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CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I would like to call the meeting to order for the Fall Federal Depository Library Conference and Depository Library Council Meeting. Again, I would just like to welcome all of you.

My name is Suzanne Sears and I'm the Assistant Dean for Public Services at the University of North Texas Libraries and I'm the current Chair of the Depository Library Council.

(Applause)

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Before we get started I would like to have the other Council members and the honored guests we have at the table to introduce themselves, please.

David, would you start?

MR. CISMOWSKI: How do I turn this on?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: You push the button.

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David
Cismowski from the California State Library.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

DR. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt Institute School of Information and Library Science.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony from Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island.


MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library in Indiana.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, Director of the Library Business Unit and Acting Superintendent of Documents.

MR. TAPELLA: Bob Tapella, Public Printer of the United States.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster,
University of Akron.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto, Eastern Washington University.


MS. BURKE: Helen Burke, Hennepin County Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

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

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you, council. I get tasked with all of the housekeeping items. I have a long list here so bear with me. First off restroom locations for this meeting room.

If you go out to the registration table there is a little hallway and like an escalator that goes down and they are right next to that so if you go to the registration table, make a little bitty right and then a left and the men's and women's restrooms are right there.

Also, if everybody could please turn their cell phones off or to silent it
would be much appreciated. To all of the
speakers both in this meeting and throughout
the conference, we would appreciate it.

The sireless in the room, we have
wireless for about a hundred people so I think
we'll be fine. You need to go to the P-A-S-V
when you're looking for your wireless network.
PASV is the network and the password is U-S-G-
P-O, all in lowercase.

We do have live blogging and so,
although the council members will not be live
blogging, they will be reading the questions
into the record if there are any from the live
blog.

We also have a Twitter hashtag,
which is #d1c10f. So announcements: there is
an announcement board that is back by the
registration table. If you are trying to meet
with a group of people for lunch or have just
general announcements to make to the
community, that is where you need to put them.

Also you can hand them to me and I
can make announcements during the beginning or
the end of our different council sessions throughout the conference.

The audience questions, if you are new to council meetings, the way that it works is after the presentations we open up to the floor for questions. Usually we ask questions for the council first because GPO has paid for us to come here to get information so we try to get our questions answered.

After council is through asking questions we will open it up to the audience. You have microphones in the middle of the floor for you to come up to and line up and we will call on you to ask your question. We do ask that since we have a court reporter that you do state your name and your institution so that we know who you are for the record.

If you're not comfortable coming to the mic and you have a burning question we do encourage you to ask that of the council members during the breaks. We do ask that you please be respectful if we're running to the bathroom to let us go there first. Then you
will have all of our undivided attention if you do that for us.

You can also write it down on your FDLP pads and hand it to the registration table and they will make sure that we get it up here and we will try and get those questions answered.

Your packets have orange evaluations in them and we do ask that you fill those out. When we're planning for April it will be very important to us to have that information from how you felt about this conference and what sessions you would like to see and what things you would like council to consider.

Also in your packets are some of the handouts for the sessions that council will be giving. In the backs of some of those slides you will find discussion questions that are questions we are going to be asking during those sessions so if you would like to read ahead on those questions and be prepared to discuss those questions, that would be very
helpful to us.

Today at noon is the regional selective lunch. I already have seen out on the announcement boards the Texas librarians are meeting at the registration table at noon, the Kansas librarians are meeting at the registration table at noon, the Michigan librarians are meeting at the registration table at noon.

Also the California librarians are meeting at the hotel cafe outside at the front at 12:05, I believe, is what it says. Is that correct, David?

(No Response)

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Somebody handed me Florida, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands are meeting at noon in the lower lobby.

We have a lot of really great sessions put together for you today. The council members worked really hard on these sessions. They each were assigned a session and are moderating their own sessions. Please
be sure that if you come to the session if you have questions that you don't get a chance to ask that you talk to one of the council members on that session and make sure that you get your input to them.

It's very important and part of our role as an advisory committee is to represent you as a community. To do that we need your feedback so we need you to talk to us and tell us what it is that you would like for us to ask, what questions you would like to have answered, or just if you have comments that you would like us to pass along we would really appreciate having that feedback from you.

Okay. Now it's time for the all-time favorite calisthenics to wake you up. So sometimes we do this on funding but I have a little different take. I would like for those of you who have been less to four council meetings to please stand up.

So those of you who were seated, if you have somebody standing up next to you,
that's the person you need to take under your wing and show them around and let them have a good time.

If you've been to more than 20 council meetings, please stand. These people know a lot. Find them and talk to them.

If you have become a depository coordinator within the last two years, please stand up. If you are a regional librarian, would you please stand. Regionals remain standing, please.

Very loudly I would like for you say the state that you represent as you go around the room because I don't want to make you all come to the microphone but I do think that several selectives do not know who their regional are so I would really appreciate it.

Starting with the lady here in the lovely orange.

(Introductions of Regional Librarians)

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Thank you all for that. Now we have skills for knowing
whether your regional is here or not.

Ah, we missed David. Go, David.

And Ann. You weren't standing.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I'm short.

California.

MS. SANDERS: Michigan, and I'm even shorter.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Okay. With that without further ado I'm going to pass it over to our distinguished guest today. It is my great pleasure to introduce to you the 25th Public Printer of the United States, Mr. Bob Tapella.

MR. TAPELLA: Thanks, Suzanne.

Good morning. Oh, come on. We just had a coffee break so let's try this one again.

Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. TAPELLA: Thank you. As Suzanne said, my name is Bob Tapella and I'm the Public Printer of the United States.

Welcome to the Fall 2010 Federal Depository Library Council Meeting and the Conference
here in Arlington, Virginia.

Suzanne, welcome as the incoming chair. Actually as the current chair, I guess. So far I hear you're doing a great job.

We also have a number of new council members, Helen Burke, Stephen Hayes, Peggy Jarrett, Shari Laster, Debbie Rabina. Welcome to council.

I would like to begin by thanking all of you for your hard work. The new council members came to Washington this summer for boot camp. I think it was an eye-opening experience for them as they saw just what the GPO is all about beyond just the Federal Depository Library Program.

For all of you in the audience, thank you for coming. I understand we have nearly 400 people at this conference. I appreciate you taking the time to come here and your continued hard work and commitment to government documents.

Now, the first question that
always seems to come up is, "Are you still the Public Printer?" And the answer is yes, which is why I'm standing in front of you. The President did nominate my successor and it is currently sitting within the United States Senate.

Then the next question I'm always asked, "So, when is it going to happen?" My real answer is I never presume to know what is on the mind of the U.S. Senate so if you have any questions, ask them, not me.

We are at the Government Printing Office celebrating our sesquicentennial. It's a big word that I had to learn this year and it means 150 years. GPO was created on June 23, 1860 when President James Buchanan signed Joint Resolution No. 25. We opened for business March 4, 1861, the same day Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated as President.

To begin our celebration of the sesquicentennial GPO honored our current and retired employees on June 23. With the help of the Archivist of the United States, David
Ferriero -- by the way, he's a former GovDocs librarian -- we unveiled a facsimile of the seven-page handwritten document that created the agency.

The celebration continues and for that date we published a sesquicentennial edition of GPO 100 Years which was originally issued in 1961 on our 100th anniversary. 100 GPO Years takes a chronological approach to GPO history beginning with a history of public printing in America prior to 1860 and describing the events year by year right through 1961.

Now, as part of the sesquicentennial edition we made a few changes. We added an introduction and we also added an index for those historians in the room that like to know what's going on.

Continuing as part of our publication world we also introduced GPO's first comic book called Squeaks Discovers Type. The comic book takes a unique approach to educate readers on the importance of
printing and the role it's played from the
beginning of civilization to today.

Jim Cameron, who is somewhere in
the room, or maybe he's out at the booth,
wrote the story. Nick Crawford, one of the
GPO designers, did the illustrations. The
book is for sale in our bookstore in the back
of the room. Actually I guess it's in the
anteroom there. If you have an interest, I
suggest you thumb through it. It's actually
a pretty interesting book. We've been
receiving rave reviews for it.

Of course, the comic book is for
sale in our bookstore. Speaking of
bookstores, we've just remodeled the GPO
bookstore. For nearly a century the bookstore
has been in the main building of GPO and has
served the American public by making it
possible to purchase Government publications.

Unfortunately, it has been
probably 50 or 60 years since the bookstore
had any alterations of any significance. We
decided that it was time in celebration of our
150th anniversary to make it a modern
bookstore and it is now a bookstore where you
can browse, where you can see, and where you
can touch. I think it's a great resource and
I'm very proud of the folks at GPO who had the
vision to do this and to move it forward.

Now, we also, of course, are
online. Perhaps some of the biggest news is
that we are going to be moving into the e-
publishing world in the very near future. We
just signed some contracts. Pretty soon our
Government publications will be available on
e-readers as well as in print, as well as free
for download through FDsys.

Now, as we continue into March of
2011 there will be additional events and
activities taking place at GPO. One of them
is that we are publishing an updated history
of the Government Printing Office and that
will be released on March 4th of 2011. We are
also developing a historical exhibit and
museum at GPO.

We are doing that because we want
to preserve the great history of the Government Printing Office and the role that it has played in keeping the documents of our democracy available to the public. I hope you'll join us as we move forward celebrating GPO's 150 years.

Now, under real business. The fiscal year 2011 budget for FY 2011 GPO has requested a total of $166,560,000 and that funding will enable us to meet projected requirements for GPO's Congressional Printing and Binding Fund as well as for information dissemination operations during fiscal year 2011 and recover the shortfall in the account accumulated in FY 2009 and 2010.

They will fund the operation of GPO statutory information dissemination programs and provide investment funds for necessary information dissemination projects. We will continue the development of FDsys and its implementation.

We will also be covering some more IT infrastructure, perform essential
maintenance and repairs for our aging buildings, undertake necessary continuity of operations initiatives, and provide funding for employee retraining and workforce development.

For the SME specifically we are requesting $44,208,000 for fiscal year 2011, an increase of $3.297 million over fiscal year 2010. As part of the appropriations request for the FDLP GPO is seeking funding to continue three specific projects funded in the appropriation for FY 2010.

First, a half a million dollars for the modernization of legacy computer systems supporting the FDLP. These systems are essential for meeting program needs and must be migrated to current and stable hardware and software solutions.

The systems to be modernized include shipping lister, item lister, depository distribution information system, the acquisitions classification and shipment information system, and the automated
depository distribution system.

Ric will be updating you on some of the contract awards we have recently made on these systems when he speaks. This funding that we're requesting in fiscal year 2011 will serve to continue the development and modernization needs.

Second, we are requesting a half a million dollars to support the digitalization of historical public domain government publications to make available for permanent no-fee public access via online dissemination through GPO. This project will help citizens overcome barriers to public access to depository collections due to geographic distance, protect and preserve valuable information content from damage and deterioration, expand public access to federal information resources for a broad range of educational and other purposes, and promote greater openness and transparency in relationship between citizens and their
Funding for this initiative will be directly applied to the cost of the actual digitization process for the FDLP material pending approval of GPO’s plan by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Third, we are requesting $200,000 for establishing performance measures and survey instruments for evaluating depository library access, collections, service, and cooperative efforts. This data will continue to build a foundation for ongoing program assessments.

As part of the appropriation request for cataloging and indexing for fiscal year 2011 GPO is seeking funding to continue a specific project funded in the appropriation for FY 2010. That is a half a million dollars for special cataloging and indexing projects including completing the creation of the Mark 21 records for current and historic serials and investigating a long-term solution for bibliographic record distribution.
As part of this project bibliographic records will be distributed from GPO's integrated library system to federal depository libraries. As of now we are operating under a continuing resolution with no additional funding but will keep the FDLP community abreast as that changes.

Our appropriators are telling us that this is going to be a tough year but GPO's finances overall are strong. We have just finished our 7th consecutive year in the black. I believe that our fiscal responsibility at GPO and the prudence we have shown will weigh in our favor as the appropriators make difficult decisions.

I would like to move on to FDsys. I am happy to report that the migration of content from GPO Access to FDsys is now complete and the two systems are running in parallel. This will remain the case until the end of December when GPO Access will sunset.

With the sunset of GPO Access FDsys is scheduled to become the primary
digital content management system for GPO

securing and providing access to digital
government information for the American
people. FDsys will be heavily relied upon by
federal agency publishers and our FDLP partner
libraries to archived and host digital
publications and harvested web content.

As digital repositories have
become more important to libraries and
archives in their role to preserve and provide
digital information, a body of evidence has
developed that defines what constitutes best
practices for the design and management of a
secure repository of digital content.

This fiscal year GPO made the
necessary plans to ensure that FDsys will
serve as a certified trusted repository. GPO
will be conducting an internal review of FDsys
very shortly. I think it's in two weeks. An
audit of FDsys will require GPO's preservation
librarian and program management office staff
to work together to assess the FDsys system's
architecture, ingest in archiving methodology,
as well as GPO staffing and financial support for FDsys.

After reviewing FDsys documentation, GPO will engage the services of an independent vendor to review FDsys documentation and conduct an independent external audit of FDsys. A key requirement for such a vendor is experience in TRAC which is Trustworthy Repositories Audit and Certification.

The trust of the practitioners in the digital curation preservation community and other interested parties are part of TRAC. TRAC is an auditing tool to assess the reliability and commitment and readiness of institutions to assume long-term preservation responsibilities.

