third slide. Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: I'm sorry guys, but this is where Camilla, Victoria and myself wanted to kind of pull everything together to followup with some discussion as used for Council with the idea that FDsys is something we want. We have been waiting for it. We want it to happen and we want to assist in its development and we want Council to start thinking and discussing some of these issues involving FDsys. Of course the first one, oh, boy, I wish I had my glasses. Again, Council would like -- ageing is so wonderful. Council would like a concise business plan for FDsys moving forward that which will include a discussion of the ingestion of documents into FDsys of both content from government agencies and outside entities through partnerships. We'd like to discuss if the goals and implementations 2 and 3 can not be met, Council would at least like to see the ability to ingest converted digitized content increased and would like to see improved navigation of the relationship between the publication as well as notification to users and delivery by RSS, e-mail and FDP. GPO is also financing requirements for migrating legacy applications like PURLs to FDsys for later system capability releases. Council was told that once FDsys is fully enabled, GPO will have migrated into a more modern and scaleable infrastructure. Moving forward, Council would like a concise plan for stable and redundant systems to access online content. While congressionally appropriated funds have been put towards improving FDsys, we want more assurance GPO is focusing some energy and resources on improving the stability of PURLs and the legacy servers.

MR. SHULER: Does Council have anything further, based on those three points, to present? To the Community I think what you have just witnessed Council 2.0. We are the recommendations through our discussion and what we give to you in GPO at the same time. So does the Community have any response to the three points?

MS. MORIEARTY: Come on, guys.

MR. SHULER: You are totally coprostatic with this approach? It's good to be chair.

MS. MORIEARTY: It's okay.
MR. SHULER: It's okay. The people are happy. This will guide Council's hand into October.

MS. MORIEARTY: And you know how I can get.

MR. SHULER: Any further discussion? I do believe then, based on my considerable experience, that we are done talking about this, in this fashion and except from now on it will be a notion of going forward in collaboration and deliberation with our GPO partners through the well established means of communication, which we all take advantage of, of course, and through the good work of Council. Yes, somebody, yes.

MS JIALAL: Kamanie Jialal, St. John's Law School. I can understand you wanting our answers to the what you have written there. Can we have a little more time? I don't know if anybody feels the same way, but I couldn't answer you right now when the meeting is over in ten minutes. Can we maybe discuss it tomorrow, maybe Wednesday?

MR. SHULER: By all means.

MS JIALAL: So we can have just a little bit more time.

MR. SHULER: Point taken. Just because we don't have the answers at this moment, doesn't mean that we can't use the advantage of those wonderful social networking tools that we have available through the Community Desktop of which you are all going to sign up and be part of, no doubt. We can continue this conversation online in that fashion because that is the Council meeting between the times we meet physically.

Mr. SHULER: It's okay. The people are happy. This will guide Council's hand into October.

MS. MORIEARTY: And you know how I can get.

MR. SHULER: Any further discussion? I do believe then, based on my considerable experience, that we are done talking about this, in this fashion and except from now on it will be a notion of going forward in collaboration and deliberation with our GPO partners through the well established means of communication, which we all take advantage of, of course, and through the good work of Council. Yes, somebody, yes.

MS JIALAL: Kamanie Jialal, St. John's Law School. I can understand you wanting our answers to the what you have written there. Can we have a little more time? I don't know if anybody feels the same way, but I couldn't answer you right now when the meeting is over in ten minutes. Can we maybe discuss it tomorrow, maybe Wednesday?

MR. SHULER: By all means.

MS JIALAL: So we can have just a little bit more time.

MR. SHULER: Point taken. Just because we don't have the answers at this moment, doesn't mean that we can't use the advantage of those wonderful social networking tools that we have available through the Community Desktop of which you are all going to sign up and be part of, no doubt. We can continue this conversation online in that fashion because that is the Council meeting between the times we meet physically.

We've got the Web people, as annoying as they are.

Okay, what have they got?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, University of Stanford. The Web people are about to speak. I have a comment on a live blog. Could someone clarify the purpose of FDsys? Is it primary, and this is regarding earlier questions about change in focus of FDsys. Is it primary easy way to use public gateway of information or more of an official publishing arm repository? Why I ask, FDsys program review differentiates FDsys from USA.gov saying that USA.gov a "a Web portal that makes it easy for the public to get US Government information and services on the Web. But the purpose of FDsys is not to serve as a portal, but instead to provide access to official and authentic content." A little bit more.
It says the main functions of FDsys are publishing information, enabling, searching for information, preserving the information and providing version control. The knowledgeable forever government document says that one criterion for the digital FDLP is to have "a common easy to use technology for the public to access the information." So I will just circle around again and say this question one more time. Could someone clarify the purpose of FDsys as the primary easy to use public gateway to information or more of an official publishing arm repository?

MR. SHULER: We have seven minutes on the game clock. Ric.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I'll be very quick in the answer. A repeat of what I said earlier. It's an advanced search system. It's a content management system. It's a digital repository. I wrote that answer to the FAQ in the program report about USA.gov. There has often been some question about whether or not in the past GPO Access was a portal. Whether or not FDsys going forward is a portal, no. We are not in the portal business. We are not in the gateway business for that purpose. We are a content repository of official and authentic content. Period.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. I'm looking at you guys. Anything else from our esteemed Council? Members of the Community one more time come up to bat?

By the way it's going to be regionals night at the baseball game tomorrow night. I just want to let you know that. Tough crowd. Tough crowd. I declare this plenary done.
MR. SHULER: Before you come to the mike please say your name and your institution.

MR. DAVIS: A couple of additional things, handouts, speeches, other materials from this conference, have ask Ted to work with the Web team to have those posted on the FDLP Desktop not later than Friday. As is often the case the transcripts coming back will take a little bit longer. As soon as Lance gets those, he'll post those to the Desktop as well. I also want to remind everyone that Matt Landgraf and the PMO team will be outside on one of the tables during breaks and at lunch. If anyone missed the statutes at large, digitized demo yesterday morning during the early session, I encourage you to go out and take a look at that. We are really looking for comments on that. And one piece of sad news to pass along. I know many of you knew Willie Thompson who used to work at GPO. Will retired in 2004. Formerly in a position similar to Lance in terms of making these conferences happen, and Willie passed away last month. Willie worked at GPO for over 40 years and I believe all of those were spent in the library unit. So a huge loss to all of our family here but I wanted to make you aware of that because I heard that some people didn't know about that. Thanks.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Ric. Okay. One last bit of housekeeping before we get to the main match of the morning. The third in a set. I'd like to publically recognize in the extension of my remarks yesterday of how we are slowly inching into the Web through these meetings. Sherry Laster from the University of Akron is referred to as the resident live blogger. So she is streaming our remarks out to the greater world; I think another indication of how much our lives are changing. So without further adeu, I'd like to
introduce the next set of players, which would be what I would call the regionals and these good folks are going to guide us through a discussion with the question is education properly projected, and the match begins.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair, the University of Hawaii at Manoa. I'd like to start with the first bullet point on this slide which is -- the

question is, sufficient progress is being made on the shelflist conversion and development of a goal for creation of disposal lists to reassure depositories. The basic question is, are you reassured by what is taking place at GPO in terms of dealing with the pre-1976 shelflist conversion and development of a tool? We had a session about this at the fall conference where Cindy Etkin talked about the disposal process and then Lisa Russell solicited ideas for what would be needed for a tool to create disposal lists. We heard yesterday from Laurie Hall about the progress of the shelflist conversion. I believe she said, and she can jump up and correct me if I misheard, that there were 600,000 shelflist cards that had been scanned or are being scanned and out of those -- you are already wobbling your head. Do you want to jump up and say something?

MS. HALL: It's Laurie Hall, GPO. We have estimated there is a million cards in the shelflist. Of that million there is about 600,000 that are not OCLC cards that will need transcription. So we digitized or scanned 285,000 of the cards for our own purposes or for if anybody is interested in them. To date we have about 5,000 transcriptions that have been completed and are displaying in the CGP. We just started the project in January. January it was contracted.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One thing I'd like to add to that as well is in addition to getting ready for the conference last week, we are working away on this project. There is a list serve announcement that will be going out today that we have a concept of operations document which then leads to the requirements document and then the procurement used for expenditure of the funds we have approved for the automated disposition tool. A link will be made available today to that concept of operations document and we have a comment form up where we are soliciting feedback from the library community on that ConOps to help develop the
requirements document.
The other thing I want to mention is I believe Cindy and Lisa did an OPAL presentation that is archived related to this and we also tried to generate some discussion on the FDLP Community site. I think we only had five or six comments, so we are hoping for more comments on the concept of operations document because that leads down the procurement path.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Laurie, could you clarify for us the content of that one meeting card shelflist? How complete is that? What's the time frame that covers?

MS. ETKIN: It's about 1880 and we shut the shelflist data in 1992. It is a real mixed bag of things. We know it's not complete. We don't know what we are not missing. George and I have been dealing with you to try and figure out ways to identify the stuff that is missing. It's a combination of some of our dictionary catalog that we used to have in the library division and actually some shelflist things. So it's a real combination. There is temporary cards. There are cards that were things that were identified from libraries throughout the country, but we never had a copy. Most of the stuff has gotten into the paper monthly catalog. We are not sure that everything has. So it's the beginning start of trying to figure out, you know, what's the entire collection. I know people have said something about making a list of everything that was distributed to depositories. I think this is one of the beginning pieces of making that, finding out what that list is. The project is we are estimating about a two year project. We have about 20 staff and the contract will be up and fully running. It's about 20 staff people.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library: Laurie, you sat down too soon. When corrections were made to SuDoc members, were those reflected in the shelflist?

MS. HALL: Yes. He is asking if there are corrections to the SuDocs numbers, yes, there is lots of corrections and there are lots of discrepancies and there are lots of questions. A lot of work to be done after the transcription.

MR. SHULER: Anybody else on Council?
Anybody from the audience?

MS. SELBY: Barb Selby, University of Virginia. Under disposal tool I guess -- I mean I would look forward to whichever document comes out first about the requirements. Many of us are working towards a less formal more collaborative or cooperative way of disposal and I would hate to see any tool that would put more burden on either the selectives or the regionals while at the same time making sure that we do get the things that are needed for our collection. So I personally don't want everyone to put everything into a form, each individual book into a form, if people can do it from their online catalogs and reports, that might be drawn from those. I'd like to see flexibility in the way that we are allowed to input disposals to our regionals and also examine them.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. We had envisioned something that would use the MARC records and then would pull in from the MARC records from ILS and use that so that people wouldn't have to enter at all themselves.

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New Mexico. It's more a question there was a product out -- I'm not as old as I look or feel today. There was product put out, but at the same time that accumulative subject and accumulative title indexes were put out by the same husband and wife team and they used to sell it out of their garage along with popsicles to the neighborhood kids. It was 98 rolls of film. I don't have it. Barbie, do you? Does anybody have it? Do you have it? Do you know what I'm talking about?

MS. HALL: That is what George and I have been working on with Ann Sanders. Here comes George.

MR. BARNUM: George Barnum, GPO. We tracked down this thing that was published in the '70's. A couple of librarians came to GPO with a microfilm camera and filmed the entire thing. It's important to remember what this shelflist was. It was not exactly what we in libraries all think of as a shelflist. It was the authority file for the classification system and, oh, by the way, because everything we classified went onto the shelves in the old public documents library, it sort of acted like a shelflist. So at the time that the public
documents library, the old public documents library was
sent off to the national archives, this thing got
divided up and what remained at GPO, what Laurie's folks
have been working on for all these many days now, is we
think is what class stems were still active at that
time. And what went away, and we don't know exactly
what away constitutes was the rest of it. That
microfilm, which I don't remember the title of it
either, Dan, but I've actually got copies of the --
finding a title page and stuff in my bag, was the whole
thing. That was below that split was made and before
the public documents library went off never to be seen
again at the national archives. So we've got that and
Laurie and I are going to work on seeing how we can make
the two things mesh because there is even more --
apparently there is even more than those hundred and
some rolls of microfilm that is handwritten cards and
guide cards to get the librarians in public documents
library back and forth then there is in what was left
behind.

MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of
Minnesota. It's really great that you want to use ILS
records that has to be cataloged before that will work.
I'm still getting a lot of stuff on disposal lists that
is not cataloged. I'm just wondering if maybe you can
talk to that, but the other point I want to bring up, I
don't know if it's sufficient progress. I'm kind of
feeling like that I can't really answer this question
because there is still so much uncertainty, having not
seen the tool or really see how the shelflist is going
to affect disposal lists. I'm just not quite sure how
to answer this question.

MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. We have
talked about a number of ways of allowing libraries to
input things that are not cataloged. There may be a
free form and there is something that is not already
cataloged. One of the problems I think someone raised
in the past, is that you get something -- if somebody is
free forming it, you get something because it looks like
something that doesn't match anything that you've got
and low and behold, you've got six copies of it. So we
want to try and avoid that by using the ILS records as
much as possible.

One thing we are talking about is having a
matching between needs and offers and that might encourage people to use the category records if they are there, so that people aren't free forming things that they could find on the add list.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. One of the other things that we are hoping will be a benefit of doing it this way and while we understand that there will be a few titles that you might have to put into this tool by free form, it also is a notification to us that is a fugitive so we can add it then to the CGP and include that in the inventory.

MR. SHULER: Any other questions from the audience?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Will those records, once they get into the CGP, will they be tagged in someway the libraries will be able to tell where they are coming from or pull out just those records?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. There is actually off the Desktop a project page that has some information about that and has the exact search strategy in the 955 field; it says the historic shelflist and you can actually tell the drawer number of the shelflist so you can retrieve them by simple advance search from the ILS -- expert search, sorry. So the instructions for the search on the Desktop.

MS. BURROUGHS: Jennie Burroughs, University of Montana. These are questions for Laurie, actually. You mentioned the conclusion of the project is a two year project. It that two years to finish up quality control or two years until the digitized records are transcribed?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. We are expecting two years for the transcription of the records to be completed. The digitization of the cards is totally different, but one thing to make clear is the contractor is describing, doing quality control. It comes up to cataloging and then those records go through an additional level of quality control adding a subject heading, an LCSH subject heading and an authority heading, authorized heading. So there is a little bit of additional work that is going on, through my stream of catalogers, so it adds a little bit more to the record. Just to remind people too, that includes
serials, so there will be holdings checked in, that's part of the project as well. We should start our serials check in for some of the stuff in the shelflist July of this year.

MS. ETKIN: I have an addition -- I wonder if there is a way for libraries to help out GPO with some of these because what we are finding is a lot of these items already have existing cataloging in OCLC. So we are going to talk about maybe a project later today about --

MS. HALL: Right. We just finished up a draft of cooperative cataloging partnerships with GPO, more specific on how to not content partnerships, but actually cataloging exchange where, if you come in to be a partner we will potentially catalog this stuff for you; that's one of the projects. Also we will do some classification for you, so there is more details on this. This will be posted. I've got copies for it for the two-thirty meeting, two o'clock meeting. If people want it we are going to post it for comment when we get back. What was the OCLC part?

MS. ETKIN: There are an existing record for a lot of these materials already. So it's not so much wanting GPO to catalog this stuff in my library as much as we are already doing a lot of this work. Can we help you out by providing records?

MS. HALL: Right. There is some stuff in that already is talking about doing that. Also just to note that, yes, you can get the records through the catalog from Z39.50. Part of the pilot participants with the cataloging record distribution also have the opportunity to get those records as well through that venue.

MR. SHULER: Any other questions from the audience? David?

MR. CISOMOWSKI: David Cismowski from California State Library. You're getting your exercise today, Laurie. Laurie?

MS. HALL: I'm sorry, David.

MR. CISOMOWSKI: At a previous session somebody, maybe you, spoke to the detail of analysis of numbered series that is present in the shelflist. For instance, are the titles of individual monographs, that were issued in a numbered series, are they consistently
present in the shelflist?

MS. HALL: Yes, in those cases they are. We treated -- as far as I know. I don't know how far back, but we have always treated series analytically. There may be some other ones that we haven't come across. It's interesting what we have come across so far. But open file report, they are all treated analytically.

Very little was checked in as a series and simply by the series number with no analytic. So just say for that one or some of those labor bureau series they are all analytically treated. So there will be individual representations.

MR. SHULER: Anymore takers? All right.

Serve up the next bullet item.

MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. The next bullet point we want to discuss.

How can we help educate regionals and selectives about alternative approaches to disposal and collecting?

MR. SHULER: Any additional thoughts from Council? Turn it over to the audience.

MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina. Define for me alternative approaches?

MR. SHULER: Council?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I think that most regionals who have coordinators who have been around for awhile are familiar with the so called traditional way of processing disposal lists, which was a very time consuming iterative listing of every single item that you wanted to withdrawal from your collection, with the possible exception of serial issues which I think most of us have been allowed to be collapsed into consecutive holding ranges.

I don't know if this is the right time to bring it up, but just a few days ago ASERL released a discussion draft of streamlining not only the disposal process, but also collection maintenance and within -- I only looked at that yesterday and just skimmed the part about disposals, but it seems to me that the thrust of that discussion draft is to -- is to generate lists that are more general; that is, you would give a general idea of what a library in that particular area of the country was deciding to withdraw, but you wouldn't -- going back to the numbered or the individual monographs in a
numbered series, you wouldn't necessarily analyze them
title by title in your list.

For instance, if you were withdrawing your
entire collection of geological survey bulletins, you
might have one listing saying number 1 through 2,500
with gaps and that would be your list. So I think what
the traditional way would be would be that you would

have to individually list all those 2,500 titles, but
can we do it in a more streamline way and still
communicate to both regionals and the selectives in that
region what it is that libraries are withdrawing? I
think that is the issue.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of
Virginia Library. I mean I think we are already doing
this by in large. I think regional has a lot of
conversation about disposal lists, the way that people
are approaching that. I do sort of see this one and the
first one possibly being in conflict because if -- what
I was trying to say before is I don't want GPO to come
with the be all, end all of the individual listing title
way of doing disposal lists while we are all moving
towards potentially a less individual listing of these
things, while still making sure that -- you know, I mean
I talked to the people. If somebody is disposing
something in Virginia, a lot of times if it's a large
thing, we'll have a conversation on the telephone and
I'll find out what it is and get them to give me an
overview of it and then I'll say we will do it this way
for that particular group of things. If it's something

different then I'll say, no, I think you should do those
individually. So I think it needs to be a conversation
and I would hate to see some conflicts and somebody is
going to address that.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks,
Barbie for bringing that up. I just want to reassure
you all that the disposal tool that we ultimately come
up with is going to be voluntary for libraries to use.
It won't be mandatory just as the national needs and
offers is not mandatory. There is certainly advantages
for using it for lots of other reasons, but for those of
you who want to do as Barbie is doing, that will still
remain an option.

While I'm up here, I want to point out a
couple of other things. In your packet is a handout
Streamlining the Process, Disposition of Depository Materials. When we went away from the fall conference there was some confusion. So this summarizes what we had presented back in the fall about the disposal process indicates our actions taken and then on the backside of this practice is an education and the recommended best practices. Since that time, we have had discussions with our general Council and the bottom of the front side you will see a little paragraph that is labeled Revised Procedures. And I want to point this out to you all because this will make a difference in the end of the process. Once libraries have fulfilled their legal obligation of offering unwanted depository materials to other libraries, followed the procedures established by their regional and they have received permission from their regional to discard publications and still failing to find a taker after reasonable effort, the depository publications are then to be considered abandon by the government, no longer considered government property. The library may dispose of the publications in any manner appropriate. I want you to know too that the handbook is in the process of being revised to reflect that change. I think that directly affects a third bullet which we haven't gotten to yet.

But getting back to education, I want to let you all know there is a disposition of materials project page on the FDLP Desktop. It has information about the ConOps links to the presentation that was done in the fall, as well as the open presentation that was done in December. Links to the pages that Ann has put together on the Community site for the discard procedures of the regionals. So it's sort of a gathering point for all of this information. If you go under about the FDLP there is a link to projects and you'll find it there.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders. We spent a lot of time last fall gathering all the disposal procedures for the 50 states and there is a tremendous variance there and I don't think that anybody here is advocating that there should be one method of disposal and that one state's policy isn't someway the best. But at the same time there is just a huge range of different approaches and there is a huge range of effort required on the part of both the regionals and the selectives.
It comes back to I still get questions regularly, I get lists, that conform to about three disposal procedures to those standards. It's still an education problem more than anything else and that's what we are looking for is suggestions. How can we spread this around in more useful ways before someone goes to the effort of compiling a 249 page list which wasn't necessary, which happened to me about three weeks ago.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. One quick add to Cindy's comment as well. As a result of a meeting that we had with legal staff last week that also eliminates the need to send proceeds to the superintendent of documents for the sale of property.

MR. SHULER: Well, I think that excited some interest.

MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago Public Library. I would say that one of the biggest issues that I have run into with us is we never discard anything so when we do need to discard something everybody is paging through old notebooks trying to figure out what to do and where to send it to and where to do it. And we only run into -- from the small public libraries we run into somebody after three years and they've suddenly realized they are getting documents. And now they need to get rid of them. And so now they need to appoint a depository librarian and their first job is to discard things. It almost always seems like there is somebody new in the process. The people here are all fairly sophisticated and discard things regularly, but I would suspect the majority of the depositories don't. They do it by fits and spurts.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn State. I'm sitting here thinking about all the innovation that's happened over the years in terms of depository needs and offers lists and the different ways that people have done it. And recently my regional decided to use Facebook to do their lists. And, you know, to me part of the genius of allowing regionals and selectives that sense of autonomy in doing these lists is it encourages innovation.

I'm concerned that you're going to come up with a tool that is going to become obsolete in about
five years and we are going to have spent time in trying
to create a tool that will become obsolete and there are
going to be new and innovative ways to do these lists.
And the reality is that these needs and
offers lists, I understand that there was sort of a
hint, and I would like to hear GPO talk about this more
in terms of how you guys use theses needs and offers
lists. The reality is is how we communicate with one
another, how the selective and regional communicate to
one another. And that by definition we have so many
different personalities it is going to be difficult.
It's just -- and to me part of that is a communication
between a regional and selective in terms of what that
should look like.
I guess the main point that I want to make
is I'm kind of concerned that we are making something
more important. I would much rather you folks finish
that shelflist, get cataloging records for that
shelflist then spend time working on a product that in
about five years is going to be obsolete because there
is new technology that will make our -- it's always
going to be involving how we are doing these needs and
offers lists. There are innovative ways that we can use
data minor to create these lists. There are innovative
ways that we can use our cataloging systems. In terms
of education, as documents librarians, isn't that our
job in part? Just a thought.
MS. CLARK: Kirsten Clark, University of
Minnesota. I'd like to add onto what Steven said. I'm
just wondering if maybe I missed this, but when you guys
were looking at all the different lists, is there a
report that is put out what everybody is doing? Because
I feel as a regional I can go look at 50 different
regional pages to see what everybody is doing. That
innovation piece, I think that talks exactly into that.
Where do you put the ownership of somebody having to go
out and figure out what is happening with all the
different regionals and what people are doing? We talk
about it. I hear about it in conversations in the
hallway at meetings, but there is really no -- what's
the word I want? Site. You know, maybe that's what you
guys are trying to do to have here.
The other thing I want to mention was with
the selectives. I can communicate all I want, just as
Ann talked about. I'm to the point, you know, what? I have sent this out five times. You are still sending me a list handwritten. I'm not going to accept it anymore. I think there is a point where the ownership has to be on everybody within the program, not just the regional, to have to deal with things where we are trying to make changes, we are trying to move forward, and people just aren't listening.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Two points I want to make. One is that we did compile all of these disposal procedures in one place. It's on the Community site. I wrote a summary which I don't think I put there, as I think about it, and I certainly can. But I wrote a summary that went out to regional (inaudible) and the rest of you wouldn't have seen it. So I can fix that, but they are in the Community site under the Web links.

The other thing is, I want to kind of flip this around a little bit. Because we have a lot of, wherever two or more are gathered you will discuss disposal. But it's not only about the disposal because there are libraries out there, gulf coast libraries, for example, who really do need this needs and offers tool. There are libraries out there that are actively looking to gather rare and valuable government documents about their region. And that is not going to happen if we completely walkaway from the notion that we need to know what each other is doing.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Ann, your summary is in the slide deck from the fall presentation. I borrowed heavily from it. The other thing I want to reiterate that this is not going to be a mandatory tool for you all to use. So if you want to use Facebook or whatever to do your disposition of materials processes, that is perfectly fine, but we were asked by Council to streamline and come up with a tool. We got appropriations for it, it's not coming out of the same pot that is paying for the shelflist conversion, just so that you understand that. We are not robbing one to pay for the other.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. One of the things David mentioned the ASERL report and one of the things that is in there, sort of speaks to Ann's comments, a needs list as well as an
My library has a needs list up. It's very incomplete. It's what -- it's very incomplete, but I got something from someone who was just trolling around on the Web and had something in his personal collection and he mailed it to me and it was great. And I, of course, realize that any libraries that have undergone strategies and have lost tons of stuff, couldn't put up any real kind of a real -- a needs list would be impossible at that point, but there might be general things. I know I've looked for one 42 volume on Indian affairs thing between the wars. There might be some more general things that librarians could put up. So I think there is that side of it as well, that for my library has been very helpful to have that up. MS. RUSSELL: Lisa Russell, GPO. We do have plans in the ConOps to have both needs and offers in the same tool and then match them and then also to be able to mark if you need something because it's a replacement for something that was damaged in a natural disaster or if you need something for digitization project. MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley University of New Mexico. I think we are all getting an education here because we all do things a little bit different. Like Barbie, I have a needs list and I have an offers list because I'm still one of those old time regional librarians that really believes that we should build our historic collections and I don't want to open that can or worms right now. That's just the way I operate. The other thing is I have scared my selectives into not discarding. So I deal with those lists and so if you kind of take that approach it kind of solves the problem. But in a more serious vein, one of the problems that Ann just mentioned, that kind of turned my light bulb on, is the fact that we have all bits and pieces of all these different things going on in different parts. Some of it's on the Community and some of it's on the FDLP. I think centralizing this information would be a big help for everyone because then there is just a one stop place where everybody can go and take a look at, do I need this? Is there an offer? There is a couple of other suggestions that may come forward as well. So it is hit and miss right now. I don't have a lot of time to spend trying to figure out
where the hell things are. I need to know where they
are so I can take a look at them and move along with my
life and get things done in a more expeditious manner.
So I would hope that at some point we can take some of
these things and kind of centralize that.

MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University
of Wisconsin, River Falls. I'm a selective. We have
never had much problem doing discard lists because it's
part of our working routine. And I think the group here
that needs to be educated perhaps are the library
directors who have this idea that a discard list is the
most suppressive thing to create in the world and it's
not. We give a card to a student at a cert desk and say
type. And then someone checks to make sure they have
created something reasonably close to what is there. I
don't think that regionals are demanding, you know,
coming in a white glove and checking to make sure
everything is perfect. They want to kind of have an
idea of what is there. There has been a campaign that
this is awful, awful, horrible, hideous thing. All that
this is, is something that is not in our normal
processing for weeding our materials that we acquire and
purchase. I think it's important that this update on
the sheet go out and that the information about being
able to sell materials at book sales goes with that
because that has been the one thing I have never been
able to explain is that. Okay, we have some things that
are really nice here and nobody wants them and we have
to absolutely throw this away because the idea of
sending a $2 check to the government costs us way more.
So I think that would be a very good thing, to get this
information out to directors that it really isn't the
worse thing. I don't know that regionals are in a
position to communicate with library directors around
the country. They communicate with the librarians, with
the coordinators, but I'm not sure they are at that
level and I'm not sure that's appropriate. I think
maybe that should come from SuDoc.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks,
Michelle, for that. We'll get out and post it to FDLP-L
as well as the director's list. That's a good idea.
Thank you.
I also wanted to followup on the sale thing
so that question is resolved now. And the reasoning is
that once the government has abandoned the property and
the libraries can do with what they want, putting it in
a book sale and sending the proceeds to the government
makes no sense since we have abandoned all interest.
You're not selling our property anymore, so that's the
question that was finally resolved.
And a followup to Dan. The project page is
that one place where all of this stuff will be gathered
or linked to from.
MR. MARTIN: Heath Martin, University of
Kentucky. I just wanted to return a minute to the
alternative approaches aspect of this question. It's
specifically to the eight year old draft proposal that
was mentioned earlier. Again, just to use as an
example, it's a draft proposal. But, again, for
example, if one of the things being proposed is
something of a parodyne shift in that historically
regionals have been responsible for knowing what
regionals need. And those proposals there is discussion
of the idea of selectives needing to know what regionals
need. The burden is on the selectives to understand
what the regionals need to publicizing regional
priorities. In that case the Center of Excellence and
what they are planning and that sort of thing. As these
models emerge, if they do in fact emerge, it's going to
be important to obviously make sure that for example
selectives understand that in theory at least that
responsibility has shifted and what regionals'
responsibilities are under these, you could argue,

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California
State Library. I have a comment and a question for GPO.
The comment is relating to what Michelle said about
regular consistent, methodical creation of disposal
lists and that obviously is the way to go about maintaining your collection. The problem with directors comes when all of a sudden something happens in that library to cause a desire to drastically reduce the size of a depository collection that has not been weeded judiciously over time. I think that is happening more and more in the last few years, putting a burden on regionals as well as the poor selective depository coordinator who is told by the director, you have to get rid of all of this stuff and I want it gone in a month. And my question for GPO is at the end of the first page of Streamline this Process, this handout, the sentence reads, "the library may dispose of the publications in any appropriate manner." Could you give us an example or two of what would be an appropriate manner?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. My colleagues say littering on the highway. That language, I can't think of an inappropriate way right offhand. I took that language from a 1962 instructions.

MR. SHULER: Body art.

MS. CONCANNON: Marie Concannon, University of Missouri Columbia. One thing that might come into play here is the fact that my university is a public university and we have rules about disposition of university property. For example, Fraser 1 and 2 have a book. They are digitizing a serial. They were missing one issue from 1889 or something and we had a copy and they asked if we might have it for digitization. I looked at it and we had a gift plate in it. It didn't come through the depository program so I could give it to them, but then my boss said, oh, wait a second. We have rules about disposition of university property. We can't just take a book out of a collection and just give it to anybody. You have to be very careful about what you do there. So the question about disposing in an appropriate manner, probably the institution has to check its own internal rules about this. And I think another question that this brings up is after it ceases being government property, if it's cataloged, does it become the property of the library or does it simply become no man's land, nobody's property?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's a good question. If you accessioned it and added it to your
collection, and then we have abandoned it, it would seem
to me that it would be your property, but I'm not a
lawyer. So is that something that we should check with
general counsel? We'll take that as an action item with
our general counsel and get an affirmative answer for
you.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
Michigan. I'd kind of appreciate it if this whole
handout was updated to include that bit about, I don't
know, not having to send proceeds to the superintendent
of documents because that seems like a glaring omission
here and if you could at that same time clarify that
point. I think that makes a huge difference.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'll be glad
to do that, Ann, and then we will post this on the
project page.

MR. SHULER: We've got 30 minutes left in
the match.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University. The third question and all of these are
very much interrelated, but just to toss it out there.
The third question, do you have ideas for how discards
could be redistributed to other states or digitization
projects? And we have touched on a little bit of this
already. Other ideas?

MR. SHULER: Council, any further thoughts?
Audience?

MS. ROWE: Beth Rowe, University of North
Carolina at Chapel Hill. It used to be that selectives
in North Carolina, after I got through with the list, if
I didn't take too long, had to post it on our local
lister, but as I started making visits, when I became
regional to the selectives in the state, I found out
nobody was taking the materials off of these lists. So
it was a waste of time. So I changed it to suggesting
that they could post it on gov.sell or doctogo where
people said they had much more luck. I would love to be
able to tell them to post it to the national needs and
offers list at GPO, but GPO has an onerous 90 day
posting requirement and that is way too much for my
folks. So I'm curious as to how that 90 day requirement
came about and whether or not there is any flexibility
in changing that because I have a lot more selectives
who would love to post to that list and perhaps give
materials to people who need it, rather than recycling it as many are doing at this time.  

MR. SHULER: GPO?  
MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I don't know, but yes we can be flexible. Would you suggest what, 60 days, 30 day, 45?  
MS. ROWE: Forty-five.  

MS. ETKIN: Or options. Yes, okay. Consider it done.  
MR. SHULER: Jill.  
MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University at Utah. I can remember 20 or 30 different sessions of the last decades where we asked the same question and I was going to say what I always remember is that we were dealing with snail mail then and 90 days almost was not enough time to send it in and have it processed, bring it back then perhaps decisions had -- you know, reasons for decisions had changed. Some you kept. Some as you remembered discarded. You never -- very rarely did you get permission to discard an entire list at one time. So, yes, so pleased to hear that it was just decided unanimously by GPO that we are going to reduce that time because we live in a much faster communication age now.  
MR. SHULER: Suzanne.  
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I just want to speak to the part about being redistributed to other states for digitization projects. A lot of why items are not claimed could be the cost of shipping to get those items to your collection. UT is doing a massive digitization and we are taking duplicates from needs and offers lists, but we do have a limit to our budget as to what we can afford to ship. I'm personally driving a truck to Fort Worth to pick up some items, so that it will cost our library less and we can get more items. I know we have people going to the University of Missouri to pick up items this summer in the same way where we basically have staff driving trucks to go and get these so that we can save money. I just think that can be a main reason. I don't know that there is a solution, but we do try to heavily pick up the Texas list because we are using interlibrary owned courier and it saves us money that way. I know there were some items that were available last year that I could not claim because the expense to
ship them to my library was going to be way too much.

MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict, Chicago public

library. I wanted to briefly address the ownership

issue again. Number one, I'll say that it's often hard

for our administration to be able to claim that -- we

have a large government documents department. And we

are able to claim we don't own these things. The

federal government does, therefore, you have to treat

them kindly, but it seems the logical end to what your

legal counsel said is that we could put up an offering

list saying large depository library wishes to get rid

of everything older than five years old. And then if

anybody wants it, they could just -- we could just say,

no. We decide to keep it then it's still the federal
government property and then everything else turns into
our property and that seems like not quite right.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Yes, that is

not quite right because there were all these other

conditions in here about following the regional's

procedures and getting the regional's permission. If

Chicago Public were to put their entire collection, that

is more than five years old, I think that would be

suspect.

MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict again. I agree

with you, it would be way beyond suspect, but would it

be wrong would be the question; you know, if we either

gave them away or didn't give them away, you know?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. As Cindy

mentioned this is the end part of the process. So you

would need to go through your regional and I think it

would also need to be considered as part of an overall

state plan.

MR. WOOD: Steve Woods, Penn State. One of

the things that comes to my mind, in terms of this

question, in many ways it sort of relates to some of the

discussions that the CIC has been having about

digitizing -- digitizing a federal collection. And

is -- the question that comes to my mind is, is there

some sort of special dispensation that a library could

have in terms of disposing a collection that ultimately

would be made accessible to the public as a digitized

item, instead of having to go through this process of

needs and offers? And I could see something like this

happening in the future where, you know, specific
sections, you know, some initiatives by cooperative libraries where they are trying to digitize the whole department of agricultural and they want to do it with destructive scanning, would there be any kind of dispensation to this if the collection was made available to the public?

MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Having already been in that position, I'll take a stab at that and then Cindy can correct me, but generally it's within the law, it's up to the regional. That's a regional decision. I can tell you that I have answered that question in specific cases, both yes or no, depending on what they were asking for, whether or not we owned it and whether or not I felt like it was vital for there to be a copy in the state of Michigan. Regional always has that authority under law. It's just whether or not they can feel like they can make that call in the best interest of having a tangible collection in their area served.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I am not going to correct you, Ann, but I'm going to add to that because the law also says that you have to share your offers with other libraries.

MR. SHULER: I would make the observation that this binary relationship between selectives and regionals, most of this conversation has been talking about physical stuff, but we do have a binding relationship with the geography represented by the selectives in particular congressional districts and other designations. So I would suggest it's more than just unburdening a particular library, but it's also a deliberative disengagement of a civic value to a community that needs to be carefully considered in any of this. So it's not just about collections. It's also about service.

MR. SHULER: Next slide? Next slide.

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public. Staying in the program. What are the exclusive benefits of being a regional depository and what types of incentives are most meaningful to librarians besides chocolate?

MR. SHULER: Council? Doughnuts maybe?

Audience?

MR. BARKLEY: Dan Barkley, University of New
Mexico. This is one of the $10 questions that keeps me up at night. When I talk to my director, she asked me this very question, what is the benefit of being a regional anymore? And you know back in the day, Carmen, back in the day. I hired Carmen, that's why I can say that. There used to be a lot of incentive to stay in the program. We used to say these collections are valuable. They provide all this great information to a lot of different clients and what not. But we have a new breed of directors that are coming in and they think everything is electronic and that's great. Why do we have these paper intangible collections when I can use that space for special collections, for posters and things like that. And that's the dilemma I face to U of M right now.

My director goes, when is GPO going to give me money to keep these things here? And I'm sure there is probably one or two other people in the audience whose directors go, where is the money that I can pay your salary or pay staffers to maintain this stuff and we all know realistically that is probably not ever going to happen, at least in my lifetime. So I don't know what you're looking at for incentives. But I think it's again going back -- like somebody else mentioned earlier, it's a matter of going back and talking to the directors again convincing them that these tangible collections are worth while. That they do continue to compliment electronic collections. That we continue to gather and take a look at and try to figure out how to capture the digital stuff while we preserve and maintain the tangible stuff.

I don't know what to say about this anymore. My director is ready for me to kind of go away. I think if I retired tomorrow GPO would get a call the next day to bring the moving vans down and get rid of everything. That's the only reason I stay there. I'm really at a loss. This thing has caused me male pattern baldness long before my time.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library. Thank you for that, Dan. You're not alone. What Dan said is a really eloquent truth among regionals. I think I was the one who wanted that question phrased this way about exclusive benefits because this is a question I think that concerns not
just regionals, but also selectives who want regionals
to stick around. I think that selectives need to be
thinking about this too. And put yourself in the
position of both regional coordinators and directors of
regional libraries. What exclusive benefit do I get for
being a regional? And is it just the feel good stuff
about doing my civic duty as an academic library or the
flag ship library of my state or a state library or is
there something I can point to that has a monetary value
that says, yes, I'm getting -- I'm getting that because
I'm a regional?

MS. NICHOLS: Hi, my name is Celina Nichols.
I'm at the library, R.M. Cooper Library at Clemson
University. I was really hesitant to stand up. So
forgive me. It's really early in the morning and I
haven't had enough coffee.

I'm actually in a very, very, very unique
position of having just recently relinquished regional
status. April 15th was our last day. I'm no longer the
regional librarian. I'm now the selective librarian. I
actually was just kind of dropped into this position and
told, hey, you get to stop being a regional. You pissed
off a lot of people and, hey, I want you to get rid of a
lot of stuff. And oh, by the way, completely wants to
move into this area, so you need to get rid of about a
quarter of your collection. So I'm actually really glad
you guys all brought this up. One of the first things I
asked myself is what are the benefits of being a
regional? What are the benefits of being a selective?

And everybody is talking digital. Digital this and
digital that. And in one way it was actually easier for
me to be a regional because I was able to say, hey, I
can't get rid of anything. Sorry. Go away. And now my
problem is, I can't say that anymore. Five years and
people want me to get rid of stuff. And I don't trust
everything that is digital. Why would I? Things are
appearing. Things are going. I come to a meeting and,
hey, all the PURLs went down. I've got a lot of mean
professors that are going to come after me if I get rid
of the wrong thing. So I guess what I'm trying to say,
there are benefits of being a regional but at the same
time I did go along with not being a regional anymore
because I started to thinking about all the
possibilities. When you are a selective you have the
flexibility to collect like a regional and get rid of things when they are not necessary anymore. And so I almost wish this question had been posted long before when I first started this job because maybe it would have helped me navigate these waters and now I'm up to my eyeballs in trying to figure out how to justify getting rid of this or keep that. I hope somebody can answer this question. What am I suppose to keep and what am I supposed to get rid of? I have been working with my new regional, but it's kind of a big question for me. I know it's a big question for everybody else and it doesn't go away. It's a problem as a regional and it's a problem as a selective. I think what a lot of people are asking is, what is the benefit of staying a depository library? I want to stay in one, but that's one of those questions that keeps me up. And it's one of the things that I have been using trying to work with to explain to people why these documents are important not only to governments, but to different liaison areas because other librarians don't understand. Everybody looks at me because I'm a goof. What's a library? What is a depository library? What are all these government documents? And I guess that's why I keep coming to these meetings. I keep hoping that somebody will explain to me how I can tell all these things to all these people. But thank you.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, University of Notre Dame. I have been coming to these meetings almost 30 years and I always enjoy the needs and offers discussion. It arrives at such concrete solutions of how things are going. And it does fill up lonely hours here at these meetings. I'm glad you moved onto this particular one because sitting in the back of the room it gets a little frustrating. Right now we are trying to figure the benefits to remain whatever, selective, regional. If I understand, I was talking with a colleague in the back, there's a clause in there that says if you want to give up your status, you're supposed to ship this back to GPO, correct? Is that still in there? At the library's expense you have to return this government property to someone representing the right one. I think some of the our directors would rethink the cost benefit of a
business library if suddenly the price tag was there
that says, yes, we are more than willing to allow you to
give up your status and whatever, but, you know. And
the young lady who was just here, you have some regional
only content that in my opinion if the director decided
to give it, up needs to find it, pack it up and ship it
back to GPO at the director's cost. I think you would
suddenly find the directors going, it's probably in our
best interest to retain the status. It is cheaper than
to find, box up and send back to someone else what they
own. And this is based on a shrinking engineering
library when the dean of engineer says, I need half of
your space and we presented him with the bill that says,
here is how much it is going to cost us to reduce the
space by half in the time frame that you have dictated
to us. And the dean changed their mind. So much as I
like the carrot approach, what is in this for us? We
are here to do due diligence and to serve, you know, the
citizens of the United States. There is that flip side
that says, okay, people have been giving this up at
absolutely no cost to them, you know. Is there someone
from Detroit Public here before I pick on Detroit
Public?

MS. SANDERS: No.

MR. HAYES: They cherry picked, if I
understood and selected what they wanted and did not
want. I'm sorry. What was the upside for us to let
them give up their regional status? They want -- you
know, it was nothing but a benefit to them instead of
there has to be some cost. Yes, it's costing you too
much, but guess what, you need to get rid of that
regional only material that is now a benefit for a
selective who used to be a regional instead of, you
know, you need to behave like a selective like the rest
of us. We have to go to a regional to get that because
if it was a regional only maybe there would be a little
bit more. I'm sorry. It's a little irritating this
only carrot, only carrot. There has to be a stick in
there too that says give it up, ship it back. The first
time GPO presented the bill that says, here is your
shipping bill. We are loaning it out to the directors
as to, maybe this is not the best way to garner space.

MR. SHULER: There are 10 minutes left in
the match. May I suggest that we introduce the last
MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. Steve would like us to change that question to what are the exclusive penalties of dropping regional depository status? It could be a valid point.

MR. SHULER: I will make the observation that docs for dollars I think is going to change the equation. So we've only got 10 minutes left so let's introduce the last question.

MR. CISMOWSKI: The last one and I was trying to crane my neck because the angle here means I can't read the monitor. What practical steps can GPO regionals and selectives take to ease the administrative burden on libraries and ensure their continued participation?

MR. SHULER: Okay, Barb.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby University of Virginia. And sorry, but I'm going to get back to the exclusive benefits. And one thing that GPO did offer regionals about, three or four years ago, were the OCLC records which are a benefit and a problem because then if you supersede things you have all these map records, but that was an exclusive benefit and I'm glad that it is no longer going to be exclusive because I think it's a great thing to offer libraries is that cataloging for our government documents.

Incentives meaningful maybe this would even apply to this last question as well about easing administrative burdens. But for instance with Steve, if Detroit Public had offered to digitize those materials that they were getting rid of or they wanted to get rid of, for me if there were a way for large selectives or even regionals, if I were to say, I could digitize to GPO standards this part of my collection and it's owned by six other regionals in the southeast, can I digitize it, get it into FDsys because it's all to standard and they are starting to take nonGPO originated materials then would I be able to discard it? That would be an incentive.

And as with Dan, five years ago I said there was no pressure on me not to be a regional and there certainly is now. I mean it's space, space, space. So if there were some way, either within current title 44...
or with something beyond title 44, to let regionals or large selectives digitize and then offer, that would be an incentive.

MS. BAYER: Hi, Kathy Bayer, GPO. Sorry to put you on the spot, David or Council, but I was wondering if you can apply some explanation to administrative burden. We hear this all the time. Some of it is accurate and some is not and I feel sometimes that I act as a myth buster. So I was just wondering if you could explain that. Thanks.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I'll give it a shot because I don't know what was in the collective mind of the rest of the people. But when I look at that, I think about the things that both directors and coordinators of depositories have to do in order to stay in good graces. And I think you are right, Kathy, that a lot of what people think they have to do, they no longer really, truly have to do, but there are some things -- I mean, even the biennial survey is a burden for somebody even though it's required by law. But are there some other things that even in the new era are required of depositories that are not really all that central and could be dispensed with?

MS. BAYER: Kathy Bayer, GPO. I know the Outreach librarians work very proactively trying to dispel those myths and what we are always saying is that there is -- continues to be flexibility in the program and libraries do have that. There are some processes like the discard lists that obviously are a burden. I'm not sure how the biennial survey, short survey every two years would be a burden, other than we still have a hundred libraries that haven't submitted the survey, but it is something we come across all the time and I just wanted to for context sake bring this up. Thanks.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I think that because these were designed to be discussion generating questions that that is primarily something to be thrown out for your response. Are there administrative burdens that I have as a depository that you see as inconsequential? Why do I have to do this? What benefit does this have to my abilities to run the depository for the national good?

MS. CLARK: Mary Clark, University of
Virginia, Richmond. This isn't what I would consider practical so I guess this series of questions are to GPO and Council. Several years ago we were having conversations about our dark archives and that kind of dropped away. I think the reason I bring it up is I think a lot of people were rather intrigued by it just as Jay's stories come by with their dark archive concept where people feel, okay, now that we know that there is dedicated collections we can withdraw things in a more timely manner. We don't have to worry about we are getting rid of something that no one else has. So I'm just curious is that gone?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The dark archive concept in terms of having one collection in the east and one in the west put forward by the former superintendent of documents, was not approved by senior management at GPO in terms of an authority action or by our legal counsel. That said, you know, I continue to look at our archival affiliate agreement with NARA as an opportunity for what I call that east collection at least.

MS. CLARK: Thank you and then a comment in terms of practical steps. At this juncture I just think we need to make a concerted effort to modify title 44. There is too much specificity there and it's to the point now where people are like, it's too rigid. It can't change and we are just going to get out because GPO is not going to show up with the truck. They are just not. So we can keep the material we want to keep. So I understand what I'm trying could be controversial to some, but I think this rigidity or the lack of wanting to do something because we can't control that entire process, is making the system almost obsolete. So that was just a comment.

MR. SHULER: We've still got two minutes on the clock.

MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, I'm still advocating chocolate as an incentive to stay in the program. I think it's the only thing that will work. I think this last question is an excellent question, but you may be addressing it to the wrong group. This would be something very good to have the regional librarians to take out to their selective depositories and talk to them about because I don't know
that this group sees particular administrative burdens. But the people who don't get to come to national meetings, that come once a year to a meeting within their state if they are lucky, are the ones who maybe able to answer this question, much more to the level that you are looking at because I don't feel that there is a burden. But I also think that I'm well educated and work with this quite a bit. I also think when you talk about incentives, you have to be very careful because there are many things that the GPO can't do. They can't give us equipment. They can't pay for staff and that it brings up in a director's mind, like Dan was saying, that is something that is possible and they don't have statutory authority to do that. So I think we need to be very careful about what the GPO can't do when having that discussion about incentives.

MS. JOBE: Hi, Peggy Jobe, University of Colorado at Boulder. I'm not feeling any pressure to drop our regional status, but what I am feeling pressure to do is to downsize our onsite collection and ascend a lot of it to storage. My problem with anything in storage, because we have to do it fairly rapidly, is I have to look for big swaths of material that I can send on one or two bib records because that's the only way that we can clear out large amounts of shelf space. So what we are not moving out are little, tiny things that we could do a hundred of them and we get six inches. So what that does for us is that we are keeping outdated health information in the HE's which really is problematic so we have an overall stacks plan that says we'll move this off and we can get this much space because we are losing a lot of onsite space. I looked at this and I looked at our stacks plan and I said, what is our brand? We are losing our brand. If we were going to keep the things that were really useful here, we would not be keeping the same things. We are keeping things that's (inaudible) because of the cataloging issue. And if I were to say our brand is the history of the United States, rich environmental information, rich demographic information, we should be making some different decisions about the collection. So I would like to see more flexibility for the regionals to actually say, you know, we don't need this. It's outdated. If we are running a public library we'd be
embarrassed to have this outdated information on our shelves. So I would actually like the ability to -- to the best of my ability collect for the region, but make some withdrawal decisions.

MR. SHULER: Two last questions, Suzanne.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I wanted to comment directly to you -- I'm sorry you sat down and I can't see. At the University of North Texas before I got there they had to do a major, major move of material to offsite storage to make space. And the solution that we came up with, Robin Mohamed came and did a public access assessment on my library in October and she said it was fine. We don't have time right now for me to go into the details, but if you will see me I can talk to you about what we did. There is no reason to keep things on your shelf that should be in remote storage, against things that you're sending to remote storage that you should keep on your shelf.

MS. JOBE: Thanks. I'll look for you.

MR. SHULER: Bring us home.

MR. SUDDUTH: Bill Sudduth, University of South Carolina. I think other than replacing the old cost benefit, which the benefit was if the materials were there and they were benefit to the library, it's now the information, unless you can replace that benefit with some kind of ability to help libraries to cover the cost, what we are left with is the flexibility to be able to do what we can to share the costs along the regionals and among the libraries within each state and that's about all we are left with.

MR. SHULER: The time clock has run out and I thank everyone for successfully completing this third plenary. The Council will convene again in a half an hour to begin its first work session in which we will be considering what happened in October. Come if you're interested. It's declared ended.

(Break in proceedings.)