We have requested specific funding to accomplish this as part of our budgetary process. Once the sunset of GPO Access is complete the next two top priorities for FDsys are: first, enable direct submission of content by Congressional users and, second,
discovering born digital information so that it is not at risk of loss.

You'll learn more about these at the FDsys educational system tomorrow.

Correct? These are major steps forward for GPO in creating a one-stop site for published authentic government information.

As we work to transition from GPO Access to FDsys GPO's program management office and library services and content management staff continue to work together to make the transition smooth from the FDLP libraries and their patrons.

Staff members have developed extensive transition plans, training materials for staff and the public, and a wide variety of promotional activities. Ric will be telling you more about these activities.

Another exciting FDsys development is the recent release of the continuity of access, COA, instance on September 30, 2011. This allows GPO to provide a robust disaster recovery solution to ensure continuity of
access to all data within FDsys. This release allows GPO to declare a milestone victory in its mission to continue permanent public access to official government information.

The separation of content allows GPO's information to reside beyond the reach of accident or attack and ensures that the documents of our democracy will be accessible under any circumstance.

Moving onto open government. This past July GPO and the National Archives, Office of the Federal Register, launched the Federal Register 2.0 prototype in a user friendly online version of the Federal Register. I often talk about the government newspapers that GPO publishes, the Congressional Record and the Federal Register.

As we look at this new Federal Register 2.0 it mirrors the best that online newspaper websites have to offer. This daily journal of government information has provided the public with access to government information and federal regulations for the
The Federal Register 2.0 features a new layout that organizes content by topics similar to the best newspaper websites. The site displays individual sections for money, environment, world, science and technology, business and industry, and health and public welfare.

The website has improved search and navigation tools to guide readers to the most popular topics and relevant documents. Users can submit comments and stay connected through social media.

A few months back we announced the conversation of the Code of Federal Regulations into XML and that it was being placed online via FDsys and the government site for government data www.data.gov. I'm pleased to tell you there are now over 20 CFRs and Federal Register XML data sets available.

Another item, GPO and the Office of the Federal Register are currently drafting a vision document for a point in time system.
for regulatory information that will replace the current e-CFR. As further progress is made on this endeavor we'll keep you updated.

On another note regarding open access to government information this past year GPO developed a new partnership with the Cornell University Law Library for a pilot project to evaluate a conversion process of the Code of Federal Regulations into XML.

The Cornell Legal Information Institute is utilizing GPO CFR XML data and will be making this data available on the University's website for research. GPO and Cornell will use the lessons learned from this pilot project to find ways of providing public openness to government documents.

There will be a focus group here at the hotel this evening at 7:00 p.m. with representatives from GPO, the Office of the Federal Register, and Cornell in attendance. I encourage all of you, particularly those from the law community, to learn more about this exciting open government initiative and
Authentication. FDsys is continuing with the essential work of authenticating U.S. Government online publications that began with GPO Access. A workshop was hosted in June of 2010 pertaining to document authentication.

GPO stakeholders from the library community, academia, and federal government agencies were invited to attend. The objective of the workshop was to facilitate input from stakeholders related to user community requirements for different levels of authentication assurance on the same content, the standards and techniques that should be used for native XML authentication, standards and techniques that should be used for chain of custody, and user community requirements for granular authentication.

A summary of the conclusions of the workshop are as follows. First, XML content is the content type that GPO should next concentrate on as to authentication.
methods for future GPO systems employment. Second, the W3C technical standards for XML digital signatures are the appropriate authentication standards for XML data. Third, the granular authentication concept presented deserves feasibility and cross-analysis in the context of the overall FDsys system's delivery. And, forth, reuse of authenticated content is very important to the end user community and XML authentication techniques need to permit easy content reuse and processing by end users. There is one other sort of over-reaching or over-arching conclusion from the workshop and that is that the dialogue amongst the community is so very important.

Now, on October 21 of 2010 GPO will be hosting an industry day to gather information on technology options for XML digital signatures that would be of use to GPO and our end-user community and stakeholders. Once again, GPO stakeholders from the library community, academia, and federal government
agencies are invited to attend.

The next steps that GPO plans to take in this area are, first, evaluate the concept for granular authentication that you feel presented and determine if it's feasible to produce and deliver. If it is, proceed towards the development and to actually deliver it.

Second, to communicate the hash value distribution that FDsys already delivers and foster the use of that for segments of the user community that would benefit and desire to use that approach. Third, update GPO authentication white paper to incorporate the lessons learned at GPO based on our experiences with digital signed content and our understanding of how authentication can support GPO's mission and benefit the user community.

Moving on to some broader topics within the Government Printing Office. Earlier this month I spoke about the successes about GPO's sustainable environmental
stewardship initiatives at the very first GreenGov symposium.

The White House Council on Environmental Quality invited me to be part of the event which brought together leaders from federal, state, and local governments, nonprofit and academic communities, and the private sector to share the challenges and best practices in going green.

Among the topics I discussed I emphasized GPO's sustainable paper achievements in the agency's factory and paper options for federal agencies. GPO employees made history by printing the Congressional Record and the Federal Register on 100 percent recycled newsprint.

GPO is trying to expand the sustainable paper choices available to federal agencies by testing and validating 100 percent recycled and other sustainable office papers available through the GPO paper store. GPO also soon will be testing paper made from the pulp extract from sugar cane which is 100
percent tree free and biodegradable so you may see some differences in your paper collections in the coming years.

We also recently completed an installation of a new highly reflective roofing system. This new roof includes several bio-based layers and reflective coating that increases the efficiency and the life expectancy of the roof on our 100-plus-year-old factory. Furthermore, we updated our fleet of vehicles used to deliver printed products for Congress and federal agencies with alternative flex fuel and hybrid vehicles.

Now, in case you aren’t socially connected to GPO I want to let you know where you can find us. You can check us out on YouTube and we are GPO Printer on YouTube. We also are on Twitter at usgpo. Finally, I would like you to check out our government BookTalk blog which is GovBookTalk.

The new blog is a mix of informal
first-person reviews of federal publications, discussion of past and present federal content, and personal stories about encounters with government information and updates about GPO information dissemination activities.

As always, stay up-to-date with the latest innovations and progress of the FDLP and utilize the various tools in order to enhance public service by visiting us on the FDLP Desktop. Of course, you all know that, FDLP.gov.

Furthermore, start sharing your knowledge, experience, and resources while also benefitting from the expertise of other library professionals from around the country by signing up on the FDLP community. With all of you who stood up and Suzanne asked how many had been to less than four meetings, I hope you'll join us online.

The site is designed to create an online interactive venue to enhance the world of government documents. All members of the Federal Depository Library Community can
create an account at Community.felp.gov.

Finally, I just want to take a moment to thank Lance Cummins and his staff for putting on yet another wonderful Depository Library Council meeting. My special thanks goes to Lance Cummins, Yvonne Ellis, who I know isn't here today but she'll be here tomorrow, Bridget Govan, and Debbie Smith. As always, they are here to serve us and we greatly appreciate their commitment.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Now, I hope you enjoy yourselves over the next couple of days. We all are kind of looking forward to learning in collaboration that this fall conference always brings. I hope you are happy with the hotel. I understand Suzanne actually has -- Jill actually has soap in her room.

Are you embarrassed, Jill?

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

MR. TAPELLA: Good. With that, I will conclude my remarks. Thank you.

(Applause)
MR. DAVIS: Good morning everyone.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. DAVIS: I'm Ric Davis. I'm the Director of the Library Business Unit at GPO and I'm also the acting superintendent of documents. I am very, very pleased to see such a turnout for this event. A lot of old friends and new faces as well. Let me also welcome you to this conference.

I want to start by also thanking the staff here at the Doubletree for making this event happen. We've been coming here for a couple of years now and it's just really interesting to see how we sync up now in terms of running and hosting this event. Thank you staff here for your work as well.

I also want to welcome our new council members. As Bob mentioned, we had this bootcamp at GPO. From the very beginning they have hit the ground running. Sometimes I feel like asking do you know what you've gotten yourself into. Some of you who have served on council before already know it's a
lot of hard work and I really appreciate your
efforts and what you’ve already put into this
program.

I also want to thank the staff who
I work with every day in the Library Business
Unit. Their dedication, their commitment to
this program, their passion for the work in
supporting this program is absolutely
unparalleled. I also want them to -- if they
could just raise their hand. I won't ask you
to stand up. If you could raise your hand if
you're with the Library Unit.

(Applause)

MR. DAVIS: They also have to put
up with me every day which I can tell you is
not always the easiest things when I'm sending
emails at 2:00 in the morning so thank you all
for your dedication.

I have a lot of things I would
like to cover today including some initiatives
going on in the Library Unit as well as some
program related activities. Before I get
started I want to recognize some special
guests who are here with us at the conference.

There are a number of students from the University of Maryland who are part of a new curriculum that is designed to prepare them to be government information librarians with a focus on e-government services and digital government information.

I know it's early but if you are here with us this morning, could you please stand up.

(Applause)

MR. DAVIS: I know we have a couple of activities planned with GPO over the next couple of days and I look forward to talking to all of you. In many ways you represent our future and the future of this program and I hope that this conference is very beneficial to you in learning about what we're doing and the initiatives we have underway.

First I would like to talk a little bit more about GPO Federal Digital System, FDsys. As Bob mentioned, GPO Access
and FDsys run in parallel until the end of December. At that time FDsys will become the primary digital content management system for GPO securing and providing both current and permanent public access to our information for the American public.

The staff from the Program Management Office will be giving a demonstration tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. Additionally, as Bob mentioned, as part of that staff from my unit in Library Services and the PMO will be talking more about this trusted digital repository aspect that I think is absolutely critical for ensuring permanent public access.

I also want to inform you about what we're doing to promote and help promote FDsys. GPO Access has been with us for a very long time. It's about 16 years now and making the transition from one system to another system and making people aware of what's occurring without creating confusion is almost as much of a challenge as launching a new
system.

Right now we have 24 different promotional activities going on for FDsys. This includes a complete revamp of all of the brochures and literature associated with this, as well as a nationwide media campaign. I encourage you to attend tomorrow's session on tools for promoting the FDLP and FDsys to hear about what we're doing.

Now I would like to turn attention to what is going on in my unit, Library Services and Content Management. In FY 2009 we developed and implemented a formal customer relations program for depository libraries. This is unlike anything we have ever done in the past.

You are all familiar with the biennial surveys but this is a little bit different. We try to better gauge depository library needs, what were the unique characteristics of libraries to gather data analysis on this and look at how we run our business operations.
We contracted with Outsell to develop and administer data gathering techniques. The first step of this was to develop a segmentation survey to look at libraries by type. Not just regional and selective but a more granular breakdown.

As a follow-up to the segmentation survey a needs assessment was conducted as well as the abbreviated biennial survey that we do every couple of years.

A couple of highlights I want to mention from that process. 92 percent of respondents plan to remain in the FDLP long term. Access to depository materials was rated by over 90 percent of you as the most important service provided.

More than 80 percent of respondents reported that having cataloging records for online and monographs and serials was critical. Interestingly, staff levels were reported as adequate by 87 percent of respondents but not surprisingly over 80
percent of you reported that budget constraints remain a primary issue that we have to deal with.

The last data gathering activity that we want to do is a user survey. This survey is to help determine the value of depository libraries from the user perspective and continue to answer that age-old question that we all get, and I know that you get from directors and administrators: What is the value of an FDLP, particularly in the digital age?

The survey results will be used to develop outcome space performance measures. We have a handout literally hot off the press in the back of the room. I encourage you to pick that up on your way out and we'll also have copies at the registration table.

Likewise, strategic planning for the future is continuing. We have the goals of developing a sustainable model for the FDLP for the future to ensure that the public has systematic and secure access for the 21st
century and beyond. The desire of a consultant to perform program modeling had broad support across the depository community.

At the recommendation of the spring 2009 Depository Library Council GPO sought and received funding for library program consulting services. We conducted an open and competitive federal procurement opportunity.

The way that opportunity worked, as many procurements at GPO do, is we first put it out on the General Services Administration schedule for qualified GSA bidders. Interestingly, there were no bidders.

As a result of that we then opened it up to everyone and we put it out through a lowest cost technically acceptable procurement model that was recommended by our procurement and legal staff. As a result of that process Ithaka S & R was awarded the contract.

Working with stakeholders from across the FDLP community they will
development recommendations for sustainable models under the guidance of GPO and the guidance of Library Council for the FDLP that ensures systematic and permanent access to government information in the future.

In accordance with this contract there are various tasks that they are expected to do for us culminating in a final report which is to be issued publicly the first quarter of 2011.

Ithaka S & R has already completed their first task which is to provide details on the goals and strategy of this project and to create a website where all of you can offer input and your comments on what they are doing and how this approach is being taken.

If you have not visited the website, it's a very short URL fdlpmodeling.net. I believe Roger and Ross are also here at the conference and I know they would welcome the opportunity to talk with you as we go through this process together.
As Bob mentioned, we have also been making significant progress with the migration and enhanced stabilization of legacy systems that we talked about at previous conferences.

Just to clarify, these are systems that are outside the scope of GPO's federal digital system but are not withstanding equally important because they serve the critical needs of information processing for this program.

A couple I want to mention. The WEBTech Notes migration has been completed followed by additional enhancements that we've made. Also, one of our favorite topics, PURLZ. GPO has completed the migration from the OCLC PURL Resolver software to the PURLZ Resolver software for the PURL implementation, and an announcement on FDLPL and the Desktop went out about that this morning. For the distribution systems and the federal bulletin board legacy systems we've likewise already enabled full backup and failover systems.
For some of the systems that Bob mentioned like DDAS, Access, our item listers, our amendment of item selections, fortunately we received funding for that in FY 10 and leading up until September 30th we awarded a contract to further stabilize and migrate all of those systems. We'll be working closely with the council on that, with GPO's IT department, and we'll keep the library community informed of progress.

Also progress in terms of disposition of depository materials in federal depository libraries. As some of you remember from a couple of sessions ago, there was a request that GPO develop an automated tool for disposition of materials to help regional depository libraries better manage the disposition process in their states.

I want to emphasize again this is a voluntary tool that we are developing. I often hear from some regionals that they have a process. "It's working very well and leave me alone." We are happy to do that. But, at
the same time, I've also heard from others that you are looking for relief. You're looking for us to develop something to help you.

As a result of that we developed a requirements document, a concept of operations document. We put that out for council comment, comment to the broader community, and we received a lot of good feedback that impacted the development of those final requirements.

As a result of that leading up to September 30th as well we went through a procurement process and we made an award to a company to help us develop this. We'll be working closely with council on that as well to make sure it continues to meet your needs.

Also, back in October 2009, if you remember, GPO announced the launch of a one-year pilot project to address the need for distribution of cataloging records to depository libraries. The pilot project tested marked 21 record distribution
processes, compatibility between catalog records and FDLP work flows. Through that process we did this contract with Marcive which I think was very successful. A report of the feedback that we received, the takeaways from it, is part of your handout packet. We received funding this year to continue that and we are now implementing a one-year expansion of it. The number of libraries now participating is 75. I think those were the ones who all expressed interest so the numbers have increased. We're looking forward to looking at better methods of how we can push out these cataloging records based on user preferences and we look to continue to expand that project. If you're interested in that and expanding it to your library, please let me know.

I also want to advise that based on the Depository Library Council recommendation GPO and the Depository Library Council have been working together to create
a comprehensive list of benefits for libraries participating in the FDLP.

The intent of this is to have some mechanisms so that you can better communicate with your library directors on the importance and value of this program. Upon completion two documents will be available to depositories both on the Desktop. The first will be a top ten benefits afforded to all libraries. This will serve as a quick reference handout.

The second document based on the segmentation analysis I mentioned at the beginning will provide detailed examples of the benefits by being a regional, by being a selective and a more granular breakdown.

As part of this process it's important for all libraries participating in the FDLP to have the opportunity to provide input to us. We're going to be having a council session at 2:00 p.m. today in this room where we talk about progress on Library Council recommendations from Buffalo.
We are also going to be taking time to go over that document and we would welcome your input. It will not be your only chance for input. We'll have this out again on the Desktop and we have a room where you will be able to provide more information on your thoughts.

We are also continuing work on the transcription of the historic shelf list. In January 2010 we awarded a contract to begin to transcribe the shelf list cards into mark records. We began with the Y4 Congressional information and we have now moved on to other SuDocs classes.

Library unit staff had been enhancing these records by adding one Library of Congress subject heading and also one corporate name authority to the transcribed records.

At present there are over 31,000 shelf list records in the CGP so duly noted. We have also completed the digitization of nearly 300,000 shelf list cards for internal
use and a contract has been awarded to
complete the digitization of the remaining
shelf list cards.

Next I would like to turn
attention to the integrated library system.
I'm pleased to announce to you if you didn't
see the announcement as you were getting on
the plane that MetaLib was recently released
with an initial collection of 53 databases.
This is a federated search tool component of
the Catalog of Government Publications that we
mentioned at the conference in Buffalo was
under development.

It launched on Friday. You can
use this to retrieve reports, articles, and
citations by simultaneously searching across
multiple databases. It is our intent to
expand this seed list of 53 or so resources on
an ongoing basis and I would welcome your
feedback on this service and to see what you
think about it.

Another item that we talked about
at the conference in Buffalo is being under
Development was the Catalog of Government Publications FDLP login page. That is going to be released tomorrow. This gives depository libraries access to authenticated services in the Catalog of Government Publications. This includes the ability for you to set up selective dissemination of information searches where you can get results returned to you by RSS or email.

In addition, it allows you to customize information according to your preferences to create folders and store information and save them across sessions. There is also an option to save authenticated local users PC and the option to set and save user preferences according to results page and results formats.

A topic I always like to talk about at these conferences, and it dates back to when Barbie Selby was chair of council, is marketing initiatives. I wanted to inform you about some new resources we have available to FDLP libraries.
First, I hope as part of your packets that all of you picked up the new event planner. This 2011 planner highlights facts about the FDLP and it also provides cross references to various events going on in 2011.

I’m told that literally hot off the press this morning we also have a CD that is now available out at the registration desk and that has a screen saver and FDLP Desktop wallpaper information for your public access work stations.

We’ve also recently contracted with an organization called NAPS, N-A-P-S, which stands for North American Precise Syndicate. Through this we are disseminating information articles about the FDLP to 10,000 print and online publications nationwide. We also have radio spots to promote the FDLP on over 400 FM radio stations throughout the nation.

For more information on our promotional efforts I encourage you to attend
a session tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m.

We'll have copies of our new products
including the CD and I encourage you to pick one up. These will also be available as well as the event planner for you to get as promotional items off of the FDLP Desktop.

I want to turn attention next to the Registry of U.S. Government Publication Digitization Projects. You'll hear more about this during the council session this afternoon but I want to mention that at the conference in Buffalo when we talked about the registry there was discussion about certain things that library council wanted to see appear on the registry to make it easier to find digitization projects that we're all collaborating on.

Also kind of a revamp with a fresh look and feel of the registry page. We've made some strides in that regard partially by profiling things that I think were a little bit hidden on the advance page. We've also established additional links and made some
enhancements.

There's going to be a
demonstration of the new look and feel of a
beta of this registry at an 11:15 session
tomorrow on web services for the FDLP. I
courage you to take a look at that. We'll
also be releasing that in a form where you can
offer comments after the conference.

I would like to turn attention
next to public access assessments. Public
access assessments have sort of evolved from
the historical inspection program, as we
called it at GPO over the years. It's very
focused now on outreach initiatives and what
I deem to be partnering with all of you.
It's about helping you better manage his
program and be involved in the program.

We were recently conducting public
access assessments and in attendance in a
number of states; Arizona, Arkansas,
Connecticut, Georgia, Mississippi, Nebraska,
Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico.

I want to encourage all of you
when you think about assessments from GPO also think about other things that we can do; speaking at events, participating with you at events at your university to promote the Federal Depository Library Program. Also, most critically, to help provide training to your users and to each other. I think we have a real collaborative opportunity to really expand this.

In terms of expanding it I think at the last conference I mentioned that we had three library assessment staff on board. We now have doubled that staff and we are up to six. We've never had six assessment librarians since I've been at GPO and I'm very happy that we have so many people on board who are available to work with you and support this program.

Again, speaking at events. I want to encourage you to contact us to do that. I think right after this conference I'm going to be heading down to the University of Virginia to help Barbie celebrate the library down
there so please let us know when you would like us to come out and work with you.

I would like to conclude by talking a little bit about partnerships. GPO has entered into a service partnership with St. Mary's University for the government information on the web subject index which provides a starting point for browsing subject areas and bringing broad and detailed subject listings from many libraries together into one index.

I'm also happy about GPO's recent involvement in joining the Digital Preservation Alliance, associated with LOCKSS. We're getting a lot out of that. Our digital preservation librarian David Walls who joined us. He wasn't at the Buffalo conference but I believe he's here today. There's David. He has been involved in this and we are very happy to work with James and the LOCKSS staff.

By joining LOCKSS I think we've taken a major step forward as well as the work we're doing with certifying FDsys as a trusted
digital repository to put some real teeth into this process about permanence of government information which to me is equally as critical as discovering all of the born digital information that's out there that is within scope of the program.

Even with all of the attendance that we have here today, obviously we know there are a lot of colleagues who could not make this conference. As a result of that, providing online learning opportunities and the way to do things virtually I think is equally important.

We've been doing a lot of things with OPAL over the last few years which is online programming for all libraries. I know a number of you have participated in that and we have a lot of archived presentations but we've also developed with a contractor educational training modules.

We've launched one on WEBTech Notes, the FDLP Desktop and more to come. I'm getting a lot of good feedback on that and
it's a way to virtually connect and for all of you to share information about the program with others.

Staff often cautioned me about doing this but I have to again. If you need help from GPO we have a help desk but I always want you to contact me as well. My email address is rdavis@gpo.gov. I've started giving out that email address several years ago. I can tell you that not only have I gotten a lot of good feedback from all of you, I've gotten these incredible land deals overseas that --

(Laughter)

MR. DAVIS: I don't know why I'm here today because apparently there are fortunes all over that if I had just got on a plane I could go get them. Again, rdavis@gpo.gov. In all seriousness, if you need help with anything, I encourage you to contact me.

I want to thank all of you for coming again. I can't thank you enough for
your dedication to this program, the passion you bring to it. I appreciate the opportunity to work with all of you and to see you throughout this conference.

I now want to turn it over to Bob to announce an award, our Library of the Year.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Thank you, Ric.

Ric's former problem was that he was on the "do not fly" list.

Since 2003 GPO has been awarding the Federal Depository Library of the Year. We look for a library that demonstrates innovation, creativity and leadership in its mission to keep America informed.

Past recipients have included last year the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, the Law Library for San Bernadino County, the Middendorf-Kredell Branch Library, Benton Harbor Public Library, the New Mexico State Library. We do know it's in the United States. Southern Oregon University's Lenn and
Dixie Hannon Library. And the very first recipient was the Tulsa City-County Library.

This year's recipient provides excellent customer service and an ongoing commitment to open government. They have implemented many initiatives in order to connect the public with federal government information including an annual GovFest event where the library connects government agency representatives and business owners to create and expand economic opportunities.

They participate in the GovDocs kids group, a national group of government document librarians that provide government information and resources to the K-12 students, teachers, and librarians.

During the 2009 tax season the library's government information web pages and Tax Tips blog assisted over 5,000 people with federal tax related issues. The library includes a central resource library and 12 neighborhood libraries.

In 2009 over 2.7 million people
visited library locations and 2.2 million people visited the library's website from their homes, offices, and other locations outside the library.

The library was established in 1952 by volunteers and last year's patrons checked out over 6.9 million items. There are over 1.1 million publications in the library not counting the GovDocs. The vision of the library is to create an environment for people to learn, to explore, to enjoy, to create, and to connect.

Please join me in congratulating the 2010 Federal Depository Library of the Year, the Johnson County Library from Overland Park, Kansas.

(Applause)

MR. TAPELLA: Accepting the award is Donna Lauffer, the county librarian, and Martha Childers, the government documents librarian. While Donna is holding that, we actually -- you get to hold it for a little while.
MS. LAUFFER: Okay.

MR. TAPELLA: I actually have a congratulatory note from our congressman Dennis Moore. "It is with great pride that I congratulate the Johnson County Public Library on being awarded the 2010 Federal Depository Library of the Year. The prestigious award is provided to the library that furthers the goal of the Federal Depository Library Program by ensuring that the American public has free access to its government information. As a long-time supporter and user of the Johnson County Public Library system, in particular the central resource library which is located just down the street from my Congressional office, I know this award is well deserved. I send my heartfelt congratulations to the libraries and staff of the Johnson County Public Library on this special day. Congratulations from Congressman Dennis Moore."

(Applause)

MS. LAUFFER: I had to come up
beforehand to make sure I could see over the
podium. Thank you very much for this
prestigious award. I'm very proud to accept
it on behalf of a very dedicated staff that
really truly believe that this is what they do
every day. The long list of accomplishments
is just no big deal because that's what public
librarians do.

They have a great team spirit that
Martha Childers, our government documents
librarian, they all help her do things even
though she has that uncanny talent of really
sticking to it and dogging it all the way to
the end of the project so that we end up with
a result that is more than anybody imagined.

We have been challenged in the
last couple of years by the economic downturn.
People come to the library much more during a
recession. I think that is one of the reasons
why the GovFest was so successful because we
had lots of people that had never been without
a job before.

You can't even get a job at Pizza
Hut without doing it online so we do a lot of computer literacy and financial literacy with our patrons. Let's face it, if the federal documents folks are tweeting and blogging, then everybody has to retool in this day and age.

We are very appreciative that the documents are now integrated into our collection, into our catalogue. They are interfiled in the collection. They are much more accessible to patrons. Of course, the online collection is featured in a website that we have developed.

We also have found over the years that the camaraderie of our neighboring agencies such as the IRS, the election office, the Health Department, the federal archives in town, the human services and aging folks in the county, the civic engagement nonprofits, and even the census folks are much easier to work with now. We all are moving in the same direction and that's a joy to see because I've been in the library world for over 30 years
and it wasn't always that way.

One thing I would like to share

with you in closing, though, is that all of
the new staff that come to the library have an
orientation session with me and I always ask
them, "So, what kind of services do your tax
monies provide?" They kind of scratch their
heads and think of, you know, public
education, public safety, roads and bridges,
waste water, water health.

So then I ask them, "Why is the
government in the library business?" They all
kind of are puzzled at that. They eventually
come to the conclusion that people need to be
informed. But, you know, it's really
important in a democracy and important to the
federal government and to state and local
government that we have an informed citizenry
when they vote. Hopefully they will do that
in great numbers in the next couple of weeks.