MR. SHULER: I begin with the handout that was given to us by GPO with the PURLs incident. You've had a chance to review that. Is there any discussion amongst the Council members and GPO about that incident that we wish to do here? Blank looks.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto from Eastern
Washington University. This is a question for GPO so yes from that document, just to make sure I understand, a new PURL server and that is be contracted out? So that is going to be a private firm that is running it now on GPO's behalf, is that right?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Yes, Justin, that's correct. As a matter of fact, James Mauldin, in our afternoon two o'clock session as part of the CMP Collection Management Preservation update, is, again, I believe talking about it in some detail. But to answer your question directly, to reaffirm it, it's going to be a hosted solution. It's going to have realtime fail-over. So when we talk about some of those enhanced tools that will have, that is kind of part of the whole package, but, yes, it would be a hosted solution all the way.

MR. SHULER: Other questions from Council about the PURLs? And while they're still considering that, Ted, we can have some assurance that this is going to address the central problem that caused the failure in the first place, does it not? That's an affirmative?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO, that's an affirmative.

MR. SHULER: James has a question.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Maybe I can talk to Mike and the folks later on, but I was wondering if there is a way that those PURLs can also point to content that is off of GPO servers? There may be libraries that have digital collections that would like to be part of that PURLs system and I think that would be a real incentive for libraries to keep participating in the depository library.

MR. SHULER: So you're talking about distributed PURLs?

MR. JACOBS: I am indeed talking about distributed PURLs. Something that I know DOI can do. And they are looking into DOI for FDsys, but it is not part of FDsys right now, but I know DOI can point to multiple institutes of the same digital content. If library hosted content can be part of that whole failsafe solution if a GPO server does go down, it automatically points that to a library server somewhere that has that same content. That would be amazing.
MR. SHULER: Ted?
MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Thanks for putting that forward. The one response I'd have is that certainly is an opportunity for GPO. That is something where we would look at if we had a formal partnership in place with that institution, then by all means that PURL using that technology would point to that content. If we don't have a formal partnership in place, based on our permanent public access role, we would want to have that on GPO permanent to enable that.
MR. SHULER: So you would be looking for a relationship with the organization. Other questions?
MS. MORIEARTY: User testing. I'm sorry. Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I see that the user testing is continuing. Is that inhouse? Do you need anyone externally to test it as hard as we possibly could crank it?
MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. It's part of the validation process that our in-house folks and James Mauldin and his team have done. They haven't requested that yet, but we can certainly look at that as part of when we get through the internal training of our stuff whether that load testing, outside of what we have done, would be needed or for an additional level of assurance perhaps.
MR. SHULER: Chris.
MR. GREER: Chris Greer, Office of Science and Technology Policy. This is the first I have heard about outsourcing the PURL server and that's an interesting step. Until now the central strategy at GPO has been inhouse in terms of FDsys and its related services. Can you say a little bit about whether the strategy for inhouse versus acquired services has changed or maybe just summarize that strategy for us?
MR. PRIEBE: Welcome, Chris. Ted Priebe GPO. So when Ric Davis had talked about the bridge to stability in this particular legacy technology solution, the best path for GPO and what we felt for the Community was to have that hosted solution with that fail-over, based upon that particular enhanced software utility that they had developed. I think when you look at it from a strategic perspective, it's going to be a case-by-case. If we have a legacy system that is more conducive in the short to midterm to have as a hosted
piece, then we are going to look at that. If it's something that can be integrated much like that list technology where we are working multiple legacy systems to bring in-house on a single solution, it's going to be where a case-by-case basis, whether it's stability or the long term piece. So it's not a yes or no answer. We look at the technologies that are in our existing tool belt, as well as the requirements that we have from a community prospective to come up with the answer on any given technology.

MR. GREER: Just a followup. Chris Greer, Office of Science and Technology. But case-by-case is not a strategy, it's a tactic. So part of that overall architecture set of issues is how do you integrate the various components, functional components into an operational hold that works for a lot of different settings?

So you're in the process of revising how you are going to handle the Enterprise Server Bus, that is an integrating function. It seems like a lot of the integrating elements are kind of up in the air right now and this is not a time for that to be true.

So I guess I would like to spend a little bit of time offline hearing a little bit more about the integration strategy, particularly where case-by-case services solutions are going to be on the table.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Right now quite a few depositories are using the statistical reporting from the PURL referrals to justify the purchase of bibliographic records that contain PURLs. What affect if any is this hosted solution and the transition going to have on the integrity and stability of that PURL referral statistical reporting.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe GPO. So in answer to your question about the integrity of it, it will actually be an enhanced capability. We've got the requirements there. As a matter of fact, in terms of the whole interface and the ability to enter multiple URL's to provide statistics and be able to drill down into those statistics, you are actually going to be able to see much more then what we have been able to offer with that legacy technology. So it's going to be full access. The exact number of months that we are going to
have, we really have to get through that final user
testing depending on the size of the data base. But to
directly answer your question, it will be equal to and
enhanced in many ways from what we currently have.

MR. SHULER: Other questions from Council?

We have come to a point on whether how we continue this
correspondence, if we need to continue it. I'd like to

get a sense from Council, where do you want to go with
this?

MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP. Maybe a way
to do this is to have an offline conversation, bring a
couple of us up to speed on a strategy and then defer
that discussion to a later session.

THE AUDIENCE: Can you speak up please?

MR. GREER: I'm sorry. Chris Greer, Office
of Science Technology Policy. Let's have an offline
discussion and then continue that at a later session.

MR. SHULER: Reaction? Is that acceptable
to Council? So we will push this to an offline
correspondence, probably a phone call, here in a couple of
weeks, and then see where that takes us.

Anything else on the PURLs? All right.

Let's go on to the consultant work. Something that
Council asked GPO to do a year ago I believe and this is
where they are now with it. I believe Ric also gave us
a brief update in his presentation yesterday morning.

After this moment of consideration, does Council want to

do anything further with this?

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto from Eastern

Washington University. I understand that it's in
procurement and, therefore, a whole lot can't be said
about it. But I think a little more explanation, if you
can please, about how this whole -- just in general how
this kind of process works? At this point where you
can't really say anything about it, does that mean an
outside contractor has been selected like it was put out
to bid and someone has been selected and now it's where
you've got to be quiet until all the details are worked
out, is that how that is?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. No, not at
this point. We have sent a statement of work to our
procurement folks that outlines the requirements that we
need of a contractor. That has to go through the
approval process through our general counsel to make
sure everything is okay and then it will be posted on fedbisops and contractors will have the opportunity to bid.

MR. OTTO: Thank you.

MR. SHULER: Okay, any other reaction from Council members? How does Council wish to proceed on this?

MS. LAWHUN: Kathy Lawhun, San Francisco Public. Once they get them on board is where the real work begins and we really hope that they work with Council -- I mean GPO and Council work together to set priorities and I think that is part of the requirement. So I don't think we can do much until we get somebody selected.

MR. SHULER: So we can put this on the watch list until the next time of activity? Chris?

MR. GREER: Chris Greer, Office of Science and Technology Policy. Is there a deliverable timeline that you can show us when, what, Council and this Community when will the output be delivered not what the process is. What's the time line?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Chris, that's a fair question. I think in terms of any procurement, GPO as a part of that statement of work has proposed a timeline, but to be totally honest with you, depending on the responses that we get and potential alternative time frames, I think the most appropriate thing would be to wait for that procurement process to come through. But from a general sense, let's talk about it in terms of several months, not several years. But the exact time frame I think we need to let that procurement process come out depending on the responses we get that would be part of the award process and we'd reaffirm it at that time.

MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP, so would it be fair to expect say some national disaster, deliverable by the next Council meeting?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. When we talk about a deliverable, the statement of work is going to have multiple deliverables with multiple milestones within them. So in terms of the entire process being completed, I don't know if I'd go to that level of detail. There certainly will be things completed. Whether the entire process is done or portions of the
study are completed, that's really to be determined, I think. But we will no doubt see a good bit of progress by the fall meeting.

MR GREER: Again, this is Chris Greer, OSTP. What would be the longest timeline that would be acceptable to GPO? What's your drop dead date on completing this? Do you have an end in mind?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I don't think we want to take something as important as this and define a milestone that if it is a day later than that it wouldn't be useful. So to go back to my first response, the defined final deliverable time is going to be something that we agree to and approve, based on the responses that we get to that statement of work. So I think we need to let that process go through, see what kind of responses we got, and what the vendor community can support and go from there.

MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP. So a consultant is envisioned in order to provide a snapshot in time to help with planning and so on. So a bit of advice that never actually arrives isn't useful. And so setting some kind of timeline on this process so that, you know, there is advice on the table, there are tangibles to act on, I think seems critical. We are a year into this cycle already. We are talking about now maybe another year in that process; that's not adgile enough, it really isn't in order to get input. And so I would like to see a revised timeline for this that gets advice, significant advice on the table by the next Council meeting.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. The -- there is a timeline that we developed as Ric had mentioned and as I was trying to reaffirm earlier. We can't really get into that kind of detail before this procurement goes out. I can assure you when it's on fedbisops you will see the definitive time tables that we have opposed or recommended. So at this point that's all we can really get into, I think. When that is posted, you'll see all the information that is there as well as the time frames.

MR. SHULER: Does Council think it's reasonable to ask GPO with an official update within a X number of months in the process and where we are in the whole matter say by July 1st? Would that be reasonable
and maybe try to address some of that with Chris's
concerns that the timeline might be more flushed out and
described? That could be an official Council request?
Is everyone agreeable? All right. Thanks. Anything
else? All right. Let's close that item if there is no
other discussion from Council and let's move to the
perennial question of statistics and though this was not
a specific recommendation, it was a concern that popped
up on a regular basis at least to the spring and October
meetings. I just wanted to put it back in front of us
to see what the -- looking at the statistics might
generate. Suzanne?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
North Texas. Are we talking about the second page out
of the status report on the consulting?

MR. SHULER: Yes, that's the one I'm talking
about.

MS. SEARS: Comments on those statistics?

MR. SHULER: Yes, I want to get comments on
those statistics to see if it generates anything with
you all.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
North Texas. I found a lot of things interesting from
these statistics, as I'm sure everybody did. The
digitized historical collections are needed by 60 plus
percentage of the respondents. Also that the FDL
Community OPAL conferences are all listed as the five
least important services. But I also was curious about
the number of respondents because this is a separate
survey then the biennial survey and so we will also have
the biennial survey statistics to you and I think that
those would be important as well.

MR. SHULER: I was going to add that as an
addendum that we consider these statistics with anything
we know about the biennial survey and see if it
generates -- comparing those statistical instances and
see if it generates any discussion from Council
indicating further Council action. It's hard to say.

So Suzanne has made a few observations.

Does anybody want to throw in a few more?

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
California State Library. For the benefit of those
people who may be out there saying what are we talking
about here, there is a handout in your packet that's
headed Customer Relationships Program Status Report and it's the second page of that or the flip side of that handout that we are discussing right now.

MR. SHULER: Cindy, how are you?

MS. ETKIN: Hi, John.

MR. SHULER: What have you got to say?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I think if I'm hearing Suzanne correctly, I think there is a little bit of confusion about the different surveys that were done. There have been two surveys; the first one was the segmentation survey and the second one was a combined needs assessment biennial survey. Two different surveys.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. So, Cindy, these statistics we have at the bottom that says needs assessment, those are the biennial survey responses?

MS. ETKIN: The first half of the survey was related to the needs assessment. The second half of the survey was related to the biennial survey because it was that time again to do one and rather over survey you all, we combined the needs assessment and biennial survey. So the first part of the survey was to give us information about your needs, how we are doing on the services we are providing and trying to find out from the depository community what you all need, what you all want that we aren't providing. And what you're seeing here on the backside of that handout is preliminary data from the aggregate. Now I have this. This the aggregated data as well as the segmentation data that I got just before we came here. So what this shows is responses of the whole. And if you look at the segmentation survey, you can see that 71 percent are academic in the program. Seventeen public one percent special and eleven percent government. So you can see how these overall data might be skewed toward academic needs, which is why it was so important for us to do the segmentation survey and then get survey results from the needs assessment/biennial survey into those different segments because then we will be able to target what we do to different types of libraries.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. So, Cindy, up at the top it says the segmentation survey only 868 of the 1240 depository
libraries completed it and then the needs assessment is
1,127. So really the segmentation survey is still
missing quite a few libraries, is that correct?
MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Yes. That
survey only got 868 responses. And what Outsell
actually did, was go look at the profiles of the
libraries that did not submit and categorize them in one
of the segments for us.
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
North Texas. I'm sorry. I'm still very, very confused.
So the surveys were combined, but only -- so the people
just didn't answer that question then, the 400 libraries
that were missing for the --
MS. ETKIN: No, no. The segmentation survey
was a separate survey that was conducted in May of last
year? May and June of last year followed up by the
needs assessment/biennial survey which was done October
through February.
MS. SANDERS: This is Ann Sanders, Library
of Michigan. I may be missing something, but if I add
up the number of libraries in this -- these different --
what are they, sectors and types? I don't get either
the 868 that answered the survey nor the 1240 that exist
in the program. So I can't figure out the statistics.
MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Because they
gave us a primary type and a secondary type, so that we
could slice and dice data different ways. So, for
instance, a depository library like the San Bernardino
County Law Library would be a public -- it's a county
library, public library and also government because it's
county government. Not all librarians got secondary.
We left that up to the library to choose.
MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of
Michigan. I'm still confused though because I thought
you said that Outsell went and looked at the profiles of
libraries that didn't respond to the survey and
categorize them for you. So shouldn't there be at least
1240 in libraries here?
MS. ETKIN: I hope I don't have --
MS. SANDERS: I mean, it seems like we
should have more than 1240 if nothing else and I'm not
getting that. I'm a word person not a number person,
but --
MS. ETKIN: I'm getting 975.
MS. SANDERS: Yes, I'm getting 975.

MS. ETKIN: I'll go back and make sure I don't have a typo. I think we will review this. What were you going to say, John?

MR. SHULER: The reason why I threw this back into our attention circle, if you will, is because I thought with all the important policy advisory things we need to do over the next several months, having some common set of statistics about our Community would be very useful and we need to factor into a more complete reporting of the biennial survey. So what my hope was this would be the first of several conversations about what the state of our libraries are as we move into issues of FDsys, as we move into issues of regional selective relationships, digitization and access. All the big topics we just talked about over the last day and-a-half I think are good theoretical topics, but if we don't have a sound statistical grounding then we are not going to be able to advise very well. So call me crazy. I just thought I'd start the conversation with this piece of paper, see where it goes, see what other statistics we might need. It indicates to me we have a little bit more conversation about it. Would I be wrong?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Well, crazy? You said call you crazy, but this is preliminary data so --

MR. SHULER: Raw.

MS. ETKIN: Yes. So we still yet have to look at the segmentation data and there were still a couple of questions that I had of the Outsell folks and they are reviewing the data again. So we will get a more complete report out to you, but again this is based on preliminary data.

MR. SHULER: Is there any sense of Council of when we would desire that data?

MS. SANDERS: Yesterday.

MR. SHULER: Does anyone want to suggest a date?

MR. GREER: Chris Greer, OSTP. Two things; this is a biennial survey. It was completed last summer. So it's almost a year old now. At what point is the survey -- we were taking by events as we are sort of into the next cycle. What would be your optimal
cycle for getting this survey data and the analysis of that? What would be the target that GPO would have in terms of time?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. The biennial survey was through February of this year.

MR. GREER: Okay. I misunderstood. Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: And I'm expecting reports back from Outsell next week.

MR. GREER: Just some preliminary feedback. I think the strategy for understanding the segmentation and the distinct needs of different sectors is a very good one, very appropriate. Do you have any sense, at looking at the preliminary data, whether there are significant differences, for example, in response to most important services?

MS. ETKIN: Absolutely there are differences. That's why it is so very important to get that data, to get that data reported.

MR. GREER: Good. So that's an argument sooner rather than later --

MS. ETKIN: Yes. For instance when you look at the least important services provided by the FDLP, conferences and online training rank very high, yet we have had very good responses to conferences and to the use of the OPAL for online training. And you'll see in the preliminary data that I have, there's a very high need and a very important need from some of the smaller librarians, from public libraries and some of the smaller to medium size libraries, not so much the large libraries. So we expect to have important services that we are providing to show up differently for each of the segment as well as by library size.

MR. SHULER: Jill.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. John, getting back to what you requested from Council about possibly when we would want this.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. MORIEARTY: May I just throw out perhaps May 15th? Is that considered to be enough time to get it done and updated well and still get it to Council so we can consider some of these services and these stats?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Maybe.

Looking at my schedule, I will also have to review what
comes back to me to make sure we are on terra firma there.

MR. SHULER: If we turn that around and give that to you by next week, how close can you get to May 15th? John Shuler, University of Illinois, Chicago.

MS. ETKIN: More realistically the end of May.

MR. SHULER: The end of May?

MS. MORIEARTY: I was going to say my tendency is as long as it doesn't take forever. Take the time to do it right and have it be thoroughly informative to the Council. If it takes until the end of May then it's got to be here at the end of May. Is that fair to you? Oh, yes it is.

MS. ETKIN: Yes.

MR. SHULER: Rest of, Council, how does that rest with you?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. This year the biennial survey had a number of different questions which were those -- Outsell helped you generate those, is that correct?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO, yes. Outsell -- we worked with Outsell to create those questions and those are the ones that were part of the needs assessment portion of the survey.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Do you plan to like in the not biennial survey have similar help doing needs assessment at that time or will you go back to the traditional biennial survey questions?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'm still looking at this survey. I haven't thought about the next one yet and I know where you are going about the questions. We need to see how useful this information is and whether it's good enough or valuable enough for us to continue this process.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Okay, if you knew where I was going, I'll go there anyway.

MS. ETKIN: Okay.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: There were a few of the questions that I really felt perhaps made it really difficult to answer. The one about your -- I forget how it was phrased, but your service area verses who you do serve, that was a very hard question to answer. And I
can't imagine that the -- based on the facts, the way people were told to answer it was so odd. I can't imagine that is going to be that useful of information. There is something in me that doesn't like to see us asking what are the least important things that we do. Because that seems like such a negative way to look at it. And as you said, it depends on where you are sitting what is the least important, but labeling certain things as unimportant like conferences, for example, seems unfortunate to me. So I was just wondering, getting to a point here, next time if questions are going to be changed, maybe could you run them by the Depository Library Council just to like -- as a reality check, a test. Because sometimes testing the survey with some people who are -- or some other group, I don't know, some real depository librarians testing it, to find out what things make it really difficult to answer because I guess I'm wondering if the reason that there are still some nonrespondents to that is people are still trying to figure out how to answer -- maybe not. Maybe someone just forget about it, but some of those questions weren't that easy to answer and I think it was honestly they weren't that good of questions, but my opinion. Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I think the question you are referring to, the best estimate of approximate number of potential users and actual users?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, that's the question.

MS. ETKIN: And there was also an option to say don't know so they can move on. So that shouldn't have been a big deal. If it was don't know, they don't know, but there shouldn't have been a whole lot of discussion about that one, but there was.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Cindy, probably the reason there was all that discussion was because as librarians we don't like to say we don't know. So we really try to find an answer and those of us who want to respond to the survey and give you valid data, really struggle with trying to figure out exactly what you were trying to get at there, so we could give you valid data. So I think that that again speaks to Sally's comment that it needs to be run by a test of librarians because you may not realize the way that we read the question that we take it the way we
do. And that is one of those because honestly I don't
know very many librarians that like to say I don't know.

MR. SHULER: James.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I wonder if it wouldn't be a good idea for
Council to come up with a broad list of points or ideas
that we want answered and give that to GPO for them to
build a survey before the survey gets built itself. I'm
really interested in the idea of incentives to stay in
the program and so if there was pointed questions, if
GPO knew that Council was interested in finding out
about incentives, maybe they could build some questions
that were pointed towards that idea.

MR. SHULER: What's the sense of Council?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. Are there capabilities on the Community
suite of Web services to have, you know, quick Web
poles, those kinds of things, to gather information in
ways that don't require a formal biennial or other kind
of survey?

MR. SHULER: Survey monkeys, for instance?

MR. PRIEBE. Ted Priebe, GPO. For the FDLP
Community site I think if you have some specific
requirements in terms of what Council would like to have
in terms of a service offering, we can certainly talk
about what those are, but right off the cuff, we don't
have generic survey tools on there, but that doesn't
preclude the opportunity to investigate one.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University. I think any survey like this that we
consider, you know, has to be thought through because
there is a burden on the other end of folks diligently
wanting to answer the questions validly, but it probably
wouldn't be a bad idea for a group of Council members
and others to think about what kinds of questions might
go forward in terms of not just this question, this
round of questions, but over a period of time what kinds
of questions and what kind of data we might want to
gather from the Community.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
California State Library. I'd like to throw out a
suggestion for Council that could perhaps turn into
recommendations; which is that the spring before
biennial survey is conducted GPO asks Council what
16 questions would Council like asked in this biennial
17 survey and then at the fall meeting, before the biennial
18 survey is released, the actual text of the questions be
19 given to Council or maybe even tested by a small group
20 to ferret out ambiguity or bias or things like that.
21 Almost everybody who also conducted a survey knows that
22 the way questions are worded determines outcome.
23
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1 Political groups phrase questions very, very carefully
2 because they want people to answer a certain way.
3 Neutral groups take steps to abolish any ambiguity so
4 that you get consistent results, maybe not a 100 percent
5 but at least 90 to 95 percent consistency.
6    I remember that second question, that very
7 problematic question, I remember reading something on
8 gov.doc.l from a depository librarian who basically
9 said, I'm throwing up my hands here. I'm just going to
10 pick a response because I don't know what the H this
11 person is talking about. And that kind of response
12 indicates to me that whatever data was generated from
13 that question is going to be rather worthless because
14 nobody really understood what the question was asking.
15    Now, I have a question for GPO based on what
16 Sally was talking about. What was the purpose of asking
17 about the least important services? Is the purpose to
18 look at things that could possibly be dropped by GPO? I
19 mean, why ask that?
20    MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
21 University. You're asking Cindy, so Cindy will answer,
22 but I think that is exactly why you ask that kind of
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1 question. In an environment where you can't do
2 everything you have to begin to look at the kinds of
3 things that are less important for certain segments of
4 the Community. You know, it's not a dictate in terms of
5 the last three things on the list we automatically drop,
6 but it certainly informs the conversation.
7    MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski,
8 California State Library. That's my thought too, Dan,
9 but when I see things like authentication on there I
10 start thinking, how many -- how many hundreds of
11 thousands of dollars has GPO spent building
12 authentication into FDsys? Do we really want to drop
13 authentication?
14    MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
15 North Texas. What concerns me about this is because if
you look at the top with the segmentation research 70 percent out of the depository library, I think it said, are academic and we do have public libraries and we do have law libraries and state libraries and tribal libraries and so are we saying that their concerns are just going to be thrown out because the 70 percent of the academics' concerns are going to be looked at? I don't want to go there at all. So I'm very concerned with looking at the least and the most because I do think that training is a huge issue for public libraries and I do think that authentication is a huge issue for law libraries.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. I would hope that again it's not a formulaic response to this or any survey result. And I take Cindy and GPO at their word that this survey, in combination with the segmentation survey, addresses that very point. To try to drill down to find out, let's not just take it at the broad brush that because there are 71 percent of depositories who are academic that that will automatically drive the results. Let's look at the segments and find out what are the most important things to public or tribal or any other segment of the Community that you want to look at. And then take it the next step and tailor those services to enhance it so that again we are not just creating broad programs that appeal to the widest majority of academic libraries, but they address specific needs for specific Communities.

That is sort of my assumption -- please correct me if I'm wrong, but that is my assumption in terms of the intent for doing a survey that looks at segmentation and asking questions about what is most and least important.

MS ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Thanks, Dan for that. I'm not going to correct you, but let me just give you an example of why it is so important for us to look at the data, not just aggregately, so we don't just do that broad brush stroke. We do need to look at the survey results by the types of libraries and also by size. Because one of the things that jumped out at me immediately was, more than 40 percent of the public libraries said that they would really like us to do Dewey decimal classification. Forty percent of public libraries is a good number. It's not nearly the number of academic libraries in the program, but it is
certainly an important thing to that segment of our Community, so we will be looking at things like that.

MR. SHULER: Tori?

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Arizona State University. I sort of agree with Dan that I think it's a perfectly reasonable question to ask users to rank services. Where I differ is to me authentication isn't a service, it's a function and a core part of the infrastructure. So there may be some other information when what goes into what category. So I think, no, we are not going to drop authentication, but I don't consider authentication a service. I consider it an attribute of the infrastructure.

MR. SHULER: All right. Anything else? The sense I get is we have end of May -- end of this May to get some more concrete results from Cindy and we have a further trunk of discussion that revolves around the biennial scent of questions and more direct Council advice on how to structure them. It isn't clear to me exactly how we will be involved, but we will figure that out. In order to assure a closer alignment with on the ground experience in the libraries as opposed to the questions. We also have suggested the use of more quick survey tools through the Community Desktop as a possibility. It seems to me that these three taken together is constituting some kind of statement about statistics that we would come up as a result of this discussion and further discussions. Is that about right?

The only other observation I would make is that I would hope all this discussion, and this comes from a conversation I had with Chris Greer, that the use of the statistics and the use of this kind of exchange of information with GPO leads to a much more concrete notion of what the business plan quote unquote would be for the depository library program. In the sense that I think many of these questions beg the answer, as was raised by folks in the audience in the earlier sessions, why the hell do we have a depository library? What's the purpose? What's our primary core value that we bring from this relationship? As Chris would more adequately say than I would, I think not having a concrete idea of how you affect whatever these statistics develop, whatever plans you might develop in
other ways into a much more comprehensive sense of why are these depository libraries important? I'm not sure that I'm leading to a specific product. Maybe, Chris, if you'd like to offer.