In fact, our democracy depends on
people that are informed and have the
opportunity to receive information in a free
and balanced way that libraries can do. In fact, it's the very same reason that the federal depository library program was established by James Madison in 1813 and it still holds true for today.

The partnership of the federal government and the local library to help people with their lifelong learning challenges is a way to keep democracy alive and well, and it is both in the United States and even in Kansas.

(Laughter)

MS. LAUFFER: We accept all points of view.

On behalf of Johnson County Library Board of Directors and all the dedicated staff I thank you very much for this honor and designation as Depository Library of the Year.

(Applause)

MS. CHILDERS: You're getting the tall and the short of it today. The person I sat next to on the plane, and we had a really
nice conversation, had a cold and I came Thursday so I hope you can hear me.

It is an honor and a pleasure to accept this award on behalf of the Johnson County Library. For those of you who don't know where Kansas is, it's next to Missouri. That's where I live. We actually serve the whole Kansas City metro area. Some of you may have flown over.

We do actually answer questions from all over the world. Many of you get those, too, I'm sure. I love government documents, I really do, and I love sharing that passion with others.

Many have contributed to this award today, our public printer who defends our needs to Congress. Just to name a few, Robin Haun-Mohamed at GPO who has helped me so much the last few years, and Katie Davis and her web content team who have helped the Gov.kids group create a presence on the FDLP community. Of course, all of the Government Printing Office staff.
The Kansas Library Association

Government Documents Roundtable is a small, active, and supportive group. Here today are Nan Myers from Wichita State University. I can tell you Wichita isn't what it used to be.

There is Regina Beard from Kansas State University; Antoinette Satterfield, formerly of Kansas State University, currently as Annapolis; and Carmen Orth-Alfie, our regional from Kansas University. I would also like to acknowledge our capable county librarian and the hundreds of library staff and volunteers who make everything happen at our library.

There was a time when Johnson County Library before Donna was our county librarian was thinking about getting out of the Federal Depository Library Program. It has been an uphill battle winning staff over.

When Lance Cummins called to tell me of this award, I mentioned it to one of my capable colleagues who has been a librarian for 30 or 40 years. She laughed. She said,
"We don't even have any government documents."

(Laughter)

MS. CHILDERS: I said, with my iron skillet in my hand, "Anyone with a computer and internet access can read most current government information anywhere on the planet and probably outer space." The Government Printing Office is not just giving lip service to going paperless, they are really doing it.

So how did we keep the Federal Depository Library Program? First, it's very difficult to get out and I am so --

(Laughter)

MS. CHILDERS: I am so grateful for that. As Donna mentioned, we integrated our collection. We're emphasizing reliable information rather than the publisher. I realize many of you would not be able to do that. We are a public library. We document usage.

Government agencies create information and academic libraries collect and
preserve it and keep the fires of liberty
burning by monitoring its content. I see
those fiery emails out there. I'm grateful
for that. We at the public libraries are
serving it up with a smile.

At our library government
information questions rank third among
specialty reference questions. First is
business and we have four people doing
business. I'm the only one doing government.

We get everything from a high
school student doing a paper on human
trafficking to a senior citizen needing the
telephone number to the local Social Security
office, to an individual who wants to become
a U.S. citizen needing forms and study guides.

We know that a government
information specialist can provide this
information better and faster so we do
outreach. Many of the projects that we do
have already been mentioned.

Last year together with the AARP
we served 4,000 people, senior citizens and
low income to have their taxes done free. And we protect our country by encouraging children to think about and describe their experience with the U.S. Constitution.

In closing, I would like to share this video that was put together by one of our staff. It last 30 seconds and it's very quiet.

(Whereupon, the video was played.)

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Okay. We have about 10 minutes. I lost my clock but -- oh, there it is. We have about 10 minutes for questions for Bob and Ric. Council, do you have any questions? Any questions from the floor? I see people moving that I think they are headed to lunch. Okay. Well, we might get out early for lunch then. I do have a few notes.

Oh, you had a question?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. I'm looking through my notes here. Maybe this is for Ric or Bob. I'm not sure. You mentioned that there is
money for fiscal year '12 to do digitization of documents. I'm wondering if those digitized documents will be available through FDsys.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. There was also money available in this past fiscal year's budget as part of the appropriation process. Just an update on where that is. We had talked about as a first activity for that GPO and the Library of Congress wish to engage in a pilot project to make already digitized content from the Library of Congress available through FDsys. Initial focus on statutes at large, digitized material, and also Congressional record material.

Approval to proceed on that and proceed with digitization is still before our oversight committee, the Joint Committee on Printing. Once we have that approval we'll be able to engage. In the meantime our focus is on the registry standards collaboration.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Camilla.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale
Law Library. Just a quick clarification on the ECFR, Ric. I checked out FDsys and I see the link to the ECFR and it goes to the old GPO Access site. Will that link remain the same or has the content migrated to FDsys? I know you mentioned that it is in development. I was wondering about the status of keeping the GPO Access site for the ECFR.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. The ECFR is shall we say a more complicated application. Development aspects of that based on requirements are currently being worked on with the Office of the Federal Register to define what the requirements are to migrate forward. Once that's completed that will also be part of FDsys. For now it stays the same.

MS. TUBBS: And that site will stay active?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, still active.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. One more question. This one about PURLZ and e-publishing. I'm
wondering if those PURLZ are going to integrate all of the new and current e-publishing opportunities so if somebody goes to PURLZ they will be able to get an iPhone reader, a Kindle reader, PDF, etc., etc.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. I think the very first thing we wanted to do based on the great PURL crash of 2009 was stabilize. I talked about building a bridge of stability to keep PURLZ active. I think that we certainly have the capability to do that. I think what I would like next from council and from the community is now that we've stabilized, which was critical, to define where we go next with persistent name in general.

There were some initial requirements developed several years ago that I think need a substantial refresh. I think particularly looking at use of technologies like that and the ability to adapt to mobile devices is equally critical. The first and foremost thing was stabilize.
MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
California State Library. Again, on PURLZ I hastily read this morning's release on FDLPL. I wasn't quite sure I understood what the transition to PURLZ means for PURL referral statistics.

Are those statistics going to be available and collected during the sort of, what is it, a three-month transition period or so, or is there going to be that gap in the statistics since a lot of depositories depend on those statistics to justify the purchase and loading of catalogue records with PURLZ in them.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. There is not going to be a gap that I'm aware of. The first thing to do is to launch to get off the old system. I had mentioned at the last conference that the referral capability is actually going to provide enhanced statistics over what we've been able to offer from GPO. Now that we've launched, that comes next.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Any more
questions from council? From the floor?

Barbie.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia. It's not a question but it's an announcement. Can I do it?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Sure.

MS. SELBY: I just wanted to stress to everyone that the meeting tomorrow afternoon at 4:00 in this room. It's called a regional meeting but it is open to everyone.

It's a discussion of the Title 44 initial working drafts that the Title 44 regional group got together. It is a very open meeting. Please come. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Any other questions or comments from the floor? Okay. I have a few announcements. First off, we would like to invite you to a celebration for the Library of the Year. It's from 3:30 to 4:00 at the break. It will be right out where the coffee for council was this morning and there will be cake so if you each lunch, you have dessert at 3:30.
The Cornell Focus Group that Bob mentioned in his speech is from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. in the Wilson/Harrison Room. The Maryland, D.C., Delaware Region will be meeting by the elevators at noon for lunch. I hope someone from that group is here in the room because it doesn't say south elevators or north elevators. Who's from that region that knows where you're meeting? Nobody? I guess you get to just choose.

The Law Librarians and Friends, I think that's thanks to me. About 10 years ago I crashed their meeting so now they are "and Friends." The sign-up sheet for dinner, which us on Tuesday evening, is on the bulletin board and you need to sign up before Tuesday at noon so they can get the reservation in.

MS. LASTER: Ohio is meeting at 12:15 in the lower lobby.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Ohio is meeting at 12:15 in the lower lobby. Any other announcements? I've got one waving hand.
PARTICIPANT: New York, we don't have our regional here but we want to meet for lunch right here.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: New York is in the far corner by the lovely lady in blue. The regional is not here but they will get together anyway.

Okay. If that's -- oh, wait. And Washington is just meeting somewhere. Cindy has her hand up.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, Government Printing Office. This evening from 6:00 until whenever we're going to be doing some usability testing of Science.gov. If any of you are interested, see me or Tim Byrne back of the room. These will be 15-minute sessions so we'll be having people come in and out at 15-minute intervals. If you're interested, please let us know. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: And Janet, do you have --

PARTICIPANT: Yes. The librarians from Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico,
Utah, and Wyoming will be meeting tonight for dinner 6:00, the lobby.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: I believe for the new attendees Kathy Behr invited you all to lunch. I can't remember where you said for them to meet.

MS. BEHR: At the registration desk.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: At the registration desk. Of you have nobody to go to lunch with, Kathy Behr has volunteered to take you -- to go with her. You can meet her by the registration table with the large groups that are all meeting there.

Thank you very much. We will see you back at 2:00.

(Whereupon, at 11:57 a.m. off the record for lunch to reconvene at 2:00 p.m.)
MS. MORIEARTY: Hello, everyone.

Do you want the doors opened or closed? Could we have at least one of the big doors closed, please? If everyone would be seated. Most of you know me which is why you're obeying me which is very strange.

Hello, everyone. My name is Jill Moriearty. I'm with the University of Utah, J. Willard Marriott Library. Just a little plug for the Marriot group. I would like to
introduce you to the group that worked on this session.

They are David Cismowski, Head of the Government Publication Section, California State Library; Helen Burke, Minneapolis Central Library; Ted Priebe, Director of Library Planning and Development; Kelly Seifert -- how was that? -- lead planning specialist, Office of the Director, Library Services and Content Management. The purpose of this session everyone is to review the draft recommendations from the spring council meeting. Is everybody ready? All right.

If you have your packet, there is a handout there. Who has the PowerPoint control? Thank you. Let's start with the first draft recommendation which is the ability to browse digitization registration by project looking for collaborator and highlight collaborator N & Os in navigation. Response?

MR. PRIEBE: Thank you, Jill. Ted Priebe. In terms of the enhanced search capability for the digitization registry it
actually has the core functionality enabled
and it has been enabled but because it was not
as easily noticeable you have to go into the
advanced search functionality to actually to
be able to leverage it.

One of the things that we're doing
now, and as Ric mentioned earlier today, is we
will be having a session which is kind of a
beta release, if you will, of a new format and
look of that registry and that's going to be
taking place tomorrow.

Web services in the FDLP, that's
at 11:00 so I would encourage all of you who
have used it but would like to understand how
to leverage it better and have some of that
enhanced functionality to be used to join us
for that session.

With that being said, any
additional comments from council?

MS. MORIEARTY: Comments, council?

MR. PRIEBE: Anyone from the
community that would like to add anything to
this spring council recommendation?
MS. MORIEARTY: All right. Seeing no movement toward a mic, David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. The second DLC draft recommendation is add a link to the Grant Opportunities document delivered in Tampa on the Desktop under instructions and to the priority titles for digitization to digitization registry.

Ted.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.

What we've done, and I'm actually going to just break out of our slide deck for a moment and actually show you from the registry where that grants document is and just to give you a quick look for those of you who have not had an opportunity to see that.

Off of the registry page if you go to the front top face here there's the link. When you click on it, it actually brings you to a broader article off of the FDLP Desktop which is the federal publications digitization and public access file initiative. When you
go all the way to the bottom, you can see that
list of links and list of opportunities.

For those of you who have not yet
been to that portion of the site interested in
finding more about how to leverage grants that
are available in both the federal government
as well as private institutions, I would
encourage you to take a look at that.

Comments from council? Anybody in
the community have any additions on that?

MS. MORIEARTY: All right. Helen.

MS. BURKE: Helen Burke, Hennepin
County Library. Council intends to pursue
discussions with associations that collect
statistics and rate libraries to explore the
issues surrounding the weighing of e-
collections vis-a-vis tangible volumes in
their metrics.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.

This may be the shortest response of many of
the GPO responses. In this scenario it really
is just on behalf of GPO putting ourselves
forward that, you know, we are certainly ready
and able to collaborate with council if there are any particular actions or recommendations from some of that work that's occurring that is of interest that we can move forward on.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. So far has no one approached you or have you reached out to anyone?

MR. PRIEBE: This is one of the items from council that we saw as a council action that was put forward as a potential pursuit piece, not necessarily GPO leading that activity. If council feels like that is something that needs to be prioritized, we certainly look forward to working on it.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I was aware but I just wanted to find out if anyone had come forward at this point.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Not at this point.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame to your right. Who is taking the lead on
council on doing some of this outreach? Is there a group? Did I miss something?

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. So far we haven't assigned anybody, Steve, but if you are volunteering, I would love to have you.

MR. HAYES: Go ahead, yeah.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I nominate Steve Hayes.

MR. JACOBS: Second.

MR. O'MAHONY: Third. Dan O'Mahony, Brown University. I would be happy to work with you, Steve, on that.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Does the community have any comment?

Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. This is the quietest group out there I've seen in years. Our next recommendation. Oh, hot dog.

MS. MACKIN: Sandy Mackin, University of Kentucky. To what end are you doing this investigation? I wasn't here last
year so I don't know the background.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Sandy, the point behind it was we are trying to find ways that we can encourage libraries to digitize. We all know that our directors listen to the statistics they are forced to gather.