MR. GREER: Chris Greer, Office of Science and Technology Policy. I'll start out with a bigger picture. This is a government by, for and of the people. There are a lot of good people in this room who contribute to the interest of the nation. All federal agencies serve the interest of the nation and the communities at large. They do that in a mission specific way. So the Government Printing Office has a mission that has to do with access to the records to the products of government and that mission, of course, is central to their spending. But I would argue that in addition to that, the health of the Community at large, including the depository library program, Community is part and parcel of the GPO mission. I suspect I would get a little argument on that from GPO. So this effort that Cindy described to get better granularity on the survey, while it seems sort of programatic, it actually is fundamental. So better understanding your operating model, the things that make a difference to you, prioritizing those in the right way, that response to individual needs and not just to average needs, are all steps in the right direction to enable you to improve your business model and your status.

I have been on the Council for awhile now. Every Council meeting the question of what's a business model or a regional or selective comes up and the answer every time is there isn't one and that's a fundamental piece of this landscape. In that the newspaper business a similar sort of thing has happened. The business model ran along the lines of subscription income and ad income. Online access has damaged the subscription model and ads have many other channels. So the newspaper business is being restructured. Same sort of thing is happening in our landscape. And just as nobody is going to go out and rescue individual newspapers by in large, nobody is going to go out and rescue individual depository libraries by in large. I think you have heard that in an indirect way from GPO. So I think it's really
important that the effort that GPO is making to try and recognize your needs, you need to respond to that and indicate the degree to which it actually does that and then you have to come up with what is your business model for the future because nobody else is going to solve that for you.

So these things as they seem small, but they can be big, so it deserves careful attention, even though it seems like a trivial detail.

MR. SHULER: I would think to follow on that, I would think Council has a great role to play in that kind of mediation between these plans and ideas coming from GPO going out to the Community and visa versa. It's a two-way street, actually three-way street. Go back to the three legged stool of yore.

So I think it's important as we pursue the granular art, we keep the bigger picture in mind as well. Okay. Anything else I should add about the statistics? Okay. GPO have you got anything further? And perhaps -- and again forgive me, I may be missing a point here and that's not surprising sometimes. We haven't included the audience too much in this discussion. But it strikes me that this may be the one question that if we were to include you would want to contribute?

MS. MADSEN: I'm Debbie Madsen from Kansas University. I would just like to second what David and Chris both indicated in terms of improving the process for the next biennial survey and accountability. So I would suggest that Council ask GPO the next -- to have the aggregated but the granular statistical results available from the next biennial survey prior to the spring Council meeting. So that as Council sits and deliberates and discusses you have the data you need in front of you rather than having that data presented a month later.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. We will close the file on that one and we will open up the budget file. We have heard some budget figures from our Public Printer and it seems like the typical government situation; we've got more money, we got less money. It's hard to tell where it is sometimes, but we did go into the October conference with some specifics regarding the digitization project. And I believe the
consultant project were the two big ones. And then there was the FY11 appropriations issues which I think is what the Public Printer was talking about. So let me put the question directly to GPO. In terms of where we are with the digitization budget, you got your money. Are you able to spend it? Let me put it directly, I suppose.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Are we able to spend it? So Ric had talked about awaiting full approval from JCP that we've got some promising news, but there has been no formal approval based on that request that we put forward, so we still are awaiting that before we can move forward on a lot of the initiative that we talked about.

MR. SHULER: Okay. Does the money disappear if you don't spend it by the end of this fiscal year?

MS. TROTTA: Tori Trotta, Ross-Blakley Law Library. How come it takes JCP so long to get back to you? Will they be getting back to you soon or maybe never? What can we do to support your request, if anything? Is it useful for Council to communicate with JCP or no?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO, so there is two questions; the first one related to the budget from John. I'm not a comptroller, but in terms of appropriations and how they are exhausted or carried over specifically for the digitization dollars, I'd probably have to followup with you to really ensure a correct answer on that one. But certainly our goal is still with May coming upon us, that we still have several months left in the fiscal year.

So the second question from Tori. I don't know that it would be proper from GPO to advocate what Council should do, but I mean certainly it's within your purview, as well as anyone in the Community, to put forward a resolution or whatever would be appropriate from your own prospective. But there is progress. The amount of time that it takes, I certainly can't speak on behalf of members of Congress, but one would assume that from the many priorities that they are working with, that these committees, JCP being one of them, that it's one of the several things they are working on. And it's a big issue. So I don't know that I directly answered your question there, but it wouldn't be appropriate for
us I don't think to tell you what path to take, but
certainly voicing opinions is something that I can
appreciate.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Any other Council
input on the budgets?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
North Texas. John and I attended -- well, John did by
conference call, a meeting in December where it was --
the digitization of $600,000 was talked about. Can you
give us an update on how much has been spent because at
that time there was the pilot program for the Library of
Congress materials to be put into FDsys. I'm just kind
of wondering where the breakdown is on that at this
moment? How much was spent on that project and how much
is left? If you can just give us a little more
information please.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. In terms of
that request to JCP, that we are still waiting on, that
was the first effort in terms of the LC stats at large.
So we are still waiting for that approval to expend that
first amount of money in terms to ingest that content,
and make it available through FDsys. So it kind of goes
back to that first question earlier in terms of having
the approval from our oversite group to move forward
with projects, the first of which is what was referenced
with the Library of Congress.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of
North Texas. So you don't have a figure on how much was
put forward for the small amount that was done for the

MR. MAULDIN: James Mauldin, GPO. In
regards to the stats at large, that was some of the
internal processing that was being done by PMO, and
there -- so we hadn't been given, until recently a few
days ago, that we could actually demo that. So in terms
of that, what you saw yesterday, that was just made
available because we just got word a couple of days ago.
So we could provide you how much was spent because we
actually manually we had to convert those into PDF. So
it was time to convert because what we were actually
given from the LC was TIF images. We had to create our
submission packages, our archival packages and make that
available. And to get a pricing on that we would
actually have to work with PMO to price that.
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I don't know if the rest of Council would agree with me or not. I'd like to know what you think, but I would really like an accounting of the $6,000,000 for digitization because at the December meeting it was said that it could be that much or more to ingest the statutes at large. And at the meeting in April that we were at, I asked specifically of the PMO how much would it cost to ingest a collection and they said a full treatment job about $150,000. So I'm just curious if it's $150,000 or is it $600,000? I just would like an accounting. I don't know if the rest of Council agrees with me.

MR. SHULER: What's the sense of Council?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I concur.

MR. SHULER: Okay, nobody? Are we all in agreement? Okay. So noted. Anything else on the budget? We've got 20 minutes left in this match.

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Not to be forgotten are the OMNIBUS funds that we received from the Obama admission, a million plus dollars. Accounting on that so far, a majority of that money has gone to -- well, not all of it, but we haven't spent it all yet, to the shelflist project, several task orders in addition to the shelflist project to do some work to start organizing and start getting serial holdings into the integrated library system for social titles, serials and other serial issues. So you'll be starting to see some of that. And also the funding of the pilot project for the cataloging distribution.

MR. SHULER: Anything else on budget? Okay. Now we come to the other categories in the agenda, which is always fun to fill. I would like to suggest and some other suggestions that will come from Council, but I'll start with two. Considering we are in over the next five months probably entering a time of change at GPO and very well, by a nonspecified period of time, of course, have a new Public Printer and new Superintendent of Documents. Is there anything that the Council can do to help facilitate, not necessarily the actual transition, but decide on what we need to carry over to the new leadership in terms of what we are doing, strategies that kind of thing? Suzanne.
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sear, University of North Texas. I would like to see Council put together a very brief one to two page document on short term, midterm and long term goals that we believe the Public Printer and the new Superintendent of Documents could focus on in order to move the FDLP forward.

MR. SHULER: Any discussion?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I think this is reasonable. I mean this is the prep that one does when an administration changes and I like the idea of getting started on it so it can be thoughtful, I mean, well considered and the letter can be -- or whatever we are going to call it, well crafted.

MR. SHULER: Anybody else? Dan?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony from Brown University. I think that's a great idea and just to state the obvious, this would not be an effort that would sort of reinvent the wheel. There is a lot of work that has been done both in terms of the GPO's strategic plan and previous Councils have put forth vision statements and other things that serves toward the connection for whatever the next of the conversations need to be.

MR. SHULER: Are there elements of what we suggest to either of these two groups in terms of what we should emphasize and not be stopped, in my experience of nearly 30 years experience, with the GPO an organization? It strikes me during these types of transitions that things come to a stop or things become dislocated for whatever reasons and it strikes me that we are at a critical point with FDsys and critical point with other processes that are leading to the greater success of the program that we should emphasize more heavily than others that they not be misrepresented.

We may or may not have the numbers necessary for the necessary goal documents I am talking about, thinking more about more qualitative than quantitative.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I think we need to try and get that data before we make that document. I don't think the document alone stands as strongly as it would if we had data behind it.

MR. SHULER: So now we have linked the
statistics work with this short mid and long term goals
document, agreed? Okay. Any others from the Council?
Suzanne, I believe you had something about Willie?
MS. SEARS: I would like to move that
Council make either a statement of some sort or
accommodation for Willie seen as all the service that he
provided to GPO for 40 years and a lot of Council and a
lot of members of the audience remember him very fondly
and I would like to see something put forward from
Council.
MR. SHULER: Any discussion? All right.
It's on the list of things to do.
Any other items? Anything we really feel we
need to do left over from last October? Any stones
unturned? All right. Throw it back to the audience.
Have we forgotten anything from October? GPO, have we
forgotten anything from October? No? Okay.
We have come to a natural end in this
segment of the program and we have about 15 minutes
left. I would like to suggest that we break early, if
that is agreeable. Grab more lunchtime. We come back
here at two o'clock. At that two o'clock session we
take up work that has revealed itself from the three
plenary sessions. So I would ask each of the groups,
not necessarily organize yourselves, but to prepare
yourselves for the first discussion about the outcomes
we saw from the plenary sessions that would go into a
work product to add to this list; is that acceptable?
Any discussion? We're good. Let's go to lunch. Thanks
everyone.
(Lunch break.)
MR. SHULER: The one this afternoon and the one
this morning would be to organize our thoughts on what
kind of work products we want to come out of this three
plenaries. Is that agreeable to everyone? Does anybody
want to add anything to this afternoon's discussion
other than the plenary topics?
MS. TROTT: In terms of recommendation?
MR. SHULER: No, in terms of do we want to
do more than just three? I imagine it's going to take
us more than 90 minutes to get through these three. But
I'm saying anything additional? No.
MS. MORIEARTY: Let's see what happens.
MR. SHULER: All right. Let's open it up.
Let's open it up with access and preservation. Does that team want to speak to the work products coming out of that session? I am writing them down, yes. Shall we go to progress? Let's do that. Okay, so we have agreed that FDsys is at the top of the list. What does the group say?

MS. TROTTA: This is Tori Trotta and I have three to start with.

MR. SHULER: All right. I'm ready.

MS. TROTTA: Let's see how these go and Camilla and I have been working on them. We have three recommendations at least for FDsys. The first one is --

MS. TROTTA: Share functionality and requirements for FDsys Release 2 and any other subsequent releases currently planned.

MR. SHULER: Okay. And for Release 2 and what was the last part?

MS. TROTTA: And if any subsequent Releases are currently planned? So it's share the functionality and requirements with Council, with us, for Release 2, which is the next one up. These are the three we came up with. You're looking at me like I'm crazy.

MS. MORIEARTY: No, I'm thinking.

MS. TROTT: Okay. Here is the second one.

MR. SHULER: Alright.

MS. TROTTA: Notify Council and the Community of changes when functionality is modified in any way, deferred, added, revised.

MS. TROTTA: Number three, utilize the variety of Web 20 methods to notify the Community of plans for FDsys releases and seek input for setting of priorities. Those are the gist of those three. The perfect word smithing.

MR. SHULER: It's a start, not to worry.

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, that is what I want to say.

MR. SHULER: Let me make sure I get the last one down. Inform the Community --

MS. TROTTA: Utilize the Community, the variety of Web 20 methods to seek the input of the Community on priorities.

MR. SHULER: Okay. All right. Got it.
Okay. Jill now.

MS. MORIEARTY: One of the things that I wanted to come forward is a dialogue or a communication interaction between Council and GPO on the development of FDsys. You said that in a couple of ways. I want it to be much more overt. I want the dialog. I want the conversation to be ongoing and by that I mean certainly let us know the progress. Let us know what is going on as defined in the first three points, but more than that I want them coming back to Council for the next several meetings and we continue this -- this update and analysis and question and answer dialogue that we have started. I think it's helped all of us immensely to understand what they are doing. For them to understand our concern about using it and accessing it. I think it will only get stronger and better.

MR. GREER: It would be helpful to me if you clarify what you mean, by share and notify and so at every Council meeting of course there are sessions on FDsys.

MS. MORIEARTY: Not like we had yesterday.

MR. GREER: What was different?

MS. MORIEARTY: Well focused, presentation in the morning, that allowed a lot more access information and question and answer. Our plenary session here that generated a good deal of questions, of many, many questions on both sides about what our expectations are and the product. And then last night a further session that even if possible even further cleared up numbers, dates. We found that many words that people were using had definite meanings for the back end folk versus the front end folk and wound up generating rumors. What was the one that -- excuse me. What was the one that they were saying yesterday, in -- ingest.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Submissions versus ingest.

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. I couldn't remember submission. So when they were saying that certain things could not be ingested, rumors had gotten out. People had read this and they believed that that meant that certain collections were not going to be basically added. That is not what it meant. That is not what they meant it to be. If anything it gave me much for confidence after talking -- talking and
following this conversation. I've talked too much.

MS. TROTTA: The gist of the recommendation is that we would like more communication from FDsys/GPO about what's going on with the FDsys. That's the gist of that recommendation going forward.

MR. GREER: Again, it's my sense that the more specific these recommendations are, the more likely we are to get what we want and so certainly GPO has been forthcoming at all stages in talking about FDsys. I wasn't here yesterday so I can't speak to what the special sauce was yesterday, but clearly there was something about that series of presentations that was more effective. And if we could put that fine language for that and the type of presentation and so that is one thing. What is it that we want in the Council sessions? And then there is a separate issue of other vehicles like social media vehicles for interaction and communication. So maybe we should just take those in order. In a Council session it sounds like what we are looking for is how to say this in a politically correct way, the lack of jargon, so plan language explanation and a dialogue as opposed to a briefing.

MS. MORIEARTY: No, we came up last night with an understanding because we did talk about how do we get this information back and forth? Last night we had a discussion and we spoke about this. How do we get the information out? Some of the suggestions were clear, concise, bullet points, dates, less verbiage, less tech speak and more to what you really mean. And their concern is -- and as Ric was saying, they have been putting this out, but it's become obviously it's not getting to people. But a 20 page paper does not get to me as much as say the bullet points and the very clear and concise rhetoric that was in their handout that they gave us that is in our package. They made their points. They proved their points and that type of communication. Tori?

MS. TROTTA: I'd like to avoid the awkwardness of having to respond to what appears a very negative IG report when the reality for FDsys and GPO is not really that catastrophic. So I would rather hear this information from FDsys GPO than have -- it reading it in an IG report and then coming to my own conclusions. And I wasn't the only one. That's what I
would like to avoid and that's the kind of communication that I would like Council to be able to expect as a contemporaneous way prior to the release of information that is more negative than it actually is.

MR. SHULER: But I think it's important to remember we aught to not only be reacting to what we heard today and yesterday, but also with the idea that the coming regime change means that we are only going to have to remind of a lot of people about a lot things in a very clear fashion and FDsys is no less of an issue in that regard.

MS. TUBBS: And it was my understanding from the IG report that there was a lack of a clear, detailed implementation plan and then with our meeting last night, there is more of an implementation plan. So we discussed having that information shared and just keeping in communication about those implementation plans, when there are setbacks, when there are positive enhancements made on a more regular basis is very helpful.

MR. SHULER: I think as this recommendation is being drafted, it can just focus on those issues without having to reiterate every point raised over the last two days. I think we could all agree what we came down to was simply better communication. I think we take Chris's point very well. We have to be very specific what we mean in terms of that communication.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: One thing was just having sort of this deep background or the annotation added to that IG report. However often do they come out?

MR. SHULER: Quarterly.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: All of us in this room will be off the Council and within three years there will be a whole new group of people and it probably would be good to write down when the IG reports come out, if they have things that are confusing, that it would just be good for Council to have -- at least hear their side of it so that we can make some judgments because it will be new people. They will think oh, yeah, I already told the Council. Well, the Council is a revolving door and we won't be here anymore.

MR. SHULER: I think every member -- because I think I made a note of it from the conversation last night, that it was Ric who raised the issue that since
he has come out on a quarterly basis why not inform the
Council before they are issued. There is a new
quarterly report. In fact one is being produced now, as
we speak, if we look at the schedule correctly. Why not
inform the Council when that is ready to be served we
get a first, not a first, exclusive look, but we get the
first shot at it so we have less of this dropping in our
laps and going, where did this come from.

MS. MORIEARTY: Also remember somewhere
around the time you said that, he'd also even suggested
that having them posted clearly, so they didn't appear
to be more secretive that you had to hunt them down and
until the link went around, yes, you did kind of have to
know where to look and hunt them down. So on their end
being willing to put forward this information and
understanding that people will see it, which is also
very important to you.

MR. SHULER: I think we've got strategies to
address that.

MS. SINCLAIR: I think the one thing about
yesterday's meeting that was different than other
meetings I attended was the frankness of the GPO folks
and they just were able to say some things in that forum
that they could not say in other types of situations.
Like they couldn't say it in an open session. They
couldn't say it using Web 2.0 tools, but they could say
it to us in that sort of limited form. So going back to
what Chris was saying, when we need to specify exactly
what we want, somehow we need to specify the type of
communication that we want and the way in which it is
done so that they can feel free to be frank with us.

MR. SHULER: I should emphasis that instead
of putting pressure on us in this very busy meeting
because most of you all or at least a lot of you all,
are going to be involved in a regional's discussion
later this evening. We do have another working session.
I would like to propose that we use the same strategy of
using a bulletin item of where our recommendations are
going rather than investing what little energy we have
words smithing this to death. I think this deserves, as
other things do, the time necessary to serve it. Is
there any question, debate about that?

MR. O'MAHONY: No debate about that. Last
night was a different kind of tone and intimacy. Aside
from that, however, to the extent that the morning and
afternoon sessions also contributed to an informative
exchange between Council, GPO and the audience. That's
as much a control within Council -- that's our doing,
you know. And that format may or may not be appropriate
for other sessions, other topics, other venues in the
future, but it certainly proved well for this particular
round and I think Council in the future will take that
under consideration when it -- when it formulates and
structures how it is that future meetings will go, but
that certainly worked well, folks responded well and
there was a good exchange of information.

With respect to this specific request I just
have a question just in terms of clarification because
the share, the functional requirements for Release 2
that we are asking for, is that different than the
documentation that already exists because it has been
pointed out there is lots and lots and lots of
documentation out there already and, you know, at least
five times Ric has said at various points, you know, go
back, look at that FDsys requirements documentation and
tell me is it still valid. What is missing? Give me
feedback on it. So is this different documentation than
that or I just don't know.

MS. TROTTA: I don't know either. There is
a lot of documentation, but some of the documentation is
like not -- puts it under operation it seems. We asked
for and we received here what in Release 1 was
implemented and what has been deferred and I don't think
that's anywhere on the Web site or it wasn't when we
were having the conversations about planning the
plenary.

MR. O’MAHONEY: In the handouts that they
provided for this session, there was a bullet thing.

MR. SHULER: It came out of the PMO session.

MS. TROTTA: What we want is that to go on
an ongoing basis because apparently it shifts. As they
move through the process what they can do and what they
can't do shifts or they come up with other issues they
have to solve and that, so it shifts. So possibly if
it's the case that they are constantly updating that
document then they should commit to that and let us
know, okay, this is where it's going to be; puts the
onus on us to go back and look at it which brings up
another point about how Council might want to order
their work. But there is a surprise element that
appears to continue that we just like the information
for us.

MR. JACOBS: I think it's more like 11 or 12
things that were deferred to Release 2 that need to be
on an updated Release 2 schedule. So that we know, you
know, what was deferred from Release 1 into Release 2
and we are given the opportunity to say here is the 15
things that you say you are going to do in Release 2.
We want you to prioritize certain of these things to
say, you know, RSS needs to really be up there on
Release 2, not toward the end of Release 2. Things like
that. We need an updated schedule, right?

MR. SHULER: We need to keep in mind that
what Ric and the FDsys were doing in these sessions is
telling us what isn't working, and what we would like in
the future, which is a different order of things than
what we just discussed because it's actually getting in
there using the system, putting it up under quote,
unquote a stress test, whatever that means. And then
telling them what works for us and what doesn't as a
Community and that is a whole other quality of work that
we really haven't talked about yet.

MS. TUBBS: But it's related to the
communication issue. If we had a list like this, 1
through 20, of items that are pending and it's really
easy to glance through it and it's easier for me to read
this than a 20 page report with really technical jargon.

If I see this, I can easily take this back to my
stakeholders and ask them, okay, what in this list is
most important to you?

MR. SHULER: Good point.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David. I'd like to
add one other thing for the purpose of communication
from the FDsys folks; that is if there is going to be
any kind of substantial slippage in meeting deadline
dates, and we can define precisely what would trigger
such a report that is two weeks, three weeks, four
weeks. I don't know what we would want to collectively
define, but if there is going to be a delay then it
would be very helpful to Council if we were informed
ahead of time that that delay is going to happen.

MR. SHULER: Okay.
MR. GREER: My sense from the conversation we have had so far is that Council is not looking to micromanage the project; that is we don't want daily reports or once an hour kinds of things. We don't need to know, you know, some of the fine grain details, but what you are saying is that when there are significant shifts to deliverables and schedules that we would like some alert to that fact when the decision is finalized. In every project there is always an ongoing discussion amongst the project members about pushes and pulls in all directions. And you are never, in any particular point in time, sure which delays will actually happen, which won't, all of those. We don't need to know that day-to-day back and forth, or even week-to-week back and forth. I think what you're saying is when functional items in a Release get pushed back to the next Release or when a deliverable deadline gets pushed back by more than, let's choose four weeks, as an easy number then -- and the project decides that is going to happen, not just projections or discussions or that kind of thing, but formal recognition, look, we are going to have to move these things. Everybody agrees let's move this to the next Release or, okay, we have to shift that deadline and we are going to restructure some of the project, particularly the critical path elements, that's when we would need to know. So I think for project managers those are pretty clear things. If it's a critical path element, if it's an element on a Release that is getting moved. If it's change in time line that is more than four weeks on -- you know, a specific deadline then that would be useful for Council to know. Does that cover it? And I really don't want to get in the business of micromanaging these things.

MS. MORIEARTY: At no point was there micromanaging and they don't want it and we don't want it. But clear communication, current progress. It was -- this whole discussion was with the idea that we want FDsys. They want FDsys. What can we do to make this a smoother process that is taken, you know, several years to get to where we are now, but by no means was it micromanagement.

MR. GREER: And the second half of the equation that I think is important that goes into this recommendation is the why? Let's say they meet this
request. What is it that Council does about this? Let's say there is a delay of four weeks. We get notified of that. What's the value added to the project that arises from that? They meet that requirement. It goes out to Council. What is it that we want to hold ourselves to to give back? And so the value that you get for doing that is we'll do the following. What will we do?

MS. MORIEARTY: One of the things we agreed to do is give feedback. I mean to their credit they are asking us what we think and there has not been a whole lot of Community or Council response in this, is what we think. So that on our part is part of what we promised to get done.

MR. JACOBS: I think part of what we do or what we should do is be more a communication outlet for the Community as well because that is where a lot of the confusion happens. There is rumors abound that the people talk to each other, but don't necessarily have the best or most up to date information. Council can say, hey, look, everyone here is Release 2 schedule. They let us know that this piece is going to be four weeks late and now they finished it. So we can keep the Community more informed and keep the trust between the Community and Council and GPO up to a better level.

MR. GREER: So now we have to hold ourselves to just as strong a standard. If we are going to say four weeks is kind of the deadline shift that is relevant. We can't say, well, we get four weeks to turn around and respond to that because then you are into the next shift, right? So are we willing to say we will respond with our feedback on that within, what do we say, two weeks? Any longer than two weeks then it's not relevant.

MR. JACOBS: I would hope that the communication tools that we put in place this last time, the Goggle group, maybe the Community tools, those things can allow us to do our work throughout the year rather than, you know, the two weeks of leading up to Council session. And that would -- I think four weeks is crazy too.

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes, I'd say the phrase within two weeks. The reality is most people as soon as they see this electronically are going to think and
respond immediately. So, yes, I would not want to see
any longer turnaround period for us.

MR. GREER: What's the shortest for us that
is feasible, a week?

MR. JACOBS: A week.

MS. MORIEARTY: A week. What, Tori?

MR. GREER: There really could be, if they
will provide us that level of notification, we will
guarantee a one week turnaround and if they don't hear
from us then that's approval, all is well as
communicated so that they know they have a window to
manage and they will either get a response from us or
that's a done deal and we are onto the next issue. That
way they can manage the project.