If there is some way to start including the materials that are digitized into those statistics that count towards ARL status or ACRL statistics that it might be easier to convince our directors to do that.

We were going to investigate just exactly where that stands with them because we know they have been talking about whether or not to include those statistics and try and find out what is the status of that and is that something they see moving forward. Does that answer your question?

MS. MACKIN: Yes. Thank you.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Our next recommendation. GPO staff should share with the community a
detailed summary of the scope and target
completion dates of the GPO shelf list
collection project.

Ted.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. We
did post a fairly extensive summary on the
project. Laurie Hall, director of LTIS, will
also be discussing this during her session.
Again, I wanted to break out of that
PowerPoint for a moment and just go ahead and
pull up a link. For those of you who have not
yet seen it, we do have a full article with
tremendous amount of background on this.

A few snippets. There really is
-- we are estimating over $1 million of these
cards that are arranged by SuDocs order.
There's about 400,000 of those cards that are
OCLC cards that were produced by GPO through
OCLC.

We do have, and we started in
January of this year, a contract to supplement
staff in the creation of the transcription of
those cards into our catalog of government
publications. As of this month there are over 31,000 of those. As Ric mentioned as well earlier in his speech today, we did recently award a contract for digitization of the remaining shelf list cards. From a high-level summary those are some of the activities that have been started, some results that have happened and that will continue.

For those of you that would like to get even more information on this, if I scroll all the way down to the bottom there's also a link off of that page for an OPAL session that Laurie and several of the key members facilitated that will give you just a plethora of information on what that process is.

Council, any follow-on with that?


MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls. Okay, so I see this one and I see the one about the
digitization of collections. Are links to the new collections that are being scanned are going to be included in this historic shelf list when it goes into the CGP? Right?

You've got collections that are being scanned so will there be links directly from the records in -- they are added in from the historic shelf list back to the full text collections.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. If I understand your question right, community members that are digitizing content and your question is with the records that are made available in the CGP will there be a link added?

MS. McKNELLY: Link back to the full text collection, yes.

MR. PRIEBE: Okay. I'm going to ask one of my colleagues, Laurie Hall.

MS. McKNELLY: Sorry, Laurie.

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. Suzanne has told me we will only be linking to digitized document content for official
partners. If you’re a partner with GPO, then we will be linking to your content.

We also have cataloging partnership that we are working on. It’s not finalized yet. Correct? Working with Jennie Burroughs hopefully in Montana to pick up the pieces of things that we don’t have. We are doing a lot of little projects. Does that answer your question? Okay. Great.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. Laurie, don’t leave the mic, please. So I’m unclear when you say official partners. For instance, the University of North Texas is a partner with GPO and CyberCemetery. We have a lot of material in our additional library.

Would we need to be a partner on each one of those items or just because we have a partnership then anything we digitize? Like when we put up the LCC record we have to have a partnership with that for it to be linked. Then we would have to have a link for U.S. Bureau of Mines publications. Do you
understand what I'm saying?

MS. EBANUES: Suzanne Ebanues, GPO. Yes, Suzanne. We could do an overall partnership for all of your digital library if you have a large collection. We could talk about that.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: So you would need an MOU between the institution and you on digitization?

MS. EBANUES: It would depend on the exact collection and project. None of our MOUs are exactly the same so there's a lot of discussion back and forth as we develop one. I know in your case we could talk about doing an over-arching one. Just like the CyberCemetary I know started out as little bits and pieces and then became an over-arching so we could do that if you're interested.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. Suzanne, because you have an existing partnership it's easier than to modify an existing partnership than to create a new one.
for like your digital library or something other than CyberCemetary.

MS. MORIEARTY: Any other questions from council? Council questions come first. No questions? From the community?

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein from LSU. I keep feeling I need to reiterate the clarification of what makes one a partner. LSU is currently a partner with GPO for a product that is not a digitization project. If we wanted to get involved with that, we would have to have another MOU completely separate from that. Right? I see heads going up and down which seems to me yes.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's right, Stephanie, because the kind of partnership that you have now is a service partnership where you are providing a service, a digitization access to content has different requirements by both parties.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Thank you.

MS. MACKIN: Sandy Mackin,
University of Kentucky. My apologies. This may be in your summary but the 31,000 records that have gone into the CGP have those also gone into OCLC?

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, GPO. No. We've recently gotten a report back from OCLC who tested a sample of the records. They have some major concerns about how we code things and how they are going to de-dupe us loading into OCLC where there already is existing records. That's one of the projects we have in the fall to take a look at their analysis and decide how we are going to go forward.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I just had one follow-on. Some good discussion on the opportunity for partnerships and digitization. For those of you who are out there, just a reminder we do have a link off the FTLP Desktop for partnerships.

Anyone who is interested in submitting, Suzanne Ebanues, who came to the microphone, is our lead within Library Planning and development on the partnership
side. I would encourage any of you out in the audience who are thinking about what you've done and how we might work together that would be a very quick and easy vehicle to start that discussion.

MS. MORIEARTY: Next recommendation.

MR. CISWOSKI: GPO should conduct a segmentation survey in order to learn about the diverse needs of the various types and sizes of FDLP libraries and integrate these needs into strategic thinking.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Prieb, GPO. So at the spring conference in Buffalo we had not yet published and made those results available. We subsequently have all of the data accessible again off the FDLP Desktop. There is a fairly extensive article that was written in regards to that.

For those of you that have not yet reviewed that material, we've got the link in that handout. Additionally here I just pulled up that summary page. You can see in terms of
that segmentation survey data and also the
needs assessment survey which really
facilitated part of our normal biennial survey
data.

All of that was comprehensively
put together as well and us accessible for
council as well as the community to review.
With that, any additional comments from
council?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.
Anyone from the community? Anything to add?

MS. BURKE: Next recommendation.
Collaboration between council and 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.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I
could probably respond to this recommendation
as well as the following one in terms of GPO's
activities since the spring. What we did as
a business unit is created a proposed project
plan and we sent that this summer to council. From that plan it is at a phase where we are really awaiting next steps or further input on where we can go with that in groups.

In terms of high level and what that proposed plan consisted of, it's really developing that feedback list of gathering mechanisms with the FDLP community. Parts of what we were proposing was analyzing trends, reviewing what other tools that could be leveraged in terms of enabling this.

With that I'll open it up to council. No comments. Community, any additional input?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Seeing no movement we'll go to the our next draft. I think the answer has been provided, yet I want to make sure we cover this in case we have any comments.

Collaboration between council and GPO to explore ways to solicit timely feedback from the Federal Depository Libraries through the use of web survey or other web-based
tools.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.

Council, I would respond to both of these on that last one but any additional input from the spring recommendation?

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I think on this one I've always had a little bit of a concern about timely feedback. We left it wide open but there was discussion about what constitutes timely feedback. My inclination is ASAP but being a semi-reasonable person I think a month, six weeks.

I want some hard date, I suppose, for feedback. That might be a hard thing to deliver but if I know that within three months, six months, six days I can expect some kind of feedback, I think that goes a long way to building confidence.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. I think we echo that desire in response to the recommendation. Frankly, the answer sometimes is it depends in terms of the mechanism of the
survey.

If we are getting a slow response rate, many times we, as well as I'm sure the council has shared this same challenge, you put a stake in the sand in terms of a targeted time for getting responses but you still will have opportunities where people will come back and say, "Hey, is it too late? Can I get our feedback into it? We have some really important data."

In those instances you do end up actually holding off or, in this case sometimes with the contracted from, we'll have them hold off assuming we're going to have some of that additional input. Once you have it the time frame that it takes to do the proper analysis of the data many times is a bit subjective.

We may want to get a draft that we'll share as we have in the past with council. I'm sure that we've got the core information covered. Sometimes that will lead to some enhanced work on the part of GPO or,
in this case, with Outsell and the task at hand that really brought this recommendation forward.

I don't know that I've answered the comment but our policy is to get the data out as quickly as possible but, at the same time, ensure that the analysis is done properly, that we've given everyone every opportunity to provide input because, of course, that is the objective of the surveys as we put them forward.

MS. SIEFERT: Kelly Siefert, GPO.

I just want to add to that. As part of our draft plan that we were putting forward we not only want to examine new and different survey tools but we also want to talk about within GPO how often we survey.

If we need to develop parameters and priorities for what deserves a survey, there is often a feeling of being over-surveyed in the community and we don't want to over-saturate with that so that's part of that plan as well.
MS. MORIEARTY: Council, any other comments?

MR. PRIEBE: Anyone in the community? Have we surveyed you enough?

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. You know that I'm no opponent of feedback. I'm all for feedback but we have been, I think, inundated recently with things about which you want comments. "Here is a new draft policy. What do you think?" "Here is this new thing. What do you think?"

I think if that's going to continue, and I see that's probably going to continue, you add surveys on top of that and that's a lot. You're asking a lot. I appreciate your concern about over-surveying us because I think we're getting close to that without formal kind of surveys.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnellly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls. I answer a lot of surveys from a lot of places and I'm over-surveyed all around. Have you ever
considered sampling instead of surveying everybody? Just going out and taking a sample because I think your response rates are not necessarily good when you do these surveys.

Part of it is you're going out for 100 percent and you're coming back and you're getting 20 percent of the people. Maybe you should try sampling and saying, "You're a small representative here for the whole community and please take this seriously," and you get a better response rate.

It's not perfect but if you only get 17 or 20 percent of the people answering the survey, that's not that good anyway. Then there would be fewer surveys for all of us.

MR. PRIEBE: Thank you. Ted Prieb, GPO. Michele has gone back but one of the questions that I had, and maybe I'll pose this to council in terms of that subset or sampling, I'm not sure the basis of the evaluation or what criteria you use or who you survey to ensure that the full community overall has been provided that opportunity for
At least up until now any surveys that we've done on proposed new tools, value-added services we've taken that holistic view of trying to give everyone the opportunity to provide that feedback because we have to obviously support, as you do, the entire community and all the different types and branches.

A good comment and I think worth probably additional discussion with council on how that perhaps could be implemented. We look forward to input.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. It strikes me that perhaps there could be a blend of both. That is you could identify certain libraries that would be sampled and then you could also open it up to whoever else wants to comment since the purpose of this really is -- the purpose is not to actually vote or to conduct a scientific poll but to get feedback from the community. That would be a way of ensuring
feedback from a fairly representative sample but still allowing others who are not annoyed by too many surveys to continue to comment.

GPO?  James?

MR. JACOBS:  James Jacobs, Stanford University. That reminds me that there could be other types of tools involved like at the point of access. If you're talking about getting feedback on a new collection on FDsys or something like that, you don't necessarily -- well, you want libraries to give you input but you also want the public and users to give input.

It's fairly simple to put a little script when somebody hits a website. It pops up a little box that says, "Hey, got a second? Let us know what you think." There's lots of different ways.

MR. HAYES:  Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I think, Ted, you're right. As much as I agree sampling is a good way to do it depending on what you're trying to accomplish. The difficulty is, as you've identified,
drawing that sample and then communicating to
the group that, "Yes, you are the sample." We
are doing it for our purpose to actually draw
a conclusion as opposed to get the broadest
amount of feedback.

It's two different things. I
think it would behoove council to take a look
at the methodology and make some suggestions
or concur with certain suggestions to see how
we want to do things because I think the
sampling technique is one that I use at our
institution. It's a little bit better. Yes,
sampling and feedback is now approaching spam.

If I get asked one more time,
"Congratulations. You used the Office for
Information Technology. How did we do?"
Delete. It is because it has become so easy
but it is very careful what conclusion you
want to draw. If your sample is not
representative, you can't draw any conclusions
other than to say here's all the comments but
there's no action to take.-

MR. PRIEBE: I think Cindy was
next and then the community.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to point out that we did consider sampling for the upcoming user survey at the suggestion of Outsell because we learned from the earlier survey I believe it was 75 libraries were providing 80 percent of the service in the community. Something very similar to that. We were talking about potentially just using the user survey at those libraries.

We took a look at what we were trying to find out and thought that all of the libraries would benefit by knowing what their users are saying about them. We could then do some localizing value statements and things like that. It gets back to what Steve just said about what are we trying to do and how are we going to use the information when we get it. We have talked about not doing a survey of the entire community like that.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. I kind of
like the point of use survey idea. Depending on what point that is, you may be getting input from non-depository libraries and there may be times where you would want non-depository input because a lot of your products don't just impact us. They are out there for everybody.

Also, I think a phone call is something you might want to consider. Occasionally I don't want to type another response to something but if you called me, I would be happy to talk to you for five minutes.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Any more comments? All right.

David, the next one.

MR. CISMOWSKI: Council request notification if there is substantial slippage in announced deadlines for the planned Release 1 and Release 2 of FDsys and the sunsetting of GPO Access by December 2010. Council pledges to respond within two weeks with comments.
MR. PRIEBE: Ted Prieb, GPO. Bob Tapella and Ric Davis spoke a bit about the sunsetting of GPO Access so I won't continue beyond just reaffirming that targeted schedule at the end of December with FDsys being the system of record.

A couple of items of note, as well that continuity of access. Basically the search access capability or failover being enabled at the end of September was a great milestone for the system. What Release 1 is defined as in terms of having that content management system, full search enablement, and the preservation repository, all three of those core pillars of that system being enabled and ready to go at this point.