MR. O'MAHONY: I think it's good to sort of
flush out what we are talking about here. If the one
week is one week among the 15 members of Council, you
know, that we agreed that we will give due diligence to
the information in front of us, consult however we can
and respond back accordingly, that is one thing. One
week I think is a bit ambitious if it also means somehow
tapping in a systematic way the broader sentiment of the
wider Community that is a little tougher to turn around
in one week.

MR. GREER: What would be the right timeline
for that? What I heard James say that is an important
function that the Council provides. So let's say in the
majority of these instances we are going to actually
want to get at least some level of community.

MS. MORIEARTY: That's why I first suggested
two weeks. That really was why I came up with two.
Within minutes, seconds after getting the e-mail, we
will start talking among ourselves, but within a day we
could send potentially something out to our Community,
get it back, synthesize it. We are already doing this,
I'm sure on one level or another. Two weeks is enough
time to get that back and at least perhaps, Daniel, not
a full response, only a partial, but it would start to
generate discussion and show a direction.

MR. JACOBS: It's one of those things where
-- and I have told Ric and Mike, the FDsys log has not
been updated since the end of October of last year. We
can model things, model better communications and get
GPO to be more communtitive and more forward with their
information too, if we in turn communicate back so.

MR. O'MAHONY: And theoretically it's certainly an enticement for folks to become more actively engaged and participate in the Community if that is the conduit through which lots of this stuff -- lots of that information is going to be exchanged and feedback is going to be solicited.

Mr. GREER: What I heard from the response to the communications yesterday was that there is some appreciation for two different modes of communication: One was the communication in the plenary where you are talking to everybody and then the other was the communication that happened in the evening in a different setting coming from the executive branch, you can't do that, but apparently the legislative branch you can do that. So that's useful in my mind. At least Congress would pay some attention to that. So I think what this group is saying is that in notifying the Council one of the things that that would probably be useful is for the project office to be able to say, we want this to be an interaction with Council because the sensitive issue is kind of up in the air. We don't want to turn this into a broad public relations issue. We want help with the decision we haven't made yet. We want a consultation, interaction. That can happen pretty fast, as you pointed out.

There's another kind of interaction, where we want Community input. We want broad discussion with this because we think it has broad impact and that might be a two week kind of turnaround, but it sounds like this might be helpful if this all falls within the law to have the project office be able to communicate more than one mode and let us know which that is, is that right?

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

MR. O'MAHONY: For the record, it was a public meeting last night. No one would have been excluded. It may not have been as widely advertised. So I'm not trying to be cute in terms of defining it that way, but it was not a private meeting per se. Along those lines however, we have monthly or bimonthly or however frequent conference calls, you know, which are not public conference calls where the business of Council is conducted. So, you know, that is another
forum and another opportunity for whatever level of communication is felt to be appropriate based on the topic.

MR. SHULER: I do not think what happened last night was necessarily a brigadoon that we are never going to see again. And I think Dan's point is actually right on. We have other ways to create that opportunity to communicate in effective fashion in between conferences and certainly using the phone is one way to do that. It has been a very effective way.

I think going back to Chris' point, we need to be very clear. If we are not going to ask the PMO to engage in this relationship we need to be absolutely clear what our obligations are in that relationship. I think it's a good point to keep in mind.

MR. GREER: What I'm trying to get at was this line of conversation is the fundamental role of the Council and its relationship to GPO. Again, coming from the executive branch, I'm a government in the sunshine endorser and I think that all advisory committees should operate only in the public realm and everybody should have good information about who provided advice and what kind and how the government received it. What I thought I heard, and maybe I heard it wrong, was that you had in mind another level of communication that was more constrained and was trying to explore. Is that the model that, you know, gave you the better communication that you're after? Exactly where you are going with that, that thinking. Is there any sense that this is -- we have had this discussion before with Council. Some of you weren't members at the time, but the general sense was that we would adhere to general principle of open government and that is all of the advice we offered would be offered in public settings and so on. So that constrains the kind of interaction you can have with GPO and the purpose of the conversation in -- I'm trying to have is to sort out whether that was changed at all?

MR. SHULER: I don't think it has. I think what happened last night could happen in any relationship and it came after a lot of frank and honest discussion in very public circumstances. The frank exchange of both miscommunication and errors on both sides. And I don't believe, and anybody can correct me,
but I don't believe anything that was said in that room
hadn't already been said in public. Would I be right?

MS. MORIEARTY: Right.

MR. SHULER: So, in a sense that it was a
sidebar or a sense an exclusionary moment, no, not so
much.

MR. GREER: So let's backup and we are going
to say which I think adheres to our previous model that
all our interactions are the same as an interaction with
the public. That if GPO shares with us a question we
may well share it with everybody, anybody that you want
and they should make that assumption this is never a
private communication, rather it's an open
communication. In that case it doesn't make a whole lot
of sense to me to have two different kinds of deadlines.
There should just be one. That would be a two week
turnaround and consult us, the Council, you know, where
the Community is, the Council sees fit. We can respond
quicker if we think it's obvious, there is already a
Community consensus on this or take more time if we are
not sure.

MR. SHULER: With the understanding as it
happened right before this conference, there were some,
with a complete respect of transparency and openness
there are some documents that GPO shares with Council
before they share with the Community because they are
asking specifically for Council's advice and it's in a
draft form. If we are not comfortable with that and
Chris' suggestion indicates that that kind of
communication may not be necessarily expected in this
spirit of openness and transformation that we are
talking about, I think we need to get that out in the
front right now.

MR. JACOBS: This is James, I think that
open government doesn't necessarily mean that you have
to share every single draft of every single document,
you know. I have a draft of a document right here that
I don't want to share even with Suzanne, but she is
looking over my shoulder because there's typos, etc.,
etc. So, you know, if we wanted to go completely open
and have drafts and have those be completely public, I'm
fine with that, but I'm also fine with the -- the
incongruities of open government on the one hand and,
you know, draft sort of communiques on the other hand.
Does that make sense?

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes. We have all been in situations where administrators have come to us, and said will you read this? What do you think? Don't let -- don't talk about this until we are ready for the -- we have covered all our bases. We put it in acceptable form and we have sent it out. We have all been there. I agree with you it's the incongruities of open government, but the important thing is it gets out and everyone is well informed of it, but usually in a manner that it's put in the right direction, not negative, but fair and balanced. So I guess I don't see this as necessarily being bad. If it was that they only contacted us and nothing got generated out to the Community, that's bad, bad, bad. But, yes, I can see there being situations where they bounce something off us, one week is an acceptable turnaround, but they send that document out a few weeks or months later and they want a larger response. I think that's fair as well.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SANDERS: John, let me throw in too, we have had a situation recently that GPO was asking for input and Council was wanting to (inaudible) GPO's input that related to specific institution and nobody wanted that public. Nobody intended that to be public. That wasn't the point of that communication. Those kinds of things are going to happen in our advisory role. I don't think we should shut ourselves off from that.

MR. SHULER: I just wanted everybody to hear it at the same time that we are talking about in some degree nuance and complexity.

MR. JACOBS: But at the same time if they come to us with a draft saying, we are going to shutdown FDLP tomorrow, but don't share this anybody. I wouldn't feel comfortable with that either. And I would expect that all Council members would feel that, under an open government directive, that we would share that information out and ask for comment from the Community.

MR. SHULER: Ah, the litmus test, yes.

Well, unfortunately that isn't on our agenda. We may not have to cross that Rubicon, Dave.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I want to say this very carefully, but I'd like to remind everybody, who was there last night, that there was one thing said that to
me was probably the most important thing said. It had
to do with a personnel matter.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I doubt very seriously if
those words would have been said in a public forum. And
I think it was an extremely important piece of
information that helped me see some things that I
wouldn't have seen otherwise.

MR. SHULER: Agreed.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And so when we are
talking -- it probably won't come up very often, if at
all in the future, but if we are talking about actual
personnel, that should not -- well, you know, what I
mean.

MR. SHULER: I believe there is enough legal
precedent in both the federal and state level that
respects the privacy of personnel discussions that we
can easily recognize and respect.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: But as John said before,
too much communication is not good. I mean 20 page
reports that are full of stuff that we can't figure out.
So if we are perfectly transparent to the whole
depository Community and shared every bit of information
we get in every report -- I mean we have to filter it
down to what is important, don't you think? Otherwise
it's meaningless when you are sending out stuff all the
time, nobody reads any of it anymore. So I think that
is kind of our responsibility too to make sure that what
gets sent forward is understandable to people.

MR. SHULER: Agreed.

MR. O'MAHONY: I perhaps might put a
friendly amendment on that. I absolutely agree that it
can be the role of this body here and any number of
other folks to connect the dots, to steel information,
make it digestible, make it understandable to a variety
of audiences, but I don't think that's incompatible with
if you go to the FDsys Web page now are you going to get
a whole Web screen full of extreme documentation, which
I would welcome anybody that wants to look at that to
look at it and then some. So I don't think there needs
to be a filtering process. There can certainly be an
enhancement in terms of communication, but I wouldn't
want in any way GPO or anyone else that, that means, oh,
well, we don't have to, you know, share that
documentation with folks because it's too long and they
won't read it.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: There have been several
examples of people here at this meeting where things
have been mentioned that they are on the Web site some
place, the Community or the FDLP.gov and we didn't know
they were there. They are so hidden there anyway, I
mean. And I don't know if they are available to anybody
that wants to go poking around there, but we who are
most interested in it have come across there and then --
and were told that was there and then it wasn't there
anymore. So there is a lot of miscommunication.

MR. O'MAHONY: Absolutely, I'm in complete
agreement with you. I'm just saying let's have -- let's
have lots of detail that is available and then let's
also let folks know that it is there and further enhance
it or make it more meaningful.

MR. GREER: I wanted to just digest some of
that conversation, that in asking for this kind of
interaction we want to set clear standards for GPO for
when we expect communication. I think we have tried to
do that. We need to be responsible for our part of
that, be clear. For example, when we get a document
that is way too detailed and this can not be digested,
give us a high level view and say that or this is not
enough detail, we need some more to react in those ways
quickly. So that they can adjust and then to respond in
a timely way. So that we actually fit into their
project management plan and don't become the critical
path for everything. So let's try to hold ourselves to
those things. I can say that because this is my last
meeting.

MR. SHULER: So unless there is anymore
discussion on this issue? Anymore?

MR. OTTO: I have another issue I'd like to
add.

MR. SHULER: That's related to this?

MR. OTTO: It's related to FDsys.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MR. OTTO: I just had a light bulb go on at
lunch and maybe you guys already knew this, but I
thought the demonstration of the FDsys yesterday morning
was really good and I found it really informative. And
they kept saying we were just authorized to show this.
I think they were only authorized to show it here in Buffalo. So I'm wondering if the people from GPO can clarify that, which means that if you're not here, you don't get to see it. So is that the case?

MR. SHULER: It's Cindy.

MS. TUBBS: That was my understanding too. If you go to FDsys now that is not there. It was just some dummy thing they were using here, yes. If you go to FDsys now that is not there. It was just some dummy thing they were using here, yes.

MS ETKIN: Just a second and I'll flip through my e-mail. Selene, do you know whether the permission to do the demo yesterday was just for yesterday? Okay. Just a second let me check my e-mail.

MR. SHULER: So while we are finding that information --

MR. OTTO: So, if that's the case, I think there were a lot of people who weren't able to be here in Buffalo who would like to see that or see some form of it. So I think it was -- the authorization came from JC Pete, right? So we can't really ask GPO to go ask JC Pete because it doesn't work that way. So I guess it would have to be us asking JC Pete to allow --

MR. SHULER: No, it won't work that way either.

MR. OTTO: It won't work that way either?

MR. SHULER: No.

MR. OTTO: Okay.

MS. TUBBS: We talked about it yesterday about sending a message that we do want to see this get approved.

MR. SHULER: We did get that read into the official record. That can be sent to JC Pete, to get a sense of the Community and that would be an indirect way of achieving that goal, but your point is well taken that if this is frozen in Buffalo, what stays in Buffalo -- no, I've got that backwards. Anyway, you've got the point. But while you guys are looking for the e-mails. Is that it?

MR. OTTO: Yes, that was pretty much it.

MR. SHULER: So we can continue to pursue that line of inquiry. But I think the more important takeaway from this conversation is can we pull together two sentences, three sentences for tomorrow for our bullet on this issue that we can demonstrate to the Community this is the direction we are going in, is that
possible? Do I have to word smith it to death? I'm looking at the plenary group obviously in my vision, all my visions. Okay. Is that a good enough conversation? Does anybody else want to add anything? You've got Ric's e-mails?

MS. ETKIN: GPO received approval from JC Pete to show a small demo in Buffalo (inaudible).

---

MR. SHULER: So that would suggest what happens in Buffalo stays in Buffalo. We will need to pursue that along other lines.

MR. JACOBS: That doesn't mean that we can't see what is coming down the pipe?

MR. SHULER: No, it does not.

MR. JACOBS: It just means that we can't use the link to it.

MR. SHULER: Exactly.

MR. OTTO: So people can't check it out themselves to see how the process is going to work.

MR. SHULER: Okay. So we close the book on this one. All right. Let's move to access and preservation.

MS. SEARS: I came up with just a few things that I wrote down as main themes from the group. One was discoverability. One was incentives to keep and preserve digital contact. And one was collaboration and I wrote down that we need to recommend to GPO that they need to add a browse feature to their registry to browse by projects that are looking for collaborators. Cindy had said in the meeting that the registry does this already and it does not. The registry has a place on it where you can say that you would like a collaborator, but there is no way to search by that particular donation. So, if you are looking at each individual registered item, then once you're looking at all of the information for that item -- so say like my A to Z digital collection for UNT, if you look A to Z digital collection up then you look up then you look all the way down it, there might be a spot that says, yes, I'm looking for a collaborator. I find that as many items that are there are on the registry and it would be very difficult for somebody who is wanting to collaborate. It would be much easier if they could browse by all of the projects that want a collaborator and then they could go down and look at the different titles and then
they wouldn't be looking at every single thing on the registry because it is getting very populated.

Also, we would like to recommend that GPO add a link to grant opportunities document which was distributed at the Tampa meeting and the Tampa recommendations that are posted on the FDLP Desktop library Council recommendations that they add a link to that grant opportunities doc to the priority titles for digitization also to the registry. So those two items; links need to be added to the registry.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Suzanne, going along with that, was there something that I heard somewhere about keeping that list updated of grant opportunities that it was going to be Council's responsibility? Did I imagine that?

MS. SEARS: I never heard that it was Council's responsibility. I don't know that I would feel qualified to keep that list up to date.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Yes, but the list is already a year old. That's a thought that maybe we ask that be updated.

MS. SEARS: Yes, I would say and in the recommendation we probably need to assign the responsibility of who is updated or ask GPO if they have the staff to keep it updated. If not, then maybe we do need to see if somebody can keep it updated.

The other thing, and this was something that was told to me after the meeting, so it's something that somebody heard in the meeting, a suggestion for an incentive for digitization projects. Is that Council or GPO or somebody communicate and talk with associations such as SCRL and ARL about their statistics and their induces? And if they give more weight to E content being counted as volumes in their induces then perhaps the universities would take that as incentive to digitalize and have E content.

MR. SHULER: Any discussion, Council?

Keeping in mind -- not quite yet. Keeping in mind of the forward looking aspects of these kinds of documents, given these basic five points, is there anything we need to add or flush out more, given the coming regime change?

MS. MORIEARTY: Which regime?

MR. SHULER: Public printer and sudoc.
Chris?

MR. GREER: This is to add something to this set. The one thing that I keep -- trying to keep on the table is the ability of the depository libraries to contribute their only capabilities to the FDsys landscape. And so discoverability and collaboration, particularly collaboration, but the depository libraries themselves are good source of capacity and capability for discoverability, for example. They are kind of interface with the local communities out there that understand both sides of that equation. An incentive is to give them, as part of their business model, the opportunity to contribute to that discoverability and all of that is in a collaborative mode. My issue here is that it should be possible for the depository libraries to build their own applications on top of the FDsys foundation. So if you are at Stanford you can create your own search and match of capabilities that combine, not just FDsys resources, but all the many rich things that are available only at the Stanford Library, or only in California or what have you. So, I have brought this up a number of times, the need for a rich application program interface and engineering that into the frame work. We have been assured a number of times that we would see some examples of that. I'm not sure that is on the table at the moment, but I would like to put it back on the table and say I'd like to see that -- that maintained as a high priority throughout the project.

MR. JACOBS: Although GPO might argue that putting stuff in their bulk data repository is, in fact, sort of an API. I understand your point and I agree with it.

MR. GREER: Even just -- let's just take that very simple model of just highlighting how that bulk repository is available, what the choice of standards are there and how that promotes interoperability and have discussion with this Community to get that thinking going. So wherever that happens, even in a very simple mode like that, let's highlight that and mark it as an important progress for the Community.

MR. SHULER: Any other aspects to bring up in regards to this plenary session? The group then
ready to roll out a few sentences in this regard to the Community? Okay.

MS. MORIEARTY: John, may I have a point of clarification?

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. MORIEARTY: Should we work on this tonight or can we work on this at the eight-thirty --

MR. SHULER: Let's get through the next piece.

MS. MORIEARTY: Think about that.

MR. SHULER: Think about that. Let's go through the next piece and see what work is left and I think we can figure that out.

So, James, I think maybe -- maybe one slide on all three topic sentences.

MS. TUBBS: Justin, you have the template for that, right?

MR. OTTO: Yes.

MR. SHULER: Yeah. I'm going to send you all a link from the New York Times that tells you how Power Points is screwing up our military.

MR. O'MAHONY: If we save our slides can we use them at a later time?

MR. SHULER: Sure, you only have a few more hours to humor me. Okay. Let's close the circle with regional issues.

MS. SINCLAIR: Since we just had our session this morning, I personally don't feel that I have had a chance to personally digest everything that went on in the session. But I also felt that we didn't really adequately discuss all of the questions. We didn't really have enough time for all of them and then Michelle McKnelly made a really good point which was we need a whole lot more input from the Community sense. There are a whole lot of people who are not represented here. So I think if I had any sense at all of what I would say tomorrow. It would be we have to get more input.

MR O'MAHONY: Building on that intro, that while they weren't regional points per se, some of the issues or points that came up had to do with gathering, feedback, gathering whatever you want to call it. So two pieces of that could be -- and these are as many recommendations for ourselves as there are for
anybody else, but perhaps for Council to work with GPO
to do two things at least: One is to figure out ways to
utilize the biennial survey or plan for the biennial
survey in a timely and transparent way such that if
there are issues or if there are questions that need to
be put out there for Community response, that those are
done in a way that we are asking the right questions,
that folks have a little bit of advanced notice that
these questions are coming, so that it doesn't hit them
cold. And that we in a meaningful way plan for how the
biennial survey will feed into an ongoing feedback and
information gathering plan for GPO.
The second piece of that would be, aside
from the biennial survey, would be to explore other
means for gathering feedback and information and data
through the Community, whether it's through Web tools,
whether it's through some feature of the Community site,
yet to be developed or other mechanisms, but ways in
which to in a more timely way, in a more focused way,
have the advantage of soliciting brought in in input
from the whole Community.

MR. SHULER: I believe that those two
points, Dan, were also mentioned earlier today in our
first work session where we talked about statistics, so
those ideas have been captured on that to do list as
well. And about the biennial survey and releasing the
questions to the Community early?

MR. O'MAHONY: That is exactly what I was
just summarizing.

MR. SHULER: So that was captured in that
earlier discussion.

MS. SEARS: I don't know how relevant this
is, but something that disturbed me greatly about that
session, there seems to be a lot of myths out there. I
don't know what we can do about it or even if it's our
role to do something about it. But it just concerns me
that some of these people are thinking that they have --
they were saying that GPO is rigid and I see GPO very
flexible on most things. And the one person who was
saying that, she couldn't move what she wanted to to
storage because of the cataloging she would have to do.
I don't know that we have a role there or if there is
something we can do about that. But it does concern me
greatly that there are all these myths out there that
haven't been diffused yet.

MS. SANDERS: I agree with that, but one of the other things that did concern me about that session was the dropping of the bomb, to my mind, about no longer needing to provide a monetary return to the superintendent of documents for stuff that is deposed. That was huge and it just was offhanded and it wasn't even in the handout. I'm still trying to get my brain around that one.

MS. SEARS: It is in the handout, Ann, but it's buried and I have some background that I really don't know that I can put on the record, but if the rest of Council wants to meet me after the meeting.

MS. MORIEARTY: Well, what never fails to amaze me, although I live in a state that the regional does not provide information, does not really provide guidance, and this is not a secret, they do agree with me. But I was surprised at the questions. And it seems to me the other part of this and why all this misinformation is out there, is that people do have regionals who, unlike the regional I grew up with, wasn't keeping people informed, didn't seem to be a lot of these people were saying they didn't hear any of these changes. They didn't know any of these changes and it also seems to be the shifting nature of regionals now.

MR. O'MAHONY: A couple of reactions. One of the most compelling points, or just audience comments that I found this morning, was the woman from Clemson. In a nutshell I think that summarized a lot of the issues that a lot of folks are facing in terms of in many cases these are folks very, very new to their environment. There isn't an institutional or broader context for them to grapple with some of the very difficult challenges they are facing. So whether they then view that as rigid or frustrating or perplexing or whatever, you know, that's part of it. I'm not exactly sure how to address that, but I do think whatever outreach and educational and training kinds of things that go on, that that is a huge target audience that needs to be addressed on an ongoing basis because that is just going to get worse before it gets better.

The other thing I will just throw out is that, you know, for a long time lots of us in libraries
often confuse policies dictated to us from outside our libraries with the way our libraries individually have responded to those things over time and the policies that we set for ourselves. So just using my library as an example, I could commiserate with the person who couldn't send things to storage because we have a policy in place that there has to be piece level cataloging for anything that goes to our remote storage facility. We don't have that for a lot of our older government documents. So we are not in a position thus far for us to do that. That may not be anything that GPO has said. That may not be anything that our regional has said, but that is our own internal policy and at some level those things just sort of meld together for lots of us.

MS. SINCLAIR: I just want to throw out that I think Ric has mentioned more than once that he would like to have another regional's meeting similar to the ones we had in 2003 and 2000 --

MS. SEARS: One is 2003 where they paid --

MS. SINCLAIR: Yes, where they actually paid for the regionals to come. That might address what Jill brought up that the regionals that don't -- you know, either don't know what they are supposed to do or just don't do it. But it doesn't really help with what Dan is talking about where people at the selectives don't know what they are supposed to do.

MS. SANDERS: Well, the elephant in the room is still that the last time that GPO held one of those that they paid for us to all come there were regionals that didn't come. Some regionals are more regionals than others, if you'll pardon the paraphrasing. That is still the elephant in the room and there are lots of reasons why that is so. Some of them are beyond the control of individuals who is wearing that title, but --

MS. SEARS: I guess I'm just really concerned when I do believe that a lot of it is new depository coordinators who get confused with institutional policies and GPO policies. What concerns me is when they bring those out into an open forum and they are not challenged then other people that are in the audience who don't know think that is a GPO policy and that's how these myths get born and they go around and around. I'm just concerned that we are still hearing the same things over and over again about a
ridded GPO when they bend over backwards to be as flexible as possible. I don't know. Like I said, I'm not sure we have a role or what we can do about it, but it does concern me.

MS. SANDERS: I think it's in part because we are still singing to the choir. We are still singing to the group that is able to get to these meetings.

They are not the people that need the outreach to. It's the people who never -- you know, who can't make it to an individual meeting in their state.

MS. SEARS: Right, and they read the transcripts and then they have just what is in the transcript and if it's not been challenged then they just take it as -- because they can't hear tone of voice. And a lot of times when you are reading through the transcript you'll get confused as to who is saying it. And I guess it just really -- again, they don't have anybody they can turn next to you and say, what did they just say? Is that right? And the person next to them says, oh, that is not right because they are reading just a dry transcript.

MR. CISMOWSKI: In the hopes that we can craft some recommendations, I'd like to throw out three goals that I see coming out of the session this morning and they are not new -- well, one is brand new, but the other two are not.

The first would be the Community is better informed about the shelflist conversion process. I put that out there because before this meeting I really didn't know how many shelflist cards there were, but what the plan was for converting them, what the plan was for digitizing them. I think this information should be disseminated to the Community in a better way than it's been.

The second, to make sure that the -- the ideal goal, every depository library in the nation knows that it's no longer forbidden to sell unwanted publications as long as those publications have been withdrawn, according to the established processes and GPO has through the agency of the regional, relinquished federal property control over these things.

And the third would be more incentives are developed to provide exclusive incentives for both regionals and selectives to remain in the program in
those roles. My hope is that once we -- I'm sure that
there will be more goals for ideal outcomes, but once we
have those outcomes mainly we can craft language in the
form of recommendations to try to further those goals.

MS. SEARS: Can I just say, I have two
really big concerns with the selling of the collections.
I understand the concept behind them, but I just took
the -- the Fort Worth Public Library dropped their
depository and designation in February. They have
about, I'm estimating, about 700 to 800,000 items. And
I'm taking all of those items. If it's duplicates we
are going to digitize them and if it's not we are going
to add them to our collection. They have been a
depository since 1905. So there's a lot of historical
material there.