Everything is on schedule from what we've discussed in spring in Buffalo, what we went over. There will be an educational session tomorrow that takes place at 4:00 and that's an opportunity as well to learn a lot more about what will happen in this current fiscal year with FDsys.
Council, additional comments?

Anyone in the community?

MS. McKNELLY: I feel like I'm doing the perp walk up here. Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

Ted, when FDsys goes live now that you have the failover we going to stop getting these messages that FDsys is down at 5:00 on a Friday from maintenance? The failovers will be live with the system and that's all over with?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.


MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Ted, can you just -- this is probably just a reminder but when GPO Access switches over to FDsys for good and you have the new PURLZ, with a Z, server all of those PURLZ are going to automatically go over to FedSys and things are going to be cool. Right?
Absolutely in terms of the redirects. The PURLZ, nothing will change in those. They will be completely resolved under FDsys. With GovDoc and all that great technology behind the scenes it's all part of our planning that has been taking place over the past years as we get to that final finish line.

MR. JACOBS: I appreciate that.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. Just one clarification. The scheduling for Release 2 for FDsys is not taking place until the appropriations have been made. Is that the correct way to interpret that?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. Let me try to respond to that and if Selene is here if she wants to add in addition to this.

GPO has a release schedule set for fiscal year 2011. In terms of how that release capability is enabled, we're going to have PMO go over in a lot more detail tomorrow afternoon in terms of those quarterly
releases. The capability for those releases there's funding that has been earmarked for those purposes, I believe.

MS. DALECKY: Selene Dalecky, GPO. That is true. At this point we have been working on the schedule based upon the priorities work that we've been doing internally and with stakeholders. We know what the priorities are to achieve over the next year.

The funding is the question because with the continuing resolution I'm not sure the funding levels have been determined yet internally. We do have some carryover funds from the previous year that we will be able to continue working for a certain amount of time. That is still a question at this point.

MR. PRIEBE: Community? Any additional comments?

MS. BURKE: Okay. Next recommendation: Consult Council when major features of functionality is announced for
future releases of FDsys are deferred.

Council pledged to respond within two weeks
with comments.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Prieb, GPO. So
just to carry over what Selene had mentioned in
terms of the educational session, I think one
of those objectives is to talk through those
quarterly releases that have been planned for
this fiscal year. I think what council is
asking for is feedback.

Depending on what our final
budgetary appropriation is, if there are any
functions or features in those quarterly
releases that we have planned that cannot be
enabled due to funding constraints. With
that, I think that's a commitment GPO can
follow through on in terms of providing
updates pending our final budget which at this
point we don't have a time frame. We're under
a continuing resolution.

In addition to that we did provide
to council late this summer a feature set by
capability and a prioritization where we've
gotten opportunity to get some feedback from
council, some validation on what our initial
thoughts were in terms of next releases and
capabilities with FDsys.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff,
Valparaiso University Law Library. We did
give you that feedback so will that be taken
into account in setting those priorities or
what are you doing with -- will we come back
to you on that?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. We
did receive DLC's comments and in terms of the
capabilities for this coming fiscal year and
what's projected it has those into account.

MS. MORIEARTY: Further comments
from council? The community? All right. Our
next recommendation, please. Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah. As PMO review system
requirements and functionality for future
releases of FDsys stakeholders, including the
FDLP community, should be included.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO.
I've got just two bullets on this one. I've
got a lot of background from six, seven years ago when I was involved with digital conversion services and our pilot operation. What we've heard from the community, what we've heard from council is two themes.

One, converted content. We want to get this digitized content that is in a collaborative sense happening already within the community. We want the content when GPO gets the authority or approval from the JPC oversight to get in the system.

We want it in quickly and we want it in comprehensively. In terms of the spring meeting that we had in Buffalo, we had an educational session where we showed as a proof of concept the capability of ingesting converted content into FDsys.

As we get approval from our oversight to be more expansive in terms of that capability, we're ready to do it. We're waiting that go ahead, if you will, and the pilot partnership on the stats at large with Library of Congress is the first part of that
piece that we are awaiting information on to move forward.

Second part is harvested content and that's another part within our community that we've heard loud and clear. There is a concern of that at-risk material, the fugitive documents, if you will, getting not only under bibliographic control but getting it into the system so that it's not lost to the community and the public.

We do have within GPO a harvesting working group that is formed. We are putting together a draft vision document. We envision that vision document being shared with you, council, and getting some input from you and validation as well in terms of what we see as the harvesting strategic road map in terms of moving forward.

We currently have processes in place. Jill McClain's area in the acquisitions does have a vehicle for putting GPO on notice in the interim of any documents and capabilities there but when we look at
FDsys what are some core critical issues, converted content, harvested content. Those are the themes. We continue to work to strive toward our goal of getting an effective and automated process together that will enable that.

MS. MORIEARTY: Community?

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO. Something I want to add to that is that the library business unit as a stakeholder and also council have been working closely with the Program Management Office to talk about what additional feature sets are associated with FDsys releases and also discuss the prioritization of those given the funding contingencies.

I think that is something that after this council meeting we're in a position to share out more broadly for comment with the community as well since these discussions have been occurring with GPO and council at this point to make sure that we've got the priorities where they need to be for these
additional features and if there are any funding issues that we can prioritize correctly.

MS. MORIEARTY: Michele.

MS. McKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls. I'm interested in your harvesting working group. Are you harvesting content right now or are you just talking about harvesting?

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. What we are working on is the capability to have a more automated capability for FDsys to be able to harvest.

MS. McKNELLY: So you're not currently harvesting anything.

MR. PRIEBE: GPO has been harvesting. Ted Priebe, GPO. LSCM has been harvesting contents, fugitive documents when you or others in the community put us on notice of one. A cataloging record has created the ability to archive so that's been taking place now.

MS. McKNELLY: Okay. Let me try
to rephrase this. That's a manual harvest based on notification so you're working on an automatic harvest? Is that what that working group is working on, a crawl? Harvesting crawls that will be ingested or is it still preliminary for the crawls?

MS. MORIEARTY: Ted, I think -- Cindy, can you answer that? Do we have anyone from GPO?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. My mind was going in a different direction from what Michelle asked earlier so I just missed what she said.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebe, GPO. To respond to the first part of your question, yes, manual harvesting has been and will continue to take place. But in addition to that we do have some capabilities to do semi-automated harvesting as well so both of those activities are taking place now.

Part of what that strategic roadmap for harvesting is going to be able to reaffirm is capabilities and phases. Is full
automated X available in the first phase or is it the second phrase. We're going to be getting comments not only from counsel but from the community on that.

MS. McKNELLY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PRIEBE: We should be targeting getting a solution that meets everyone's needs but in terms of what's practical and what makes sense with technology.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Michelle, to your question, the 4:00 to 5:30 session today GPO is going to be talking about harvesting so you'll get all the information you need.

MR. HAYES: Hearing this likens me back to the days of bringing up a new system where suddenly, when Notre Dame brought up Ex Libris we had a user community of one, it was very easy to prioritize. When you suddenly had a user community of 50 how is this going to be done? I don't envy you your process here.
It would be interesting to see the methodology by which because the stakeholder community is so large; it's the libraries, it's the council, it's whoever else wants to comment, how GPO is going about picking out. You know, we're all equal stakeholders but some of us are more equal than others.

As well as balance again here is what the budget can hold and we can implement. It will be interesting to see from a council member point of view how that's going to go and then how is that communicated to the stakeholder community.

I remember those ballots. You all remember many of the ballots that says, "You can do this or this and you've got five votes out of 50 things. Get your library together to a degree on B5."

Then it goes in with the other 50 B5s to arrive at a list. As GPO becomes an information provider, the headaches multiply and it will be interesting to see how the stakeholder comments are truly waded through,
prioritized, etc.

MR. PRIEBE: Agreed. Ted Prieb, GPO. It's probably one of the most critical issues that we have to face and in terms of the requirements gathering and when we have the requirements how to prioritize them. I look forward to working with council, no question. We've got some good folks on our working group as well for that.

MS. MORIEARTY: Community, any further questions? Comments?

Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just wanted to respond to Michelle's question about the harvesting that we are doing and we're doing an awful lot of manual harvesting. The acquisition specialists each have their agencies that they are responsible for and they go through and do it manually.

We also have the lost docs, discovery docs that are reported to us. In addition we've been doing semi-automatic harvesting for a long time where we go back to
agency sites on timed frequencies to pick up serials, new editions of serials and that kind of thing.

As we're looking at automated harvesting, you'll recall we did the pilot project with EPA and we learned an awful lot from that. We are looking at what happened there, the results we got to put together better requirements for harvesting as we go forward.

MS. MORIEARTY: David, would you do the last recommendation and then we'll talk very briefly after you're done.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. GPO should work with council and the community to create additional exclusive benefits that will accrue to official FDLP depositories. Benefits will serve as incentives for both recruitment and retention of FDLP depositories.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Priebel, GPO. This is the point where I get to transition to my colleague, Kelly Siefert. In doing that it
seemed like it was a good time for a little calisthenics after the afternoon lunch. We have a handout that we really look forward to in the interest of the last 35, 40 minutes to get comments from you within the community on some of the questions we have.

For those of you that are in the audience that have not grabbed a copy of this, can we take a two-minute 30-second break. We've got copies in the back of the room and if you could take time and grab one of these.

I'm sorry they weren't in your conference packet but it would be a helpful piece to have. If we wait just for the next couple minutes, then I'll turn it over to Kelly on the response to the council recommendation and that will transition us into the second half of our session.

MS. MORIEARTY: And, council, you have a copy.

Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Two minutes is up by my clock which runs fast. We are going to get done and we
are not going to go over on our time. At the end if we finish on time we get cake.

All right. Kelly, if you would, please.

MS. SIEFERT: Kelly Siefert, GPO.

With this recommendation recognizing that creating additional exclusive benefits is going to take a good amount of time and specialized funding from Congress and also the research and data gathering aspect from the community, we wanted to divide the project into two phases so that we could give the community in the near-term a useful deliverable while we're working towards the long-term solution.

Our two-phase project approach.

Phase 1, develop a document aimed at library administrators that describe the benefits of the FDLP, the value that you get by being in the program. We actually created two documents as part of Phase 1. One is a top 10 list that you'll see at the top of your handout, a quick reference piece as a handout.
The second piece will be a more in-depth booklet that will take the benefits and flesh them all out, provide details and examples of each one. That will eventually be designed, as I said, into a booklet that can be a much more detailed piece. That would be the Phase 1.

Phase 2 is where we will work with council and the community to brainstorm and implement these new services for FDLP libraries. Then after that the documents from Phase 1 will continue to live on the Desktop and be updated as we add more exclusive benefits.

As for Phase 1 progress, what we did was we drafted these two documents and we worked with council to get their feedback and update a final draft for you. We posted that recently. I think this past week we sent out an announcement that we posted this draft on the FDLP Desktop. If you go to the homepage, you can click on benefits for FDLP libraries.

The document in PDF form is there,
just as the one you have in front of you, and
you can comment on any portion of the document
from the top 10 list, the benefits for all
libraries, the benefits for regionals, the
benefits for selectives, and the benefits to
the public. You can comment on any or all of
those sections.

Over the next several weeks we are
going to continue to gather that information
and produce a revised draft that we will then
again present to council and the community.
Once we finalize this draft we are going to
send it to GPO's creative services department
and they are going to do the design for the
booklet.

What will happen then is on the
Desktop you will be able to download the two
pieces, the top ten list and the booklet, and
you will also be able to order these pieces in
print form for your use.

Here we just have listed the top
ten benefits. You'll notice that within the
other sections in the document those benefits
are fleshed out with examples.

The free federal information products, free cataloging records, free permanent public access to content from partners, educational opportunities, collection development opportunities, consulting and networking opportunities, free marketing and promotional material, the opportunity to participate in pilot projects, ensuring that dedicated government information professionals remain on staff, and enhancement of the status and procedure of an institution designated as an FDLP member.

So, again, as you can see in your packet, the four sections of the more expensive booklet are benefits to all libraries, benefits to regionals, benefits to selectives, and the public.

Shall we proceed to the questions yet? Okay. The first question for DLC. What feedback can you provide on our proposed phased project approach?

MS. MORIEARTY: Council first.
MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. I think it's the perfect approach because this lets you line up exactly what you are already doing and that helps decide the best next step to take. Maybe where there are fewer and where there is room in the current benefits for more growth or easy ways to kind of grow some of these benefits it should be pretty straightforward so I think the approach makes a lot of sense.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Yeah, I think it's a great way to go and I'm really glad that this has come out. It's a good first step. I wonder if we should also be extending the conversation not just to what GPO can give in terms of benefits to the community but what the community can give for support or move forward amongst themselves so it's not just GPO and the community of FDLP libraries. It's FDLP libraries working together as well.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. I think this document is
excellent. When it was first suggested and sprang, my first thought was there are benefits?

What I like about it is the way it's phrased I can take this to my director, and will, give it to her, give it to all my assistant directors and say, "Right here look at these benefits. If you have forgotten what the depository library means, this outlines what we're receiving and without the status we lose."

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso University Law Library. One thing I would suggest before this is generally sent to library administrators would be to show this to a few possibly skeptical directors to look at because I see some things in here that I think a director that I know would probably -- maybe that I work for -- would look at some of this and say -- she's not against -- we're not dropping out of the program but just would say, "Yeah, but some of these you can get whether you're depository or not."
While they are good things, why would you have to be a depository to do these? I think those things maybe need to be eliminated from it even though it's painful to take some of them out. I mean, access to digital content through FDsys you don't just get that if you're a depository or access to authentic U.S. government information which you know is dear to my heart but that's not exclusive to a depository.