My conversations with the public services
director, who was in charge of talking with me when we
were negotiating our taking of the collection, there
were several times when he said directly to me, and to
Tom Roerrig, my regional who was in on these
negotiations as well, are you sure these aren't our
property? Are you sure we can't sell them? And I am
very, very, very concerned with who is going to be
policing whether or not they have gone through the
proper channels before they start selling this material.
We all know that there are libraries who are selling the
material and now that they have been given permission
to, basically that's a problem.

Also, are libraries going to start taking
collections with the plan that they can sell them in the
future? I mean, you know, if they paid for the shipping
to get it there and then a month or two later they put
it up on needs and offers and nobody takes it and they
can sell it, there are all kinds of ramifications. I
mean, yeah, this was just dropped on us and we weren't
given any time whatsoever to know that this was even
coming. And it's very similar to October when it was
dropped on us about regionals and retrospective
collections.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David. Regarding --
Cindy might want to weigh in on this. Regarding that
first point, Fort Worth could not sell any of their
existing collection until the regional -- until it goes
through the whole regional deselection process, correct?
MS. SEARS: And that is correct, but when you are sitting there with the director and you're saying it's government property, that's something they understand. If I showed him that, you know, yes, it's still government property and we want it so it's going to be -- I'm just saying the negotiations would have been a lot more difficult if he knew that if I didn't take it that he would be able to sell it.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Well, the process that has to be followed is that the regional makes the decision as to whether it needs to be offered to other libraries, if the regional doesn't want it themselves. And so what's really going on here is that the regional is taking possession of the collection in transferring that to you.

MS. SEARS: In a sense, yes.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And it's still federal property and once you get it, it's still federal property.

MS. SEARS: Theoretically, that's exactly right. I'm just saying the actual practice -- it was already a difficult thing to convince Fort Worth Public to give us their collection. I'm just saying that the thing that we kept coming back to was that it was government property and that was what saved me. I didn't have this, thank goodness, to deal with in February. I'm just saying that it could cause other issues in practicality. I'm not a director, so I don't know exactly how they think, but I know money is a big issue and if they think they can sell that collection, they are going to keep it and maybe list it in some obscure way somewhere so that they can then sell it. I'm just saying it causes a lot of issues. I know there is a reason behind it and I understand that we do need to not be just throwing these valuable documents in the trash. I don't know. It really concerns me and I wish I had had more time to digest it and to look it over before I was -- before it was thrown on me.

MS. SANDERS: Well, before it became a matter of public record, if you want to think about it another way, think of Detroit Public. They've got this incredibly rich, incredibly complete collection. They have been winnowing at it for the last four years, but it's still by in large very complete. And there is a
whole bunch of stuff there that the Library of Michigan
already owns, a whole bunch of stuff that is very
valuable. I mean, I could rack up probably $25,000
without using the fingers of my hands. I can probably
rack off 10 titles that will probably bring them
$25,000. Is that a direction we really want to go
because the mantra has always been you can not
financially profit from your status as a depository
library. That has always been the mantra. And if we
are reversing that, that is a game changing position
change. And there are places out there that are going
to financially benefit in an extraordinary way from that
if they choose to. Now, is that true with the majority,
probably not, but if you look at what is out there and
you spend a half-an-hour -- I mean, you go on the
Antiquated Booksellers Web site and type in U.S.
Government Printing Office as a publisher and watch what
comes up and watch what is offered for sale at. That's
a whole lot of money and it's now going to somebody who
left the program rather than comply with the
requirements of the program. Is that a message we
really want to send?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Did Detroit leave the
program all together?

MS. SANDERS: No. In their case -- and I'm
picking on Detroit. I'm not implying that Detroit is
going to go out and sell anything. There is an example
of an old, rich collection, very valuable, already held
in the state, so I don't have -- and I'm certainly not
in a position to take multiple copies just to keep
somebody from doing the wrong thing with it.

MS. SEARS: I mean, it really basically is
giving you an incentive to lead your collection --

MR. O'MAHONY: It introduces a whole other
level of incentive. In the past if you were getting rid
of things, whether you were relinquishing regional
status or just downsizing your selective, you got rid of
things but you held on -- you made the argument to hold
onto things because you were going to keep them in your
collection. This now introduces a whole other level of
incentive of financial gain by not only, you know,
leaving the program, but then selling off the
collection. Your distinction about that, the Detroit
example, where whether you leave or not leave is a good
MS. SANDERS: But they don't, Dan. If somebody leaves the program all together ultimately the regional signs off on what they decide to keep and then it is their's free and clear and then they can go sell it now because it's --

MS. SEARS: Exactly.

MR. SHULER: May I suggest I too was a bit surprised at that announcement and as casual as it was brought up in this fashion. And may I suggest that Council use it's advisory role to either advise GPO to hold off on the implementation until it is more thoroughly researched or, may I be so bold to suggest, that we might advise, based on this conversation and the concerns expensed, this may not be the best thing to do at this moment given the critical decisiontress that are being decided about all these collections.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I mean to defend GPO, they were doing this on advice of legal counsel, but there might have been some crucial angles on this that we as people that can think of the devious people that are in our Community, might possibly think of that need to be brought forward to the legal counsel and maybe they could look at it again.

MS. SANDERS: Absolutely. They were putting it forward to be flexible to make disposal easier.

MR. SHULER: I think what is critical here just as it was in the housing market. In this sense the regionals are acting as a financial stopgap. If the regionals were working properly throughout the nation, the nefarious directors that Susan mentioned -- Suzanne, excuse me -- would have a watchdog that would be watching for this kind of activity and saying, okay, you are going to deassemble your collection, but we want to make sure that you give us all parts of your collection we need for our purposes first. In other words, the regional steps back into the relationship and makes sure that the selective is behaving in the responsible fashion as the custodian of the documents that it should before the pecuniary rewards are introduced. I think that is what is missing from this equation more than
MR. GREER: Maybe it makes sense for us to include a recommendation that the Council considers that -- this is implemented as policy may have unintended consequences and potentially negative consequences and that our recommendation be that there be an analysis of those consequences at the next Council meeting prior to any action on the policy itself.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Just on the side, we had a minor sprinkler incident in our library, luckily not in any of our documents area, but a couple of years ago and several ranges of books that were with the international law collection were damaged. And in talking about this with insurance people and people in our administration, you know, just lost some books, how much could that cost? Just part of one shelf, you know, our acquisitions figured out it was $10,000 and you know what I mean? Then all at once they said, really? We had no idea. And I'm just thinking that people that aren't librarians, that aren't book people, don't really understand the value. It's a bunch of old documents. That's just like recycling paper, right? And, you know, not understanding how much this stuff costs.

MR. SHULER: Agreed. Would the regional group be willing to take a stab that at wording or do we need a different group?

MR. CISMOWSKI: We'll stab away.


MR. GREER: Another matter for the regionals, in keeping with what David said earlier about incentives for regionals, I think we ought to use our recommendations also as an opportunity to commend and incentivize GPO when they do good things. And I thought that this segmentation survey, and the effort to understand, you know, the diverse needs of the various sectors represented across the DPO Communities and integrate that into their strategic thinking, that is a good thing.

I think we ought to have a recommendation that just says, this approach, understanding the diversity to the various Communities and integrating those needs, in response to those needs into the strategic thinking, is a good direction.

MR. SHULER: Does that want to fall into one
of the groups?
MR. GREER:  That falls into the regional
discussion and David invited comments of that kind.
MR. SHULER:  Further stabbing David.
MR. CISMOWSKI:  I guess the work assignment
has been made.
MR. SHULER:  From the guy who has nothing to
lose, right.
MS. TUBBS:  We were talking about action
items for the regionals group.  The next time we have a
conference call would you just mind checking up to see
that the revised discard list with the 30 days is on the
Web site and that there is a summary, Ann, of your 50
state survey, more prominent or easier to find?
MS. SANDERS:  I can put that on Community
myself and then have Cindy's page linked to it, so yes.
MR. SHULER:  Okay.  What's the sense of
Council?  Do you guys and gals do this in off time and
come back at ten-thirty tomorrow with the bullet points
fully engaged or do you want to come back with your work
in progress and work at the eight-thirty working session
meeting?  What's your wish?
MR. JACOBS:  We'll come back tomorrow.
MS. SANDERS:  Eight-thirty.
MR. O'MAHONY:  The eight-thirty session.
MR. SHULER:  Okay, eight-thirty we will meet
here, continue the work and have it prepared in time for
our ten-thirty gig which will only give us a
half-an-hour between shifts.  Is that acceptable?
MR. JACOBS:  Yes.
MR. SHULER:  Does Council have any further
business that it wants to consider during this work
session?  Yes?  No?  Snap to it?  We are done.  See
everybody tomorrow at eight-thirty.  See some of you at
the regionals.
* * * * *
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1                  P R O C E E D I N G S

2               MR. SHULER: All right. I have of what was
3   the latest as of five a.m. this morning. Do we want to
4   do anything?
5               MR. JACOBS: These were the three things
6   that we thought, coming out of the session:
7   Discoverability, incentives and collaboration were the
8   major themes talked about. Are there others that
9   resonate any thought?
10              MR. GREER: It's my impression these are
11  sort of apple pie. They are good. They are quite
12  broad. Almost everything I can think of fits in one of
13  them. So I think that's a set of higher order
14  categories for organizing things. They work well.
15              MR. SHULER: Anybody else? Ready to turn
16  the slide? What do we think of this slide?
17              MS. MORIEARTY: Honestly, that will help
18  Chris, too.
19              THE WITNESS: Recommendation number 1, this
20  is recommended to GPO. Need to browse registry by
21  project looking for collaborator and highlight
22  collaborator needs and offers in the navigation. I
00003
1   didn't put the link in there, but it's talking about
2   registry at FDLP.gov, the digital registry.
3               MR. SHULER: Maybe we should put that word
4   or two in there indicating which registry it is in a
5   brief sentence.
6               MR. JACOBS: So maybe say digital registry?
7               MR. SHULER: Yes, digital registry or by
8   project, yes.
9               MR. JACOBS: Or digitization registry?
10              MR. SHULER: Or digitization registry.
11              MR. O'MAHONY: Why don't we just call it
12  what it is.
13              MR. SHULER: Since people don't often visit
14  the Web site as often as we think they do, it might help
15  to tell them where it is.
MR. JACOBS: Yes, I will do that, too. I believe it's registry.FDLP.gov.

MR. SHULER: So while James is doing that I'll read the second one. Add link to grant opportunities document delivered in Tampa on Desktop under recommendations and to the priority titles for digitization to registry. Any suggestions, thoughts?

Third one?

MS. SEARS: Communicate with the associations, ACRL, ARL, etc., that collect statistics and rate libraries based on those statistics to see if they might consider giving weight to E collections, vis-a-vis tangible volumes in their metrics.

MR. SHULER: Any response.

MR. GREER: My question is whether this recommendation is appropriate for the Government Printing Office? What the Council is trying to do is to, as I understand it, try to help the library Community with some better appreciation for the value of E collections and providing an appropriate way to that. Is it appropriate for the Government Printing Office to take a position on the relative merit of one versus the other, as opposed to the Council taking a position on the relative merit of one versus another. I don't know really if we have anybody here from GPO here who might comment on that. But speaking from the government side an agency taking a position on something is a significant step. It requires some consultation. You are kind of putting the government behind a particular position. This would be a significant step, I think. I can't really speak for GPO, but my impression is that would put the agency on record with respect to tangible versus digital collections. Given their current status, with respect to the new printer, things like that, this might be a steep hill.

MR. O'MAHONY: I would agree and also just sort of as a very basic background, ARL for one has been looking at this issue for a lot of years and has been testing different metrics, with respect to electronic sources, and like any association has its own realm of politics and controversy surrounding statistics and how those relate to describing or ranking collections and I don't really see the value of sort of inserting a public printer or GPO into that melee.
MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski. I agree. I think because of the politics involved here, there might be resentment on the part of some ARL directors to the government inserting itself into this issue and that might negatively impact the depositories and those directors' domain.

MR. O'MAHONY: And just to followup. I think the basic point or intent of this actually is already underway. I mean at least not speaking for, but speaking about ARL. They are very, very much aware of the importance of electronic collections and working in a lot of creative ways to try to find the appropriate measure and rank that kind of stuff.

MR. SHULER: What is the sense of Council on this then?

MR. GREER: My sense is that if Council wants to make this inquiry that is one thing, you may well be inserting yourselves in the politics of this, so I think we should be careful about that, but as a recommendation to GPO, I wouldn't support.

MR. O'MAHONY: We could alternatively, as a point for ourselves, rate this as an important issue or topic for us to take back to our respective Communities to be sure that, you know, the value of electronic government publications is included in discussions within our Communities as they move forward in dealing with measuring and describing collections and such.

MR. SHULER: I get the sense that there is a feeling that we should step softly here and whether or not this is the theatre to display this particular stage graft at this moment might be considered.

MS. SEARS: Specifically, Dan, in your comment do you think that the ARL directors would be offended if Council made it just so that we can weigh in on the side of please, yes, if it's already on its way and there is this pole against it or whatever maybe we could help push towards being done?

MR. O'MAHONY: Right. I mean, expressing the importance of digital collections and however it is that we want to describe that value. I think that's perfectly appropriate and would lend value to the discussion, but it's -- it's not directing GPO to do something and it's not telling them how to do it. It's just expressing that we think this is an important thing
that should be considered.

MS. SEARS: So what words should we changed in here to make sure that Council expresses their belief that E collections should -- how would you change the wording?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I forget who brought this up first, but it was under the heading of kind of incentive to libraries to want to participate in digitization projects, as I recall and it still seems like there is still some germ of an idea there. I don't know if there is something that GPO -- that we would need from GPO, maybe not, but it would certainly be good or if there were a way to make this be an incentive, you know, exist as an incentive.

MR. SHULER: Perhaps the question we should be asking ourselves, is this something that we want to address particularly to GPO or to the Community at this time since we are still processing it?

MS. SEARS: It sounds like it needs not to be directed at GPO. I mean, I agree with what Chris and Dan both said. I think it needs to be addressed to the Community, but I do think it holds more weight if it's coming from Council and is in a recommendation. I mean associations do look at us as the Community. And I do think that it's important that it is included because we have heard very clearly in the last two days that incentives are a big issue and this would be a big incentive for digitization. If you are going to build your E book collection by digitizing and you get -- if you're losing a tangible volume, if you destructively scan it, which most libraries are doing, but you are replacing it with an E collection book that is still being counted in the same way or you're getting credit for, I think that is an incentive. Otherwise there is an incentive to hold onto your tangible collection and not do the digitization.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Would this be a possible idea for a program for the fall meeting to bring someone that knows about this from ARL and ACRL? I don't know. I mean, I'm not in those organizations so I don't know. Do they have a person that is in charge of this or somebody that could come and do a program on this general topic?

MS. SINCLAIR: We could ask Denise Davis to
16  come.
17  MR. O’MAHONY: Well, in terms of just
18  getting to the words, I think the second half of that is
19  great if that's expressing the sentiment that giving
20  weight to E collections in terms of, you know,
21  describing the size and value of collections. I think
22  it's just the first part in terms of rather than
00010
1  directing it at somebody that, you know, Council
2  expresses the importance of digital collections --
3  digital collections of government publications and I
4  don't have the words at the top of my head, but --
5  MR. GREER: So we just might say it
6  directly, let's say Council intends to pursue
7  discussions with associations as the first part of that.
8  And I think a plan to have a session where you are
9  getting input from ACR and ARL is an excellent one. If
10  it would be an open conversation and Everybody could
11  participate. I think that would be fabulous if we could
12  make that happen.
13  MR. SHULER: So we can make the changes?
14  MR. JACOBS: If I can just say something
15  like, Council intends to pursue discussions with
16  associations that collects statistics and rate libraries
17  based on those statistics, etc., etc.
18  MR. SHULER: So agreeable?
19  MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.
20  MR. SHULER: Okay. Any other discussion?
21  Missing points? All right. Should we close this one?
22  Shall we go to since the regional -- I forget which is
00011
1  the longer one. I think the regional is the longer one.
2  Open that one next? The slide show. Should one of us
3  read this out loud? Council recommends that GPO staff
4  share with the Community a detailed summary of the scope
5  and target completion date of the GPO shelflist
6  conversion project. This summary should include; one,
7  total number of shelflist cards in the project. Two,
8  total number to be transcribed and three, total number
9  to be digitized and four, end users of these transcribed
10  and digitized records including use in a proposed
11  automated disposal list and NO, needs and offers list,
12  automation tool. This summary should be disseminated by
13  May 15th, 2010. Oh the density.
14  MS. SANDERS: I have a little philosophical
15  problem with the terminology shelflist conversion
project because we keep calling this thing a shelflist
but it's not. It's the remnant of their dictionary
catalog. And I'm a little uncomfortable that we are
setting up an expectation here that this project is
going to answer all of the pre1976 cataloging woes of
the Community and I don't think it's going to.

MS. SINCLAIR: I was going to add to this
recommendation that we ask them to give an explanation
of the content of what is being digitized which would I
think help the Community to understand exactly what Ann
is saying that it's not really a shelflist. I would
suggest that they, rather than sending out one of their
typical, you know, fact sheet type publications, that
they actually do some sort of -- make a video or a OPAL
presentation that actually has visuals in it showing
what this thing looks like so that people can understand
it a little bit better.

MR. CISMOWSKI: My purpose in drafting this
was to get information about this project out to the
Community.
MS. SANDERS: Absolutely.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I do not believe that GPO
ever fully explained the scope of this, the content of
this, what they were actually doing and I learn things
for the first time here that I don't think have ever
been explained to the Community. And so the goal here
is not -- not necessarily to do just those four things
or five things up here, but to have a -- to ask GPO to
explain the entire project.

MS. SANDERS: Yes. I'm not taking issue
with the draft recommendations. I think they are fine
and I think it says it should include, it's not limited
to, but I -- I'm word smithing I know, but I have issue
with what we are calling it because I think we are
adding to -- we are setting up a false expectation about
what we are going to get out of it.

MS. SINCLAIR: What should we call it
instead?

MS. TROTTA: That is what they are calling
it.

MS. SANDERS: From my prospective that is
part of the problem.

MS. TROTTA: What if we -- what if in the
draft recommendation the number one was really to find
what exactly is in this group of documents? Does that help you with your problem?

MR. JACOBS: What is it that they called it, a dictionary list?

MS. SANDERS: A dictionary catalog.

MR. GREER: Right, so where it says in that first thing in the goal, the shelflist conversion project, I mean a simple thing would be to just put a parentheses and then the project to digitize the old GPO dictionary catalog, because it is known colloquially as the shelflist project, but if we can help further refine that and move that and then move that discussion along.

MS. SANDERS: That helps. That would work for me.

MR. SHULER: Anybody in the group type that change in?

MR. GREER: Can I propose two friendly amendments? One is we should ask GPO to answer this question, you know, consider that GPO rename the project to reflect its actual goals and intent, maybe that would be recommendation five, which would build on all the other items in that list. What is it that you should call it? The shelflist conversion project is not appropriate. So five would be that GPO provide a -- a name for the project that reflects its actual goals and intentions.

For number four is to add examples of intended end uses, since we hope that lots of people will come up with uses that they can think of. So it's not that it is a constrained list, it's just an example of what they hope will be done with it.

MS. MORIEARTY: Can you say that one more time?

MR. GREER: Number four, start with examples of intended end uses of these transcribed.

MR. JACOBS: Just a point of clarification, can someone explain the difference between, what was that, transcribing and digitizing? In my mind I think digitizing includes OCR which is transcription or are they planning on doing snapshots of some --

MS. SANDERS: My understanding is that digitizing in this case means digital reproduction of the actual cards.

MR. JACOBS: So snapshots of everything, but
not necessarily using it?
MS. SANDERS: Yes. They are not OCR'ing it is my understanding --
MR. CISMOWSKI: I specifically asked Cindy what that was and she said, they are converting every
shelflist card into a TIF imagine. It is not being OCR'd. She showed me an example of a shelflist card. A lot of those things, up until '60's or '70's, were handwritten and so it can't be OCR'd.
MS. SANDERS: We are talking about copper plate in librarians' hands. And what the transcription project is doing is turning them MARC. They are adding the subject heading and the name --
MR. JACOBS: So they are making some sort of judgment of this card that we've taken a snapshot is crap and this card here is good and we are going to transcribe the information into MARC, correct?
MR. CISMOWSKI: Well, the purpose of the --
no. My understanding of the purpose of the digitization is so that GPO will have an in-house tool that will replace the actual physical shelflist or whatever we want to call it, which has been send to NARA. I have a question. I don't have a laptop here. Could somebody else -- are you doing it? Okay.
MR. SHULER: So is somebody transcribing --
Thanks, Gwen. Shall we move on?
MS. SINCLAIR: Do you want me to read what I put in here? Okay. The draft recommendation now reads, Council recommends that GPO staff share with the Community a detailed summary of the scope and target completion dates of the GPO shelflist conversion, parens, project to digitize the dictionary catalog, close parens. This summary should include one, total number of shelflist cards in the project. I guess we need to change that too. Total number of cards in the project? Total number to be transcribed, total number to be digitized. And four, examples of intended uses of the transcribed and digitized records including use in a proposed automated disposal list and needs and offers list automation tool. And, five, rename the project to reflect its actual content and scope. This summary should be disseminated by May 15t, 2010.
MS. SANDERS: That makes me happy. Thank you.
MR. SHULER: Okay. Next line. Goal two, as soon as possible GPO, Council and regionals will finalize procedural details of GPO's decision to abandon government ownership of depository publications that have gone through the complete regional supervised disposal process. Draft recommendation: Assuming Council approves GPO's proposal to abandon government ownership of depository publications that have gone through the complete regional supervised disposal process, Council recommends that as soon as possible GPO staff work with regional depository coordinators to finalize procedures for declaring ownership abandonment. After finalizing procedures GPO and regionals will inform the broader Community of the new rules for final disposition of abandoned depository publications.

MS. SEARS: I have a major issue, which isn't really expressed in this recommendation, but about the -- once it's abandon, being able to sell it. I don't think that I would have as much of an issue if the money wasn't going to the person who was discarding the material, but with the money going to the person who is discarding the material it gives them a very huge conflict of interest and it gives them an incentive to leave and an incentive to withdraw from the program.

MS. SANDERS: I don't think they proposed abandoning government ownership because that's always happened. The last step in the disposal rules has always been dispose of it as you see fit. Maybe the phrase abandon government ownership hasn't been in it, but that is not what is new. What is new is the what happens to the proceeds if it is sold. That is what is very new. And I think for me that is what I'm taking issue with more than the new use of the phrase abandon government ownership.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I deliberately did not put in any verbiage about selling publications into this because I realize that this is an issue that is going to have to be discussed before -- because of the controversial nature of this, it's going to have to be more fully discussed. But I think that -- I truly think and I was talking with Suzanne and some others at breakfast out there, I think that we need to do something today about this because word has already gone out to the Community that it's okay to sell publications
as long as they have been abandoned by GPO. So what are we going to do, folks?

MR. O'MAHONY: The next slide. Since we were in different hotel rooms last night, we need to have the same idea, you know.

MR. CISMOWSKI: My brother's name is Dan too.

MR. O'MAHONY: A similar approach, but just a slightly different tack in terms of identifying specifically the sales stuff. So if you flip to the next slide, I think it's the next slide, slide four, you know, it essentially says we are first of all seeking clarification on this policy, but it also sort of inserts Council into a process of helping GPO develop fuller guidelines for just what this means. And, you know, it could be stronger in terms so folks don't leave this room and start, you know, putting things on eBay but at least it's a start.

MR. SHULER: I encourage the act of word smithing in trying to sharpen these as much as possible. I also point out that the purpose of the following meeting is to present to the Community draft of where we are going and I think this is a perfect example that we want to leave it not undeveloped, but developed enough to show the Community where we are going with this and to get their feedback as well. So trying to fine tune it at this point, I don't know if it's going to be worth the effort.

MS. SEARS: I agree with David that something absolutely has to be said and I think it has to be pretty strong even before we show it to the Community. This is the exact same thing that happened in October when Cindy had that statement in her slide and it was just nonchalantly put out there and we all know what the consequences of that were in the following months. So I think we need to respond to what we heard in a very strong manner and we can pull back later if we have to, but I think it's really upon us to make sure that this thing doesn't get viral before something is clarified.

MS. SANDERS: You know, if we consider that we had more people following the blog yesterday than we had in the room and that is out there. I agree. I think we have to -- we could find ourselves agreeing
with this policy change at some point, but the issue is
that it hasn't been discussed and we see ramifications
that perhaps GPO didn't see.
MR. SHULER: Then are our words strong
enough as they are right now, in the way that they are
organized on these slides, to convey that great
importance to Council through GPO, as it is drafted now?

MR. GREER: My impression of the discussion,
I wasn't here for much of it, but my impression of the
discussion is there is not mature policy to reflect this
new legal guidance. So what is new is the legal
guidance, but what I went didn't hear was implement able
policy to act on that guidance. So my picture of this
the steps to new policy are, one, to announce to the
Community this new legal guidance and characterize it as
just that, it is legal guidance.
And, two, that GPO intends to implement a
process to develop mature policy to act on that guidance
and that will be taking place over the next period.
And that, three, that policy will be
development with input from the Community, including the
course of Council. So those seem to me the three steps
that we would like to see.
MR. SHULER: Where do we want to drop the
three steps, in the draft action item or in the
recommendation?
MR. O'MAHONY: I think that is a great sort
of approach to introduce specifically because it also
could help set the tone for future, you know, policy
development because it isn't always developed in that
kind of a way. So I think that is a nice step-by-step
approach. And hopefully -- we can even be more
explicit, but hopefully that tells the Community that
what has happened thus far isn't a full blown change in
policy. It's just now we know that the scenery has
changed a bit and we have to develop policy to reflect
that.
MR. JACOBS: I'm trying to get my head
around why GPO would make this switch? Was this some
onerous process that when a library sold something it
had to send proceeds to GPO or something like that?
MS. SANDERS: Well, if you stop and think
about the average thing. You know, we are not talking
about exceptional disposals. We are talking about
somebody wants to recycle it and their institution receives money from the recycler. Under the law they were suppose to send a check for those proceeds to the superintendent of documents. I had some just ridiculous cases in Michigan where hearings got mold and were recycled into ceiling tiles so who owned the ceiling tile? You know what I mean. The average situation is different from the one that we have been projecting about somebody deliberating selling valuable --

MR. JACOBS: So in clarifying the procedure, they are actually clarifying a really bad outcome. I mean from what I'm hearing, you know, is that true?

MS. SANDERS: Well, in clarifying the procedure they are trying to make it easier. They are saying, okay, we have abandoned all interest it, so why shouldn't you be able to stick it in your book sale and that makes perfect sense. But what we are bringing up to them is the reverse of an institution deliberating selling something for profit and thereby profiting from their current or former status as a depository. So we are devil's advocating them.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I think the purpose -- the driver behind this is a number of things. GPO has been hearing for a long time from the Community about increased flexibility. There are -- many depositories are massively weeding tangible collections to the point where no other library is picking up what other libraries don't want. So at the end of the disposal progress selectives have shelf after shelf after shelf of publications that they have to do something with. So nobody wants them, so they are faced with basically two choices; they can sell them and send the proceeds to GPO, which is an onerous process or they can just say, you know, I know these probably have value, but I can't really do anything with them, so I'm just going to take them out to the dumpster. So GPO has been hearing that a lot of valuable publications are ending up in landfills doing nobody any good at all where they could be doing somebody some good. GPO doesn't want these things, but booksellers might want them, individuals might want them for their collections. They could be told in friend's sales and benefit the libraries, that have held these things for years, at their experience.

MR. JACOBS: So really what we are talking
about is if this is part of the day-to-day -- the
accessioning process that is okay, but if it's part of a
library dropping its status then that is not okay. I
mean, that's what's --
MR. O'MAHONY: Exactly. If at the end of
the day and somebody has gone through all the due
diligence of the national needs and offers and expended
all effort to make sure that nobody truly wants it or
can use it, then if they sell it, whatever they do with
it, that's probably just fine. But what we don't want
is this to be an incentive for folks to work around the
system and shortcut those procedures.
MS. SEARS: I think a point Dan just made
that is very important, he said, national needs and
offers list, that's still an option. People don't have
to list on the national needs and offers list. I think
that should be a requirement if they are then going to
go ahead and sell it.
Also, I just mentioned this before and I
want to mention it again. A lot of times those things
aren't claimed because of the cost of shipping to get
them to another library. It's not that other libraries
don't want them, it's that they can't afford the
shipping to get it there. So I don't know. I don't
know that I have had time to digest it and think about
all the possible ways to maybe fix it.
I'm just concerned that we are going to have
some directors who are going to see this and I know that
many of us don't have time to look at the needs and
offers everyday or on a regular basis and especially
every one of the 50 states. So if it didn't go to the
national list, I may not know that it's available. So I
do think that needs to be a requirement if we are going
to allow the sales.
MR. O'MAHONY: We also heard about the
development of a tool for national needs and offers, so,
you know, if on the one hand that process is
facilitated, that could sort of potentially help that.
MR. GREER: So my sense is we are probably
not in the next five minutes, going to think of all of
the unintended consequences of the significant change on
all the proper fixes for those, although there are some
good ideas on the table. So instead I think what we
want in the next five minutes is some agreement on what
is the process to get that debate, you know, accomplished so that we do have a thoughtful policy that emerges from that. So I would suggest let's focus on the process of having a policy debate.

MS. SINCLAIR: Let me just read what I have for that action item and you all can tell me if I left something out that we might want to add. So this is from slide 4. I guess we are replacing David's text with what Dan had put in, which is pretty much the same anyway. So now it says, Council appreciates GPO's efforts to respond to the needs of regionals and -- regional and selective depositories by working with the Community to find ways to streamline the disposition process. Council recommends that GPO seek guidance from its general counsel on the newly revised policy regarding the sale of abandoned government property and encourages GPO to develop guidelines within input from the Community for interpreting and applying the new policy, in order to minimize any unintended negative consequences that might result from the misunderstanding or misuse of policy. Did I miss something?

MR. SHULER: Are we good to go?

MR. GREER: The sense that I hope we would communicate is that we don't have policy yet, so input on the newly revised legal guidance, and then work with the Community to develop policy for applying that guidance, to minimize any unintended consequences, etc., etc.

MS. SINCLAIR: Could I just say that instead of saying newly revised policy say proposed revised policy?

MR GREER: Anything that says that we don't have a true policy yet, that's fine.

MR. SHULER: With those further changes are we good to go? Since we can go back a slide since I think we finished with recommendation one -- excuse me.

We are at goal two now?

MS. SINCLAIR: That was goal two we just finished.

MR. SHULER: How about goal three? GPO in concert with Council and the Community will strive to identify and enhance exclusive benefits accruing to both regional and selective depositories. Draft recommendation: Council recommends that GPO work with
the Council and the Community to create additional exclusive benefits that will accrue to official FDLP depositories both selective and regional. Those exclusive benefits will serve as positive incentives applying for designations as official FDLP depositories and for remaining in the program. In addition, Council recommends that GPO develop and prominently disseminate a master list of all depository benefits including, when appropriate, those benefits approximate monetary value.

Council reactions? Hang on, Roger. The council has to be done.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I think it's pretty obvious this needs to be pared down, but the intention of this is to not only identify current benefits, but to provide a recommendation that further exclusive benefits be explored. And also, because directors are asking what is the practical value of being a depository, that's why I put the monetary value, if it can be determined of such a benefit.

For instance, all depositories get access to proprietary data bases such as STAT USA. What is the monetary value of that? How much would it cost to get a single license to STAT USA for University X?

MR. SHULER: So are you suggesting we edit this or are you just giving --

MR. CISMOWSKI: I'm just suggesting that I'm not going to be offended at all to reduce this or put something else in there. I wrote this at eleven o'clock last night after having a beer.

MR. SHULER: I'm not arguing it should be edited. I'm just trying to --

MR. CISMOWSKI: I don't know if that should go in the record.

MR. SHULER: I think it's pretty good actually.

MS. MORIEARTY: It's brilliant.

MS. SHULER: Is there a -- building on that theme is there any necessary changes that one would make to this?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: In 2004 there was a document about the carrot crop about incentives. It's mentioned in the 1995 memorandum thing. Maybe we should reference if that's the that the list that we are asking them to build on. There have been lists of incentives
created. I don't know what we can with them. We are
trying to see if we can find it. If it still exists on
there. Do you remember that incentives document
progress report, the carrot crop?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes, I think they have taken
it down.

MR. SHULER: Maybe the way we can get around
that is to refer in a sentence some way in a previous
effort to site incentives, something a long those lines
and if we can't remember it --

MS. MORIEARTY: Perhaps that would be an
appropriate substitution.

MR. SHULER: So why don't we refer to the
build on previous documentation of incentives?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: We found it. It is eight
pages.


MR. SHULER: So if we add that to this --
what else needs to be done to this particular one? Do I
hear the word microfiche? Oh, please no.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: It needs to be fixed
because there are things in it like published stuff in
administrative notes, etc., and things like that that
are no more valid ideas.

MS. SINCLAIR: For the purpose of the draft
for discussion, I just added to the last sentence, in
addition, Council recommends that GPO build on previous
documentation of incentives and prominently disseminate
a master list. Blah, blah, blah.

MR. SHULER: I think that works.

MS. MORIEARTY: This document has got a
title and it's from October of 2004.

MR. SHULER: We could add that to the final
version.

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you.

MR. SHULER: In the spirit of openness and
transparency because we allow the bloggers to listen in
and perhaps contribute, Roger, take a chance.

MS. SANDERS: Excuse me, just a second,
John, John, John? Excuse me just a second.

MR. SHULER: Yes.

MS. SANDERS: There is a page in the Desktop
right now called the Explore the Value of and Your
Options in the FDLP and there is a document there called
The Value of a Federal Depository Library. Both of those are current 2010 documents. So we might want to work some reference to these into that last recommendation.

MR. SHULER: Do we need to do that now in the drafting process or in the final?

MS. SANDERS: No, I just want to point out there are current ones there.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: What is the title again?

MS. SANDERS: The overall page is called Explore the Value of and Your Options in the FDLP. It's under the Outreach tab. There are two documents there: One called Share With GPO and Your Regional Library and the other is called Value of a Federal Depository Library. Just make sure that those get referenced. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

MR. SHULER: Let's get back to the other agenda item. Maybe I'm being presumptuous, but what is Council's will on this to allow members of the audience, if they have a pertinent suggestion to suggest it or how do we want to proceed?

MS. SINCLAIR: I think traditionally we have not allowed the audience to participate in our discussions because they have opportunities to provide their input in other venues and other times.

MS. SEARS: I agree with Gwen. Traditionally business meetings have been just because we have so much to get done before ten o'clock when we are suppose to break. On the open sessions is when we take comments from the floor.

MR. SHULER: So heard.

MR. GREER: We are making good progress. We don't have a huge line of people at the microphone. I always think input is good, so I would support hearing from the audience.

MR. SHULER: It doesn't sound like we have enough of a quorum to move the question so we will continue with existing procedures. Are we done with goal three? I believe we have draft action item. Council commends GPO for under taking a segmentation survey in order to learn more about the diverse needs of the various types and sizes of libraries in the FDLP and for integrating information about these needs into its strategic thinking. Council
look forward to seeing the results of the survey and stands ready to work with GPO, and the depository Community to help interpret the survey results and use them as appropriate to inform discussions and decisions about FDLP services. Discussion.

MS. TROTTO: Did we decide to leave out the request that we get them in May, the final report, and also if they were going to put out another needs assessment survey to have a test or do you think that is included in there, in that language?

MR. O'MAHONY: It is not included in this, but there are other action items later that address that directly. The deadline was just an omission so we can stick that in there, sure.

MR. SHULER: Any other discussion or changes on this draft action item? Turning the page then.

Draft action item: Council offers to work with GPO to develop a plan for utilizing the biennial survey to gather information and solicit input from federal depository libraries in order to provide relevant data on strategic and operational issues facing the FDLP. Such a plan should include timelines for the introduction and testing of new questions with the intent of giving depository libraries reasonable advance notice of new questions. Discussion.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I don't know that the -- should be limited to new questions. I think it should be limited to all questions and not limited, in other words. That is all questions that are on the biennial survey should be made public before the survey is launched for Community reaction because that's the only way that ambiguity in these questions is going to be identified and they can be refined before the survey begins.

MR. GREER: Maybe just strike the word new?

MR. SHULER: Suggestion is strike the word new? Agreed?

MS. SANDERS: Yes.

MR. CISMOWSKI: And the other aspect is that I think that Council should be approached well in advance of the drafting of the questions to get Council's input on what questions should be asked. What topics are out there that need to be addressed during the biennial survey. So there is really two parts in my
mind that is; approaching Council and possibly the Community about what should be asked. And the second part is refining the survey instrument to make sure that the questions are clear unambiguous and are going to lead to data that is usable.

MS. SEARS: I concur completely with what David said. I do know that they do start planning the questions two years ahead. I mean, the end of the biennial survey they start planning questions for the next biennial survey. So this is something that we need to act quickly on, getting it off of draft and into a finalized.

MR. O'MAHONY: I also agree with both David and Suzanne. The intent of the first sentence was to get to that very thing. It obviously isn't as explicit as that, but the idea was that in developing a plan it would include all of those necessary steps.

MR. JACOBS: I think this is a great idea. One of the things that not -- it doesn't necessarily have to be in this draft, but it would really interesting if GPO could work with some social scientists to include experimental questions like some other surveys do and then those social scientists could use that data for their own analysis to publish in GIQ or some other publication. I think it would be really interesting because the questions as they are now really gets to what GPO needs. It doesn't really get to Community needs, as much, you know. The questions that are in the biennial surveys are for GPO working, not to expand that to include --

MR. GREER: I hear the Washington assertion that no good deed goes unpunished might be appropriate. I'm a little worried about hijacking the survey for too many different purposes. The GPO, of course, has to satisfy the legal requirement to gather input on the status of depository libraries. They have been using a survey mechanism which I believe is a laudable way to gather that information. We should be careful not to create such an overhead on this that they then have to choose to use another mechanism for that. So be careful. It's just an assertion not to overload the mechanism.

MR. O'MAHONY: I agree. And that the two items there on the page try to address that -- partly
that very thing and the next one -- I mean the first one
is specific to the biennial survey. And part of
developing a plan I think would be to sort of sketch out
what the role of the biennial survey in an overall data
gathering and information feedback group that GPO would
development.
The second action item, when we get to that,
tries to create sort of a separate mechanism for doing
things outside of the biennial survey to expand that
whole effort.
MR. CISMOWSKI: I agree with Chris and also
with Dan. I think one of the really good things about
the 2009 biennial survey was that some questions, that
always appeared to me to be kind of outdated and
irrelevant were dropped out. The biennial survey should
be focused. It should be as short as possible and
should be clearly identifiable as gathering usable data
for that period of time.
And one of the things that came up yesterday
was, when I was discussing something with a member of
the audience, was the longitudinal nature of these
surveys. That is whether the survey is designed to
measure things over time or whether it is more of a
snapshot of the issues that are existent at that time.
And I think that's a debatable issue because if you are
trying to do a longitudinal survey then the number of
questions is going to be much more than if you try to
focus it on the important issues of that particular
biennien. I realize that is a totally other discussion,
but anyway, enough said.
MR. SHULER: Has the discussion lead to any
further changing of the wording?
MR. O'MAHONY: Looks good.
MR. SHULER: We are good to go? Draft
action item: Council offers to work with GPO to explore
ways to solicit timely feedback from Federal Depository
Libraries through the use of Web surveys or other Web
based tools. This work also should include developing
guidelines for the timing and frequency of surveys as
well as a process to prioritize potential survey topics
of area or areas of interest. Discussion. Jill.
MS. MORIEARTY: Please forgive me. I'm not
sure I understand exactly that this means.
MR. O'MAHONY: Well, the intent is to
compliment the biennial survey process by introducing another way to gather feedback from the Community about any number of issues or services or other kinds of things that would help inform improvements, decisions, directions, however, whatever GPO, or Council for that matter, might need to have information about.

The second part of it, the last sentence is to acknowledge that, you know, there is a cost for every time you ask a question and we don't want to, you know, over question the Community. And that some, you know, priority has to be set so that we are not always asking questions all the time and that, you know, it's fit into, you know, in a programmatic way rather than just ad hoc.

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you. I think what threw me off when I first read this was plan. I wasn't sure what that actually met in terms of implementing this and it could be I haven't had enough caffeine, but having it explained makes more sense to me. Every time I see plan without more description, as to how this is done, I start wondering. Thank you.

MS. SEARS: I do think it is very important that we clarify that last sentence in the open session because we clearly heard in Tampa from directors who said they had been over surveyed and did not want us to survey. They want us to do things. So I think when this is brought up, during the next meeting, that would clarify that that is what that means.

MR. SHULER: Any specific changes to the particular wording at the moment?

MR. GREER: Maybe one friendly amendment for that last sentence. Survey is a heavy weight mechanism and that's really what Suzanne was just talking about, but there are lots of social media mechanisms that are light weight that people can choose to participate in. So the friendly amendment is to change timing and frequency of surveys to timing and frequency of surveys and other social media mechanisms as well as a process too. So it's not just surveys, but whatever, blogs or chat posts or whatever we can get through to get Community input in a light weight voluntary way.

MS. MORIEARTY: I could agree with this because when I read this I thought we -- we were just talking about a survey monkey. We were talking about
using new social networks, you know, something more than
just sending out the basic survey again.

MR. SHULER: Anything further specific changes? Okay. All right. Cool. That closes that one. Are we sure enough to read or do you want me to continue my reading out loud?

MS. SEARS: I think the reading is important because it goes into the transcript, otherwise they don't have any idea what we are talking about.

MR. SHULER: Even when they know what we are talking about. Draft recommendations: One, Council is excited about the long awaited and planned release of FDsys and the sunsetting of GPO Access by December 2010. Council requests that if there is a substantial slippage and announced deadlines up for schedules or deliverables of one month that they be notified. Did you get the excitement?

MR GREER: I would just suggest an addition. I think this language is good, but an addition to this that communicates the value of notification. Just knowing is useful, but acting on that notification. So that they be notified and, I'm not going to get the words right, but informed of project impact and potential mitigation steps and that they be notified including project impact and mitigation steps and then there should be a Council action that follows that, that Council pledges to respond within two weeks with comments on impact and mitigation. That comes in two, but I think parallel to this, when you are notified of a -- so two goes to functionalities, but this goes to timing delays. And again, just being notified is not enough that we ought to assert that Council will have input on impact and mitigation.

MR. SHULER: Is the word smithing be noted?

MS. MORIEARTY: Including be notified of --

MR. GREER: Notified comma including project impact and mitigation provisions. Period. Next sentence, Council, pledges to respond -- maybe just the same sentence. Council pledges to respond in two weeks.

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

MR. GREER: Period.

MR. SHULER: Any further suggested wordings or discussion on this first point?

MR. CISMOWSKI: The first part of that
sentence talks about a planned Release of FDsys. And I think what's really driving the sunsetting of GPO Access is not the release, that has already happened, but the completion of ingest into FDsys of the remaining collections that exist in GPO Access.

MS. TROTTA: Did they commit to that? Did you hear that?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Yes, it was December of this year they are committing to --

MR. O'MAHONY: It's the migration of collections and then the failsafe backup nature of it are the two pieces.

MR. CISMOWSKI: So we not really talking about being excited about the release, that has already happened.

MS. MORIEARTY: How about something like, the Council is excited about the long awaited migration?

MR. CISMOWSKI: Completion.

MS. MORIEARTY: Or completion of FDsys and the sunsetting?

MS. TROTTA: Of migration.

MR. GREER: Definitely not completion. So it's a planned migration to FDsys I think is fine.

MR. CISMOWSKI: It's the completion of the collections that --

MR. GREER: The disconnect there is it's Release with a capital R. If it's Release 1.0, whatever number, that allows sunsetting. So we can either refer to the specific Release number, which is an increment because FDsys will probably never be complete and so we would capture I think the sense.

MR. SHULER: Should we use the Release number? It's shorter?

MS. SEARS: Do we have any idea what Release number we are at right now? I think it might be easier to do migration. Yes, it's one, but it's one point something, something, something A or something like that.

MR. O'MAHONY: I think they have renumbered. It's Release 1 stop and that might be easier just might be easier in terms of the wording because that comes with it, a definition that includes all the different things that we have talked about.
MR. SHULER: We can put the one in quotes.
MS. TROTTA: Council is excited about the all awaited migration of the remaining collections and planned Release, capital R.
MR. SHULER: Release 1.
MS. TROTTA: One.
MS. SEARS: The document they give us in our packet it says, the current Release called Release 1 and then in parentheses it has R1 and Release 1C.3 as the Release called Release 2 or R2. So the current Release that they are working on is Release 1 and in parentheses it's a capital R1.
MR. SHULER: That clears it's up.
MS. MORIEARTY: I'm less excited about that. MR. SHULER: I'm so glad that happens. Many Releases of ones. Tori?
MR. SHULER: Yes. Number 2? Are we done with that?
MS. MORIEARTY: So are we deleting or no, that feature Releases.
MR. SHULER: Okay, so number 2. When major features or functionalities announce for future Releases are deferred or pushed back into subsequent Releases, Council recommends that they be consulted. When consulted, Council pledges to respond within two weeks. In the interest of time, there is about 10 more minutes left in the match.
MS. MORIEARTY: Could we parallel that last sentence? Council pledges to respond with comments within two weeks? Much better than a plethora of comments.
MR. SHULER: Any further questions? Tori?
MS. TROTTA: When major features or
functionalities announced for future releases are
defered or pushed back into subsequent releases,
Council recommends that they be consulted. When
consulted Council pledges to respond with comments
within two weeks.
MR. SHULER: Acceptable?
MS. TROTTA: Should I capitalize the R's for
release?
MR. GREER: No, they are generic.
MR. SHULER: The next one, number 3.
Council recommends that as FDsys PMO reviews system
requirements for future releases, they include
stakeholders including FDLP Community when updating the
priorities for enabling specific system functionality
and that they utilize appropriate Web 2.0 methods to do
so.
MS. TROTTA: That's two sentences.
MR. SHULER: Any discussion suggested word
smithing?
MR. JACOBS: Can we just say communication
methods rather than Web 2.0 methods?
MS. TROTTA: Okay. Anything else? Council
recommends that FDsys PMO review system requirements for
future releases. They include stakeholders, including
the FDLP Community, when updating the priorities for
enabling specific system functionality. Period.
MS. SINCLAIR: You could say they use
appropriate communication methods to include
stakeholders.
MS. TROTTA: That's a good idea.
MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.
MS. TROTTA: So Council recommends that
FDsys PMO review system requirements for future
releases. They utilize appropriate communications
methods when including stakeholders, including the FDLP
Community?
MR. MORIEARTY: Such as. Such as.
MR. O'MAHONY: Or just to include the FDLP
Community and stakeholders.
MS. HOLTERHOFF: I have just one question.
I don't know what my note means, but I have a note on
here that migration does not equal submission slash
ingestion. So is migration the word we want or do we
want our new word submission or ingestion? Not
migration. Does anyone remember what we were told --
what we are really waiting for? Is it both of those
things, migration and ingestion or -- I don't remember
what this note means. I have a big, does not equal.

MS. SEARS: In the FDsys system review that
John and I went to in the beginning of April, they said
that full content submission was not going to be
available until October of 2011, I believe. I'd have to
look at the slide to make sure, but I believe that was
correct.

MR. SHULER: That's correct.

MS. SEARS: So full content submission is
not going to be in this Release 1.

MR. SHULER: And there is a distinction
amongst those values. I do remember we were corrected
several times when we used one word inappropriately in
one situation, but for the life of me I can't remember
which situation applied to which word. I think
ingestion refers to what the Community would ingest.
Migration referred from what was going from waste into
FDsys.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: So migrate is the correct
word?

MR. SHULER: Migration is the right word,
yes.

MR. JACOBS: I think from the FDsys point of
you view, they say they can ingest now because they
bring documents into the system, but we are talking
about ingest in terms of libraries large, digital
content that can be ingested into the system which can't
be done.

MR. SHULER: The first big ingestion, if you
will, would have been and will be if it gets funded, is
statutes at large. That would be the first non WAYS
ingestion. So are we good to go with number 3?

MS. TROTTO: I'm still screwing around with
the last sentence, but it will be there by the time you
put it up on the screen.

MS. MORIEARTY: Tori, I'll come over there.

MR. SHULER: Are we done? So who is going
to update -- yes. We have got one more thing to look at
and listen to. Suzanne, go ahead.

MS. SEARS: This is the in Memorandum.

Willie William Thompson. The Depository Library Council
wishes to recognize the life and contributions to GPO of
the late William Willie Thompson. Willie retired from
GPO in 2004, after nearly 45 years of service. He had
begun working at GPO as a clerk and in 1994 joined the
Library Programs Services staff as a program analyst.
It was in this position that many in the Depository
Community came to know Willie when he became responsible
for the logistical planning of the Depository Library
Council Meeting and Federal Depository Conference.
Willie served in this capacity for the next 10 years
until his retirement in 2004. Attendees of meetings
during those years remember Willie for his can-do
attitude and smile. Willie passed away suddenly on
March 14th, 2010. Our Community has lost a really great
man and an even better friend. I'm sorry I get a little
choked up.

MR. SHULER: So say we all?
MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.
MR. SHULER: Thank you, Suzanne. How do you
wish we proceed on the next session? Do you want me to
read these out loud to the Community and let them read
it on the screen? How do you want to do it? Advice?
MR. GREER: I think for the purposes of the
record, it's important to read them out loud.
MR. SHULER: Does everybody agree I read
them out loud? Okay, thanks.
MR. GREER: I think it's good to have them
on the screen also.
MR. SHULER: All right. I assume once I
read it out loud those of you who can will jump in and
offer a brief comment if needed or do I turn to the
audience or GPO and say, what do you think? What would
you like to do?
MS. SINCLAIR: I think you could just say,
does Council have any comment before we go to the
audience?
MR. SHULER: Okay. It works for me. We
have a script. We have two minutes before coffee. If I
could ask those with the changed documents just to
upload them to the Goggle docs space and I will grab
them from there and download them.
MS. SANDERS: John? John?
MR. SHULER: Yes.
MS. SANDERS: Are we doing anything with the
recommendations about the survey? We skipped that one.

There is a documentation that Tori put up about

commending Council for commissioning --

MR. SHULER: We read that.

MS. SANDERS: Did I miss that? Never mind.