I just think that we say it in a way and you've got to be -- some suggesting that you might want to test it and see what comments you get from some possibly skeptical directors before you send it out to everybody.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. One way to deal with that might be to take the approach of supporting the continued development or providing input or direct access to the sort of mechanisms of, for example, making authenticated content available because we do get opportunities to provide feedback that
aren't made generally public so we work that way.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. Kind of dovetailing off of that comment, if you could maybe even at the top of the comment sheet have the benefits that are open to the entire public that specifically if you are a depository library here the value-added things that come along as an incentive more and more to give get people active in the program.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. I think the pretest is a good one, particularly if you can identify those skeptics that are very good that way. In the sector that I work in which is business, much of it is phraseology.

We can parse what Sally has said in that, yeah, there are still some tangibles that come out that are authenticated, etc., but it's the right phrasing because you're going to have certain people that will read it one way and it will be.
The others, as I was reading through this, and I think it's an additional pass that you were -- you know, some of the examples may resonate more with the skeptics who are reading, "It's all digital and it's all free."

They keep forgetting that, no, there are some that are still coming intangible, etc., that are there. I think some of it is iterative but the pretest if we can find a couple that will read this critically might prove useful.

Then, again, I think it's going to be the additional work as well as your creative design. Is that the term you used? Much of it depends on that because perception is reality. If it looks like, "Ooh, wow."

Some of our director are going to take it as "Ooh, wow." Others of the directors don't care. "I've already made up my mind. Don't confuse me with the facts."

MS. SIEFERT: Any other comments from the community?
MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. For the top ten I would like to see something that is punchier that has more of a list of like "free publications" and then the explanation. You know, "free cataloging" and then the explanation. Something that is more 10 things and not 10 really long sentences. Something that's catchier.

MR. BASEFSKY: Stuart Basefsky, School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University. One thing that I think you might want to keep in mind is the audience that you're dealing with. The context that I would set up here is what benefits are accrued here that make the federal depository system a value center as opposed to a cost center. If you can organize it in that kind of context, I think you can sell it much better. What you have written there I think is fantastic. You just have to make them realize that the value outweighs any cost that might accrue.
MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, University of Washington Law Library. I really like that comment because my skeptical director would look at this and say, "What does it cost me?" because that's really what she's interested in. There's a lot of really good language in here but I think we would make that part as clear as possible.

MS. MCKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls. I want to echo what Sally said that there are many things in here that are available to everyone. I actually think it very much weakens the document. I want to go on to say that there is no value that is not tied to the mission of your institution.

We are not playing to mission-based what libraries are about. This is a laundry list. Not every institution has the same mission but there are common themes through types of libraries, through public libraries, through many academic libraries. I think it would afford you to
tailor this message back to those types of
groups because there are very specialized
things that each of those institutions tend to
look for in general, not specifically.

If I took this to my library
director, who is a great supporter of the
program, I would get a big "So what?" because
there is nothing here that ties back to a
mission of serving our population. It's just
a laundry list.

MR. SCHONFELD: Roger Schonfeld, Ithaka. Just a suggestion and in some ways
echoing some of the previous comments. There
doesn't seem to be very much in here about
sort of meeting user needs sort of from the
perspective of the user, the population that
the libraries are trying to presumably serve.
That might be another angle that could be
helpful.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, Gallagher Law Library, University of
Washington. I think that in some ways putting
together the last two comments, that's our
responsibility to talk to our directors about our population, our user population, not to just hand this to them as a laundry list but to use it as a basis for a sustained and thoughtful discussion with them.

MR. PRIEBE: So I think in the interest of time, Ted Prieb, GPO, we've got four questions and 20 minutes so if we can average about five minutes per question there will be no cake exodus before the session ends.

MS. SIEFERT: Okay. On number 2 we kind of touched on this with some of the comments for the first question. What feedback can you provide on the specific benefits that are detailed in the draft? Council.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. One piece of feedback that I would give is that many library directors are familiar with many different technical terminology. For the final document I would suggest that technological and
government-specific terminology. Just make sure everything is explained and clear and in non-librarian English.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. One of the benefits of the program is its diversity. One of the drawbacks of the program is its diversity. As pointed out, what will resonate with a particular leadership of a particular type of library will all vary.

I think that's going to be the toughest challenge that has to be in there in terms of -- so, you know, if we're creating one document what do we put in there that resonates with -- something in there resonates with whoever. If you've got that answer, I'm impressed. I think it's going to be the iterative.

Much of what you get in there is not detailed enough, you know. It doesn't speak the way a director would review things. I mean, if we're reading this as a depository librarian, yeah. As to the public I'm not
sure. One of the target audiences to convince of the benefit is the public.

It is the leadership of the library which is serving the public because, believe me, at Notre Dame as the public goes marching in going, "Oh, we really want more services out of you from that depository library," my former director would have listened to it but, "Thank you very much. You're down the list of users that I have to really make happy." The challenge will be what resonates, what top X number of things someone could read and go, "Yeah, that kind of does it for me."

MR. JACOBS: James Jacob, Stanford University. Maybe a question for Steve and for everybody. I wonder if it would be then more valuable to not have just one document but to have sort of a flow chart. "Are you a public library and have a document for it. Here are the benefits for a public library. Are you an academic library?"

It doesn't preclude us from
publishing a whole big document but we can also break it out so that if I'm an academic library I don't have to read through the whole document in order to get, "Oh, here's the benefits for me and my users." Just a comment and a question.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame again. Putting my librarian to the marketing department hat on, if I was back in my home this would be a wonderful project for a marketing class to take and go, "How do you reach your niche?" Defining the niche is exactly it. I mean, if you have the one who goes, "This is an opportunity for online," that does exactly what you're talking about is one. But then you have others that go. "Hand it to me it because that's what resonates with me." It's got to look good, dah, dah, dah, and all this other stuff. Again, I think it's a wonderful tool.

It's a real interesting opportunity from a marketing point of view as
an academic who has to try and do this all the
time. There is no simple answer. McDonald's
picks and chooses when and who they're going
to. After they've successfully captured that
market they move on to the next one.

Do we go after the top academics?

Do we go after the skeptics that are in here
to make sure they're not -- segment your
market. You're after the vocal skeptic that
has the audience. What resonates with them to
turn them the opposite way so they are no
longer a vocal skeptic, they are a vocal
supporter.

That's a niche. How do you get at
those? I mean, maybe Sally and others can
identify and I suspect those of us who are in
ARL can probably identify some less than
convinced leadership. Then it's getting at
them and reading their minds as to what is
going to flip it.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library
of Michigan. Piggybacking on what Steve is
saying, a theme I'm hearing repeatedly from
library administrations of all types is not so much -- I want to phrase this right. Yes, we can be part of this program but are we the only ones? Will somebody else do it?

That is something that we aren't quite successfully getting at in this. This is why do you want to be the one that does this as opposed to letting someone else. It's kind of the cheese stands alone here. We're seeing it happen increasingly throughout the community. If there is some way we can get at that, that might be a useful addition.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes again to give you a witticism we used to use at Notre Dame 20 years ago. "What's yours is ours and what's ours is ours. I mean, you know, I brought you all this stuff but I really want you to do it because I'm going to borrow it on an interlibrary loan and I'm going to call and use your services. I don't have to do that but I've got all the answers."

Again, what we're doing here is also why this amongst the other five that
bubble up that may be more, "Only I can do this or I have a sector that they are more important to keep happy and, therefore, I'll commit resources and make the choice. We'll do this but we don't do that."

MS. SIEFERT: Anything else from the community?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. I was on the committee that helped develop this. Early on we talked about developing more than one document for different library types, or perhaps for different types of institutions within the same library type.

The task was so daunting that we decided to try to craft something that was generic enough that could be applied to all library types but not so specific that it excluded any library type. I would like to go back to something that Peggy said a few minutes ago. The responsibility of depository coordinators and individual institutions to craft this, to message this in a way that
makes it specific to that institution.

There is nothing in this document that couldn't be cut and pasted into a smaller document that is specific for that assuming that the depository coordinators, which may be a false assumption, really want to save the programs that employ them. There may be some that don't.

I don't know but I have to believe that most to. When we talk about what the community can provide as well as GPO, maybe it's part of the community's responsibility to develop their own institution-specific list of benefits. It's not all on GPO.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I'm hearing a lot about local needs in this area and Michele specifically mentioned aligning to your institution's mission. All of that is very important so I want to remind you of the upcoming user survey because you're going to get a lot of this information back from them when your libraries get the reports. I want you to encourage your users to do the survey
and then you can find out what is of value to them that you are providing.

MS. SIEFERT: Okay. The third question. This one may be more of a homework type question once you've gotten a chance to really go through the current document in depth. Are there additional benefits that we've not captured already within the document.

MS. MORIEARTY: Council, any comments?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library again. These would be benefits that currently exist that we just didn't happen to think of, not benefits that could possibly exist sometime in the future.

MR. PRIEBE: Ted Prieb, GPO. So is your thinking that we do have that survey tool that's available as you reflect on this tonight, perhaps over dinner on some of the values that we've got. Use that after as well.

CHAIRPERSON SEARS: Suzanne Sears,
University of North Texas. Also on Wednesday in the closing session we will have some time so you'll have a couple of days to think about this and comment in the Wednesday session as well.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University. It's mentioned in here the prestige of being an FDLP library. I think more could be done to play up that prestige because I think documents still have a really bad reputation for being boring and hard to get through and down in the basement and nobody uses them.

I think you really need to talk up if GPO is the world's largest publisher, which I think I've heard a time or two, "Aggregated access to the publications from the world's largest publisher." Think of those hyperbole marketing kind of things that you would be using if you were a commercial publisher because I think the prestige could really be emphasized a little more because we still lack respect.
MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library. I think another thing that is missing, and I have to admit I haven't read through all of the really detailed pieces of it, but one of the incredible things that I can do in my library is talk about the unique information that is in these collections. I don't really see the value of legacy collections really in here. I know not all depositories want to have a legacy collection but when I think about how do I sell this to my director talking about how a particular user group that we think is very important to our library like genealogists how they benefit from this program is a really powerful argument with my director because he wants to keep the genealogists happy. I think that would be true in academic institutions, particular faculty that really benefit from the historical material.

Kind of take some of the rich subject matter in the collection and then skew
it with the user groups that either are
benefitting from it or could potentially
benefit more. I think that would be something
that would really resonate with directors as
well as then pass along to these user groups
that we are trying to identify.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. I think that ties in
really well with the benefit of ensuring
dedicated government information professionals
remaining on staff because some of these
legacy collections you may have a director who
says, "Oh, we can get this through some
vendor. Why would we need it through FDLP."

The answer is that you need
somebody there who can assist your users in
doing the research with these very expensive
and complicated collections and that's a
government information expert so that's a
really good point.

MR. BASEFSKY: Stuart Basefsky
again from Cornell University. One of the
things you might want to consider is how to be
very strategic in selling this. There are a couple of things. One, you're lacking examples in here so it would be a nice appendix to give specific examples on each of these points in some sort of appendix.

Maybe gear that to different kinds of libraries. You have to understand that public libraries, academic libraries, special libraries, they all have a herd mentality. If you can get them to herd, you've captured them.

If you had, for example, in the chronicle of higher education that Yale thinks this is a fantastic idea and you put it out why it's so fantastic, everybody else is going to fall in line because they don't want to fall behind Yale or Harvard.

If you take the New York Public Library or some of the other major public libraries throughout the United States, Seattle, so on and so forth, and they jump in, all the public libraries feel they have to. I think you have to be very strategic in how
you sell this. You shouldn't focus on everyone but you should focus on the people who have political power.

MS. TUBBS: Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library. I would like to see in the future as we develop this and as each library takes these set of guidelines and develops them and comes up with incentives for their own institution, if we could post sample documents to our community site so that other libraries can take that information and mold it to their needs and give specific examples from their institution, I think that could be really helpful moving forward.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Also I think maybe a comment about somehow in this time, somebody mentioned Seattle Public, many of the public libraries are having all kinds of cuts and furloughs. We've got to make sure that our program doesn't look like something you could save money by cutting.

To the contrary. This would be the last time. There have been some ads of
late I've seen in magazines to the fact that people thought the internet was going to kill magazines or newspapers but, in fact, it's upped the subscription which I hope that's true.

I don't know. I like both of them. Sort of a reverse swing on something that you might think that if you're library budget, especially public libraries, but academic, too, is in trouble and you can save money by not being a depository.

I mean, you don't want to say it just that way but this is saving you money and this is even more important now in economic hard times to be able to help your user.

Government information is really important in every kind of library. Yeah, they could get it themselves on their computer but they don't have a computer and they don't know how to use it when they get on the site. They can't find the stuff so they need us.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. Building onto what Sally
was saying, it reminds me of the document that everybody has seen, "Myth...reality." Sort of what's the myth. All government information is free and online.

In reality, you know, there are a lot of dedicated professionals in GPO and in libraries who work really hard day in and day out to make that content available. Maybe having another document like that would be of interest getting at a specific niche.

MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn State. Just a comment about the audience again, who this document is for. This is for directors. I get all kinds of really slick ads about products, that atona marketing has gone into why this product is the next best thing since sliced bread.