MR. SHULER: It was an excellent --

MS. SANDERS: Sorry. I just got really

confused when I looked at what was left -- never mind.

Forget that I said it. I'm just going to slip away now.

MR. SHULER: Chris?

MR. GREER: With chair's approval I'd like
to speak out of order, I suppose. I'm going to be
leaving in just a few minutes. This is my last
opportunity with all of you in this current mode. It
has been a great distinction and honor to serve with
this group on the Council. The dedication, the
expertise, interest, the level -- the intellectual level
of thinking is inspiring. I came from outside this
Community. You accepted me into it in a wonderful way.
I have learned an immense amount and acquired a much
greater appreciation for the value of libraries in
general, but of the depository libraries in particular.
I commend you for your mission. I envy you in many
senses, the importance of your mission and I will
continue to work in the White House and other places to
try to support you in what you are doing. I'm sure our
paths will cross in lots of other ways and I look
forward to that opportunity in the future. So thank you
all very much.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Chris.

(Break in the proceedings.)

MR. SHULER: If we could come to order. The
third plenary session of the Federal Depository is
started. It is generally during this part of the
program that we share with the Community our
deliberations and where we are going with our
interactions and recommendations with GPO over what we
have heard these last two-and-a-half days and what we
want to do in the future, especially going forward into
the October conference we will bring them up. I will
ask Council for brief responses and turn it over to GPO
and then the audience to get feedback on these points
and recommendations which will be more fully developed
after we get your input. So stay turned and that will
be released through other means. So without further issues, is there any other points that Council needs to raise? You can see that even the Council members are beginning to slip away and we have lost two.

First the major points that were taken from the three plenary sessions and what we have developed from those and this is what we have focused on these three sets of slide points coming out of the plenary sessions, discoverability, incentives and collaboration to keep and preserve digital content. Council? GPO? Audience? All right. Our recommendation: Need to browse digitalization registry by project looking for collaborator and highlight collaborator needs and offers in the navigation. Council?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. So this is just a little context. This was just a little added functionality to the registry site registry.FDLP.gov in order to facilitate for collaborations we have heard in the plenary session. This would be a great way to do it.

MR. SHULER: GPO? Anything from the audience? Okay. Going onto the next bulleted item. Add link to grant opportunities document delivered in Tampa on Desktop under recommendations and to the priority titles for digitization to digitization registry. Council?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: That list was prepared, but it's been kind -- maybe not everybody has seen it and people have brought up, aren't there grants that could be applied for to do digitization projects? One thing that we don't have in there that we might want to add is about, we had hoped that list could be updated. It's a year old now. I don't know that if we could ask GPO to like update it periodically.

MR. SHULER: Okay. GPO? Anybody from the audience? Good.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I just wanted to followup. When this second bullet recommendation came from Council, GPO had responded to that recommendation really in the context that there are a lot of grant organizations and there is a lot of various list servs that people can subscribe to. So we took that as a one time opportunity to show representatively what's available out there, knowing that grant
opportunities happen so frequently in the context of how that unfolds. Just to reaffirm again, we were looking at that in terms of GPO saying, here's a one time documentation. If the recommendation is you feel like GPO should keep abreast of all grant opportunities. I just wanted to get some clarification because there is quite a bit of activity that goes on in that arena and if that is something you think strategically GPO needs to do.

MR. SHULER: James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. So noted. I think our interest was in providing that information to the Community. Not necessarily every single grant out of the thousands of grants that are in the foundation database, but to offer pointers to libraries, you know, possibly exploring grant opportunities. The various organizations that do granting for libraries and so sometimes those do change. So pointing to them is a good thing. We don't think that GPO should have a list of every single grant out there but, just keeping that information fresh and up to date.

MR. SHULER: Anybody else?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I think if we make sure that the documentation that it links to is dated and that it does say that, you know, these are just possibilities because I believe -- I don't have a documentation in front of me, but I believe it is mostly just links to the INLS. So it is not pointing to a current grant. It is pointing to possible people for you to go to look at for possible grants. So, yes, it needs to be looked at, but I'm not sure that it is something that needs to be daily updated. It just needs to be whatever year make sure that this entity is still a good entity or still an entity that gets grants and take them off if they are not.

MR. SHULER: Anything else from Council? Anything from the audience? Okay.

Bullet 3, Council intends to pursue discussions with associations ACRL, ARL, etc., that collect statistics and rate libraries based on those statistics, to explore the issues surrounding the way of
E collections vis-a-vis tangible volumes, their metrics.

Council?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Just sort of a point of clarification. We are just saying that we think it is important to talk with the associations to see how they do their metrics. We think it can be a big incentive for libraries to digitize if electronic collections were counted similar to the way that paper volumes are counted to go into those indices. So we were thinking possibly either an education session or a Council session in October where we might invite somebody who is an expert in electronic collection metrics and maybe also the statistical individuals at the different associations like Denise Davis, at ALA or somebody from ARL or ACRL or AALL to make sure that everybody is represented.

MR. SHULER: Anything further from Council? Anything from GPO or the audience?

MR. SCHAFFER: Scott Schaffer, University of Vermont. I just have a question about this that I certainly would -- the problem with electronic journals -- that have a huge impact on all academic collections, I just wonder if this hasn't already been -- I realize that electronic journals is somewhat of a different issue than what we are talking about, but I would imagine it has had to come up in some context already somewhat.

MR. SHULER: I believe in the Council's discussions they noted the association's extreme interest in this issue, yes. Other comments? Okay.

We will go to the next set of slides.

These particular slides all revolve around the issue of FDsys and its plenary session. They are a bit more -- a few more sentences. Recommended to GPO, number 1, Council is excited about the long awaited planned migration of the remaining collections and planned Release 1 and 2 of FDsys and the sunsetting of GPO Access by December of 2010. Council requests that if there is a substantial slippage in announced deadlines for schedules or deliverables of one month that Council be notified, with information about project impact in mitigation. Council pledges to respond with comments within two weeks. Council?

MS. MORIEARTY: I like it.
MR. O’MAHONY: Just a point of clarification
and maybe a question for the GPO folks. Release 2 is
not scheduled for the end of December 2010. Release 1
and its followup is scheduled for the release of 2010.
Just so that we understand that that is not our
expectation.

MR. SHULER: Any questions from GPO?

Questions? Discussion from the audience? Okay.
Number 2, when major features or
functionality are announced or future releases are
deferred or pushed back into subsequent releases,
Council recommends that they be consulted. When
consulted Council pledges to respond with comments

Number 3, Council recommends that FDsys PMO
reviews system requirements and functionality for future
releases, they include stakeholders including the FDLP
Community. PMO should use appropriate communication

Going right along to the third one, which is
regionals. Action items from the plenary session on
regional issues. Goal 1, by May 15th, 2010 the
Community will be better informed of the scope and
target completion dates of the GPO shelflist conversion
project.

The draft recommendation reads, Council
recommends that GPO staff share with the Community a
detailed summary of the scope and target completion
dates of the GPO shelflist conversion project, project

to digitize the dictionary catalog. This summary should
include one, total number of cards in the project; two,
total number to be transcribed; three, total number to
be digitized; four, examples of intended end uses of
those transcribed and digitized records including use in
a proposed automated disposal list and N and O list
automation tool; five, rename the project to reflect its
actual content and scope. This summary should be
from GPO?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair from
University of Hawaii at Manoa. I just wanted to clarify
the bit about renaming. We felt that shelflist
conversion project gave people a misleading impression
of what the project is about and what its content and
That's why we recommend that GPO come up with a name that better reflects the actual nature of the project.

MR. SHULER: Any comments from the audience?

Okay.

As soon as possible, GPO, Council and regionals will finalize procedural details of GPO's decision to abandon government ownership of depository publications that have gone through the complete regional supervised disposal process. Draft action item: Council appreciates GPO's efforts to respond to the needs of the regional and selective depositories by working with the Community to find ways to streamline the disposition process. Council recommends that GPO seek guidance from its general counsel on the nearly proposed revised policy regarding the sale of abandon government property and encourage GPO to develop the guidelines with input from the Community for interpreting and applying the new policy in order to minimize any unintended negative consequences that might result in the misunderstanding or misuse of the policy.

Council? GPO?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. We already sought the advice of general counsel and their thoughts and interpretation of the law with this issue which is why we were able to announce what we did.

MR. SHULER: Council? Do you have a response?

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library of Michigan. Council appreciates that, but there is a suggestion of a newly revised policy regarding the sale of abandon government property that we feel has -- needs to be further worked out before we have an official policy in place.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. What is the question you want us to ask of general counsel? The specific question because we have already talked to them about the sale issue and about the point of abandonment.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. It's not that -- we feel legal counsel has already been done. What we feel is a mature policy has not been laid out and we would like to work with GPO in creating that policy to make sure that there are safeguards so that somebody is not benefitting
financially. We think that what -- what started this
was a good thing, but we have seen negatives to it as
well and we just want to make sure that the policy is
very strictly outlined and that there are very clear
guidelines as to when it's okay to sell so you are not
benefitting from dropping from the depository, so there
is not an incentive to drop your depository or to leave
your collection.

MR. SHULER: Another aspect of the
discussion, during the Council's deliberation about this
particular point, is that it's good and proper to issue
a legal finding, but what we are also hoping and
expecting is a further policy document that explains how
GPO is going to implement that particular finding and
being able to discuss with the Council what we think are
some interesting implications in terms of the negative
consequences perhaps that would come from this very good
decision. Council, anything further?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University. Just to sort of drive home the last couple
of points. One way of thinking about it would be that
the legal -- the new -- the latest released legal
interpretation of one of GPO's authorities gives you all
authority to do this activity and then as others have
said the next step is then developing, based on that
authority, a full policy with, you know, guidelines and
other guidance as many of your policies have. So that
first hurdle has been crossed. We have the legal
authority and it's to work with you all in the next
steps so that the implementation of this authority is in
the way that was intended.

MR. SHULER: Any further discussion with
Council? GPO? Anybody from the audience?

MR. BENEDICT: Lyle Benedict from Chicago
Public. I think I sort of brought up the prospect of
abuse. I can see two areas; one is financial. The book
plates alone from the 19 century serial set probably
sell for $50 a piece on the average, the illustrations.
And I don't know if people are aware, but there are
people who go through and strip out the illustrations
from serial sets; so that is one potential. A library
could decide to sell its collections essentially.
Another potential is I have seen more subtly
a library could throw everything on its needs and offers
and say after five years they keep the material, but it
is no longer part of the depository system. I'm not
sure if that is an unintended consequence either. I can
see lots of problems with that. So those are the two
issues I see. I would agree that it doesn't seem very
clear, the potential for this. Abuses still exists.

MR. SHULER: Thank you.

MS. AMEN: Kathy Amen, St. Mary's
University. I was thinking one way to kind of look at
this would be the regionals have a lot of autonomy in
developing policies for disposals and all and that is
great, but perhaps in this case there need to be
national standards or national guidelines that apply to
everybody so as to avoid the kind of abuses that have
been talked about.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Anything further
from the audience? Okay.

Goal 3, GPO in concert with Council and the
Community will strive to identify and enhance exclusive
benefits accruing to both regional and selective
depositories. Draft recommendation: Council recommends
that GPO work with Council and the Community to create
additional exclusive benefits that will accrue to
official FDLP depositories, both selective and regional.
These exclusive benefits will serve as positive
incentives for applying for designation as official FDLP
depositories and for remaining in the program. In
addition Council recommends that GPO build on previous
documentation of incentives and prominently disseminate
a master list of all depository benefits including when
appropriate those benefits of approximate monetary
value. Council? GPO?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. On this
recommendation we have actually, even as early as this
year, updated and we've got a value page that is there
so we welcome your input in terms of additions to what
is there and working with you as a Community seems a
great opportunity off of the form site to have that
discussion thread of what's missing.

MR. SHULER: Thank you. Roger?

MR. SCHOENFIELD: Roger Schoenfield, Ithaca,
SNR. I'm really interested in this particular
recommendation because I'm a strong prominent of the
importance of incentives in driving a kind of
participation and other characteristics that are needed for any program, but certainly the FDLP as well. I think -- I certainly agree that the incentives right now are not -- not where they need to be, given the direction that participation both at the regional and selective level has been heading. I'd like to urge Council to think a little bit more expansively around the question of incentives here because one of the things that I feel to me to be missing from this goal and recommendations, as is currently drafted, is a sense of what the actual objectives that we are trying to achieve, that you are trying to achieve are. Is the objective to lose as few regional and selective depository libraries as possible in the coming years? That could be an objective. Is the objective to build up the number of regional and selective depository libraries towards some kind of target? Is there some kind of minimum number that would be a minimum that you wouldn't want to go beneath? I think that there is a way -- obviously we can't answer those questions right now, but it feels like talking about incentives in the absence of some kind of vision or framework for what the objective here is, is -- not to say that the incentive work shouldn't be pursued in parallel, but it feels like there is a second set of issues about objectives that is not, at least here, as clearly stated. So I'd welcome discussion about that recommendation in that headed direction as well.

MR. SHULER: Does Council have any response?

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I just wanted to respond to Ted. We did discuss in our previous business meeting all of the great work that GPO has done so far on trying to put together incentives and we did go to the page on the FDLP Desktop so this draft recommendation that's why it's building on previous documentation and we really definitely want to work closely with GPO on developing that and trying to come up with ideas of possibly new incentives.

MR. SHULER: Gwen?

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen SinuClear of University of Hawaii at Manoa. I would just like to thank Roger for his comments and we will certainly take
MR. SHULER: Anything further from the audience? Okay. Further draft action item. Council commends GPO for undertaking a segmentation survey in order to learn more about the diverse needs of the various types and sizes of libraries in the FDLP and for integrating information about these needs into its strategic thinking. Council looks forward to seeing the results of the survey by May 15th and stands ready to work with GPO and the Depository Community to help interpret the survey results and use them as appropriate to inform discussions and decisions about FDLP services.

The one discrepancy I just noticed reading it out loud the third time is that yesterday we said May 31st instead of May 15th, looking at my notes. Does it matter May 15th or May 31st?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I appreciate Council's goal on this and certainly can put forward whatever it feels appropriate, but I think the takeaway we had was that we wanted to all insure that there was a comprehensive document that had all the necessary analysis done on it and that it would be done as soon as possible, but at the same time we don't want to get to a point where we want to push out a document that really isn't complete formally. I completely understand Council's goal. I think we are going to support that. I think the date is just the question.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I believe you're absolutely right. May 15th is wrong. I believe I suggested truly the end of May at least in going into Memorial Day, we are really talking early June, but I wanted -- you were right. Wrong date.

MR. SHULER: Okay.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I do recall what Ted is talking about that we did say we wanted to make sure it's a complete document. Will GPO be more comfortable if we said early summer or something like that?

MR. SHULER: GPO? They nod their heeds.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe GPO. I think that is fine. Whatever you feel is appropriate. Our goal is to get it out as soon as possible. It's not going to be delayed, but at the same time if we have a milestone
that we are getting ready to reach on the legacy system migration, I don't want to constrain other projects that are already in existence. I think we can work together and get something out as soon as possible, but make sure that it is comprehensive. I'm not trying to impose what Council feels lie it needs to recommend, but as appropriate we will certainly work with it.

MR. SHULER: That's why we need to draft action items because it gives us a chance to have a conversation about them before they become final. Any other points from Council? Audience? Okay.

Draft action item: Council offers to work with GPO to develop a plan for utilizing the biennial survey to gather information and solicit input from federal depository libraries in order to provide relevant data on strategic and operational issues facing the FDLP. Such a plan should include timelines for the introduction and testing of the new questions with the intent of giving depository libraries reasonable advance notice of questions. Council? Dan?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. This one and the one that follows, which you can't see that at the moment, but they sort of go hand-and-hand in that the overall intent of the two of them is to work with GPO to find ways to continue to build on the good work done in the segmentation survey and find ways to broaden that feedback group with the Depository Community, whether it's for gathering information for improvements to services or testing ideas through Community social interaction network kinds of things, but to broaden that input in a timely and systematic way as much as possible. So one piece to that is utilizing the biennial survey process and to -- in helping to both identify what questions might be appropriate for that survey and to test out those questions so that there isn't confusion among the Community and respondents as to what information we are trying to gather and to do all that in an open and transparent way. Whatever plan we hope to work with you all to develop would layout those things step-by-step and work in concert with the next slide when we get there.

MR. SHULER: GPO? Anybody from the audience? All right. Next slide. Draft action item:
Council offers to work with GPO to explore ways to elicit timely feedback from Federal Depository Libraries through the use of Web surveys or other Web based tools. This work also should include developing guidelines for timing and frequency of surveys and other social medium mechanisms as well as process to prioritize potential survey topics or areas of inquiry.

MR. O'MAHONY: So this is the second piece to that strategy in not to just limit ourselves to the standard biennial survey, but to where appropriate seek that feedback through other mechanisms and all the while Council is certainly cognizant of the fact that we all have lots of surveys that we have to take and the intent is not to over burden the Community with too many surveys or too many requests for information. So to work to prioritize those areas where it is most important to gather feedback, find the most effective and least costly, both in terms of human resources and effort in gathering that information and to integrate it into an overall approach, so that it isn't an ad hoc sort of question by question approach, but it all builds into an ongoing conversation with the Community.

MR. SHULER: GPO?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Prieb, GPO. Thanks, Dan, for sharing that. I just wanted to reinforce that we look forward to working with you. And there are a lot of mechanisms. I mentioned the FDLP Community site and the form which could be appropriate in some discussions or topics. We can certainly support Council depending on in your roles in an advisory body where you see opportunities to gain feedback perhaps you want to implement and if there are tools that we can help off the Desktop or others, maybe the suggestion is if there is a liaison or two from Council to find some requirements on where we can help you or if there is something that you are using an independent tool we will be there.

MR. SHULER: Anybody from the audience? So that concludes the plenary portion of the discussion and our recommendations. I believe those are all of them. So I'd like to move onto our two other points which are the outcome of the 2009 discussions and a little bit of a sketch of where we are going with those.
Stemming from the events of 2009, we are going to seek a further conference call between GPO and Council on the PURLz issue within the next few weeks. We are seeking a July 1st deadline for further information about the consultant work from GPO. We have some specific budget questions to send to GPO regarding the status of various projects involving digitization project where the particular fiscal year is -- where it is at with the JCP, if you will, and sort of a break down of omnibus money costs involving the shelflist project and the pilot project of the catalog; this is where we are going with those particular issues.

In addition, in the recognition that we are about to embark on a great changeover within GPO involving possibly a new Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents, Council is going to draw up a document reflecting its assessment of the short, mid and long term goals for the program to be given to both the SuDocs and the Public Printer and in particular emphasizing that there are many important projects in play and that they need to keep moving forward.

Council, any further discussion on those points? Members of the audience or GPO?

MR. JACOBS: Just one thing, John. James Jacobs, Stanford university. It's PURLz.

MR. SHULER: PURLz. So noted. That's with a z by the way.

The last item officially coming out of the proceedings involves a Memorandum for William Thompson, which I will read. William Willie Thompson, the Depository Library Council wishes to recognize the life and contributions to GPO of the late William Willie Thompson. Willie retired from GPO in 2004 after nearly 45 years of service. He had begun working at GPO as a clerk and in 1994 joined the Library Programs Services staff as a program analyst. It was in this position that many in the Depository Community came to know Willie when he became responsible for the logistical planning for the Depository Library Council meeting and the Federal Register Depository Conference. Willie served in this capacity for the next ten years until his retirement in 2004. Attendees of the meetings during those years remember Willie for his can-do attitude and
smile. Willie passed away suddenly on March 14th, 2010. The Depository Community has lost a truly great, man and an even better friend. And let me underscore that. It's hard to lose people and especially somebody of Willie's capacity and friendship. If I can ask for a minute of silence in his memory. Thank you.

Those are the official actions coming out of the series of meetings that we have had over the last two and-a-half days, at least as I recall. Am I missing anything, Council? Do we have any unturned stones? Okay. Then we come to -- what we are coming to is the conclusion of things.

I have had a number of people come up to me over the last few days and tell me how hard it is to give up being Chair and I think they are telling me for all the right reasons and I'm hearing them for all the right words, but I don't think I could ever profoundly express the significant opportunity and the honesty and trust that being Chair of Council means to me personally. I consider it one of -- you know, humble kind of way, one of the best things that I could have possibly done in terms of giving back to the Community after nearly 30 years in this business. And I would like to in particular recognize my cohort generation, class, we all have different terms for it: Chris Greer, Kathy Lawhun, Gwen Sinclair and Tori Trotta. I thank them for their support and I thank them for their -- as freshman in this process you do bind together and I really appreciate that binding.

To the other two classes who will continue on this great work I believe we have met our equals. You folks will not be left in terrible hands. You will be left in great hands. And in particular I believe that the leadership, the skill and experience that Suzanne Sears has demonstrated will continue to manifest itself and in the range of good work that she does in her role as chair.

And further I would like to add before we have the more awkward moment, I should say these transitions are not mapped out anywhere. I think we make them up as we go along. So many of you know and perhaps some of you know that this too has been a difficult year for me in other ways. And in addition to great professional support that my colleagues around
this table have given me and those that are not at the
table who have moved on, as well as those of you out in
the Community and at GPO, it means a lot to me and it
really made a difference in getting through this and
being able to come to what is essentially a second
family that helped me deal with the loss of my wife.
And I will say that I have never been more proud to be
associated with a bunch of passionate people who care
about what they do. Even though we may use sharp words
or sharp elbows to make our points, we always recovery
from those contacts and come back and say what can we do
next? And what I firmly believe in this transfer from
one Chair to another, we will continue to do so.
So I thank you again for the comfort and the
kindness shown to me over my own loss as well, also the
trust and honesty that you gave me during this time for
responsibility for these thousand conferences. I don't
know if that is what we imagined, but I would like to
invite you over to the podium and the sacred chair.
MS. SEARS: The 14 of us on Council, I guess
it's 13 now, want to thank you for the time commitment
that you have put forth to being Chair. We all
understand what an enormous time commitment that is and
how difficult a job it is. So we have a little going
away present for you. We have a card. We have this
lovely Snuggie that is our fun gift. It is embroidered
with the Depository emblem. We then have the more
serious gift, which, since we know that you are referred
to quite frequently as Reverend John, we decided to have
your plaque in the form of a pulpit.
MR. SHULER: There's a further strategy to
this, I'll have you know and this surprised me. I don't
think many people remember this, but early on in
Council's history we knew there should be a system of
failure recovery. So somewhere in the history we
remember if one gavel is lost, we will always have a
replacement. So I give officially to Suzanne to
represent the official transfer of power, Suzanne, you
get the powerful gavel and then I will use the lesser
gavel, but no less powerful, in order to close today's
proceedings.
MS. SEARS: Okay.
MR. SHULER: Thank you, Suzanne. A Snuggie.
Can you feel the love?
MS. SEARS: It's very, very, very cold up here on the stage, for those of you who don't know this down there. If you do get on down Council, bring your warm underwear.

MS. SANDERS: Or be prepared to use your laptop as a true laptop warmer.

MR. SHULER: I'm touched. I also want to thank -- I feel like this is the Academy Awards. I want to thank the GPO staff. Especially the staff of Lance, as I call them. They have been indispensable and when other worldly Chairs like myself come aboard to get involved with things, they are indispensable in offering the infrastructure and the support as sometimes in my contemplations I miss and what you see happen could not happen without them.

Further, again, I would like to express my much appreciation to Ric Davis, GPO staff, Public Printer Bob Tapella, for all their support and assistance in getting through these six months in meetings. So I'd like to give them a hand. Is there anything else before I bring it to the official closure.

MS. SEARS: I do have a few housekeeping -- Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I have a few housekeeping items.

First off, for Council members I have placed in front of you the packet on the Cost Delivery Council. I would appreciate if everybody would look over the charters and bylaws. Those are in desperate need of revision that's been set in since the '70's that the bylaws were looked at and the '90's for the charter. So I'd really like for us to work on that in the next few weeks and get that done. I don't want to spend a lot of time on it because we have a lot of important things, but it needs to be up-to-date.

For the members of the audience, you have the orange evaluation in the back of your packet and we greatly appreciate it if you take the few moments to fill it out and turn it in back at the registration desk. I know in the fall they had an online evaluation. I'm not sure if there will be an online evaluation for this conference or not, but please fill out the orange evaluation sheets and turn them to the registration desk. If you have suggestions for education sessions or Council sessions that you would like to see in the fall,
we would greatly appreciated that. I have heard some
feedback that people are saying we are discussing the
same things over and over again that's because from what
we are hearing from you, that's still your concerns. If
you have new concerns that you want us to discuss,
please the only way we know is if you tell us. You can
tell us through e-mail or through those evaluation
sheets, but please let us know.
And just in case you were interested, I
heard from Lance today that the total member of
attendees, not counting GPO staff and Council members,
is 109. According to James the number by the blog is
215.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Suzanne. As we
said before we have crossed a Rubicon and I will add
that I think it will be a Rubicon that we'll probably
being paying more attention to in time.
Anything else from Council to bring before
us or the Community before I officially bring this
session of Council to a close?
I have one last gift for you, I believe that
one thing that has always been lacking from our sessions
has been a recessional. So I'd like to as I close out
the Council I would like to have Mr. DJ start off with
the official recessional for this session and if you
like it enough, I would suggest that you find a theme
for the next Council session, and follow, if not, it
will be a singular moment we will always remember. Mr.
DJ hit the music.