Let's face it, GPO is a product. It is a product. My director is not going to read that. If my director is who you are targeting, then maybe what you need to do is answer the questions that they have. Answer the questions that the skeptics have. Ask,
you know. I would much rather see a document that says, "Answers to the top ten questions of a skeptic," or something like that.

You're answering something that they're asking. You're not telling them something that they don't want to know because they're not going to spend time looking at a slick marketing thing. They don't have time to look at that.

On another note, get some of the directors to provide you testimonies of why they think it's good. Get them to talk to their colleagues. It's going to be much better for my director to know who out there that she is rubbing shoulders with is saying this is beneficial for me.

They are going to talk to each other. They are not going to -- that could be much more effective to get testimony and I think that was sort of iterated in a previous comment. My two cents.

MS. MORIEARTY: We've only got a few more minutes but I would like to move on
to question 4. As Suzanne said, on our wrap-up session there will be time for you to make comments. Also, you'll be getting very shortly right after question 4 the URL for these questions.

Also, at any time you can write any responses or suggestions. Get them to any council member. We'll get them to GPO. There is a ton of GPO here. Who's working back at the shop? Get it to them. There's multiple ways for you to get your response out.

Question 4, please.

MS. SIEFERT: Other than the library directors and administrators that we attempted to aim this at are there other audiences to which we should be aiming this message?


MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame. The power on campus is the faculty. It would be interesting. I'm looking at Dan because he knows who motivates him and the
undergrad has a certain level of motivation, but a Ph.D. faculty member who is going to be with us for 30 years we'll listen to that one instead of the four year type of thing.

There are a lot of audiences. I keep thinking that, you know, someone mentioned that this can't all be GPO because suddenly GPO is not used to working in an academic environment and the politics of an academic environment.

I think how do we get the tools up that, indeed, as I think someone pointed out in the audience, the depository librarian who is there, you know, you've got two things. You've got a stealth methodology whereby I mobilize certain faculty to get the message to my leadership.

How do we enable them to do --

David is correct. This is general and should be informational for all but how do we craft it. Again, I have to speak as the business librarian. Marketing people don't craft it to all.
They pick out and pick their battles and that sort of thing. I still have to go back to I'm not sure how GPO is going to do this other than develop some tools that do allow us to readily craft and put into a nice visual way of getting a message out.

MS. MORIEARTY: The community, any comments? I just knew.

MS. McKNELLY: Michelle McKnelly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls. I think the GPO would be very well served to aim this message at school libraries around the country that there is this opportunity to partner. There is a network of libraries here that can help them. We think we've got it bad. School libraries are under attack in a way that we can't even imagine.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah. Could you show question 5? I do want people to start thinking about that before we wrap up.

MS. SIEFERT: It's also more of a homework question to ponder. For the next
phase of this project do you have suggestions
for new benefits, new services that would
increase the benefits of FDLP. Those can also
be submitted through the form on the Desktop
as well.

Ted brought that up. As I
mentioned before, if you just go to FDLP.gov
right now it's very prominent on the main
page. You just click on benefits for FDLP
libraries from the main page.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah. Any final questions or
comments from council? GPO? I'll get to the
community. Just hold on. GPO?

MR. PRIEBE: No. Thank you all
for attendance is all I have to say.

MS. MORIEARTY: Okay. Community.

PARTICIPANT: One last thing. For
many years I was a government documents
librarian. I haven't been one for 17 years
now but long ago the idea was to get this
stuff into the text books for schools. If
you're tied to the educational system, you're
in. If you're not in the educational system, your value is questioned.

MS. HARTMAN: Cathy Hartman, University of North Texas. I think overall what we should be reaching for is for it to once again be a privilege to be a federal depository library. I think we've gotten away from that.

We gather too much to people who are thinking they want to drop out. Let them drop out. Let it be the people who want to be there who think it's a privilege to be a depository library. That should always be our message that it is a privilege to be a depository library and serve the public.


(Whereupon, at 3:33 p.m. off the record until 4:07 p.m.)

MS. LASTER: Okay. I think we're about ready to get started. My name is Shari Laster. I'm at the University of Akron. The
other members of the team working on this particular session are Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University and James Jacobs from Stanford who is, in fact, not Ric Davis so don't be confused by the signs, everybody.

This session is about born-digital at-risk materials. We have, it looks like -- we have basically three topics that our speakers will address. First will be Cathy Hartman who is Associate Dean of Libraries at the University of North Texas Libraries and she'll be talking about their end-of-term harvest crawl.

Following that we will have speakers from GPO discussing GPO's harvesting activities. Who is speaking from GPO? James, is that you? James Mauldin from GPO will be speaking about GPO's harvesting activities. Then finally James Jacobs of Stanford University will be discussing the LOCKSS USDocs project.

We would ask that in the interest of efficient use of time please take note of
all your questions and we will have a generous question/answer period at the end of the session. We also in the packet have included some slides which list a number of questions. These are what our team is thinking of as learning questions specifically for council so that we understand how to take this information and apply it practically so at the end of the session we might review some of those questions if they weren't all the way covered in the presentations.

With that, let me turn this over to Cathy Hartman.

MS. HARTMAN: Thanks everybody. I like to stand up when I'm talking. I think people can see you better and maybe hear you better. I'm Cathy Hartman, University of North Texas.

Actually I'm going to be talking today about an IMLS-funded research project that we are working on called Classification of the End of Term Archive - Extending Collection Development Practices to Web
As I said, this is IMLS-funded. It's a two-year project. It started almost a year ago so we are almost halfway through the project. We have one funded partner. Our one funded partner is the Internet Archive who has huge web archiving experience. They've been a great part of the team to talk with us about different kinds of tools and analysis that we are looking at building and using and expanding tools that they've created.

We have an advisory board for the project that are basically institutions from our end-of-term crawl project which we'll talk a little bit about shortly. Basically Chris Carpenter from the Internet Archive, Tracy Seneca and Eric Hetzner from the California Digital Library, and Abby Grotke and Gina Jones from the Library of Congress. They've been a huge help in advising us throughout this project.

Also I want to introduce to you our subject matter experts. These are 10
people in alphabetical order -- sorry, Geoff. You always end up at the end in alphabetical order -- who have been a huge help to us already. We met with them again all day yesterday and they are leaving with assignments.

We'll talk a little bit about what their assignments are later. If you're here, I'm just going to briefly read through the names. If you could stand up briefly so everyone recognizes you. These are people that you can always ask about the project if you would like.

George Barnum, Laurie Hall, and Robin Haun-Mohamed who are from GPO. I see Robin and Laurie. I don't know that George is here today. Kevin McClure. Kevin is from the Chicago college of law. Michelle McKnelly from University of Wisconsin-River Falls. John Phillips, Oklahoma State.

In the back, Mary Prophet from Enison. Mary? And Suzanne Sears from University of North Texas. John Stevenson
from U of Delaware. Then Geoffrey Swindells from Northwestern.

Any of you who have been around docs for a while know that these folks have lived and breathed government information for many, many years and we couldn't have selected a better group of people to help us with this project.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit about our objectives for the project, why we decided to do this project in this way. What we could see was that librarians needed some way of continuing their collection practices in depository libraries so our objective was to, or is to classify materials in accordance with the SuDoc classification numbering system so that librarians can utilize that classification to continue their existing selection practices.

How do you when you do collection development now as opposed to what you did 15 years ago when you selected from the SuDoc list, or basically the Adam list which we can
match pretty easily to the SuDoc list, how can you continue to collect in the areas that you had always been collecting to meet the needs of your community.

Our second objective had to do with metric for web archives. We can say we have 16-terabyte web archive. Well, what does that mean? It means generally nothing to anyone so how can we quantify it to enable showing its value, showing the scope of that collection, and something about the quality of it so what kind of metrics might we be able to use?

The background information on this is it's an outgrowth of the project that we did with a group of other libraries listed here and GPO. These were members of the International Internet Preservation Consortium that were U.S. members. At that time the only U.S. members of the IIPC.

We were meeting in Canberra, Australia in May and we decided we would do an end-of-term crawl. If you remember the
National Archives that year had made an announcement that they would not be doing this.

They had policies in place to collect what they felt like would be the documents they wanted to collect. This group decided that we would do it, the Library of Congress, Internet Archive, the University of North Texas with the California Digital Library with GPO sitting in on many of our calls.

We wanted to harvest the entirety of the U.S. government web presence, the .govs but also the .mils, the .coms, the .edus. You’ll see it goes on and on, all URL government websites. We wanted to harvest them before the election in 2008, after the election, and then after the inauguration in 2009 to reflect something about how the web presence changes of the U.S. government when we have a change in administrations.

We used a nomination tool. We were doing this really rapidly, as you can
imagine, deciding in May. We knew we had to start harvesting in the summer so we quickly build a tool to allow people to nominate URLs for harvesting, but we also pulled in lists from UNI, from the California Digital Library, from the Library of Congress and various others who had lists that we could batch ingest into the nomination tool.

We had about 30 librarians or government information specialists who also came in and did some nomination for us. We are planning this again for 2012 and we do hope that we have time to get more of you involved in that process. Then the Internet Archive UNT and the California Digital Library did the harvesting.

The Internet Archive did broad-based harvesting of every seed URL. UNIT did selective harvesting hopefully in more depth trying to be sure that we picked up more information and so did the California Digital Library. They ended up doing a broader harvesting than we did.
We then consolidated all of that information at the Library of Congress which took some effort to move that much information. We moved it over Internet 2. We used the bag it specification to package it up and we would then make it available for the Library of Congress to come and get it and bring it over Internet 2 to their storage.

Then we turned around and grabbed it back from them for the folks that were not us. We got Internet Archive’s harvest and we got CDL’s harvest and brought it to the UNT storage. They did the same thing if they wanted it. We ended up with a 16-terabyte web archive based on this time frame.

We did some analysis. This gives you some statistical information about what was in that web archive, or what is in that web archive. You can see it’s predominately .gov but significant numbers of other kinds of material. There were a total of 160 million URLs in this.

I think the interesting thing is
also the subdomains. If .gov is the domain name, then the next level up would be the first subdomain. HHS would be a unique subdomain. There were 14,000 unique subdomains in the .gov which I think is quite interesting. You begin to understand some of the extent of a web archive like this.

This is also interesting when you look at mimetypes. A majority, a 105 million text/html mimetypes. That was the largest but look how many PDFs there are. Most often the PDFs would be an indicator that this is some kind of document, although we know a lot of them are html text documents as well but PDFs often are.

So 10 million. How do you catalog 10 million. Those of you who do cataloging how do you start cataloging 10 million documents? It becomes an overwhelming task. Yet, this is what our U.S. government is producing now.

So when we wrote our proposal for the grant, we had problem statements and
research questions that I want to briefly tell you what they were. Our problem statement was that the current discovery methods have major constraints when you are talking about a web archive.

I'm sure all of you have used the Wayback Machine. You have to know the URL and then you might have some choices about timeline but there is not at this time full text searching that is very effective of these very large web archives.

The problem is that it's difficult for librarians to identify and select materials in accordance with their collection development practices and how can you begin to do that in the web publishing environment.

Then our second problem statement was that common metrics for materials in web archives simply do not exist. This is something that is discussed almost every meeting of the IIIPC, International Internet Preservation Consortium.

Our directors, our funders, our
stakeholders have no idea what 16-terabytes means. That means nothing to them at all so how can we better count them. All of you do metrics for ARL, ACRL, the Department of Education and others who collect statistical measures.

Do any of them have any kind of measures for web archives at this point? The answer is no. How can you show the value to those organizations that collect this kind of information?

Our research questions are outlined here. Let me say that what we are going to do, you have a handout in this group of handouts that are clipped together that gives you the project’s website. That will also be on the last slide here. We have all the information about the project there and we'll put this presentation there as well.

How effective is the organization of large-scale unstructured web archives using a pre-defined classification system, namely the SuDoc classification numbering system as
evaluated by government information librarians.

What we are trying to do is to take this web archive and in automated ways visualize it and see if we can assign the SuDoc numbering system at the subdomain, that first subdomain, not the .gov but the HHS kind of level.

We can assign the SuDoc numbering system at that level in an automated way. Then that will be verified whether we've done it well or not by our subject matter experts. Their assignment as we leave here is to go in and begin to classify these websites.

Now, we're not asking them to do 10 million. We've pulled out a sample group. They will each be doing 200. Then each website will have two people doing it so we can compare.

If we have discrepancies between two of our subject matter experts, then we will have to figure out some way of deciding which one is right. Then we use that
information to compare to what we've done in automated ways to see how effectively we have classified this information in automated ways.

Then the second research question is what measurable units for the materials in web archives best support management acquisition decisions and libraries. We are working on this.

We are also very heavily involved. There is an international standards organization work group that's been appointed. The chair of it is a member of the IIPC as are we so we have been closely working with him to make sure the U.S. has input into that group.

That group currently does not have a U.S. member so we are trying to make sure that -- because we have different needs it took us 10 minutes sitting around a table with him to understand. The Europeans have very different needs than we do, as do the Australians, etc. If we're building an international standard, we want to have input from the U.S.
This graph reflects our project work areas. The items on your left were the items that happened before the research grant started. This was the collecting of the seed URLs and the harvest before the election, after the election, and then after the inauguration.

Then the center is our work area 1 where we are looking at the web archive during the structural analysis and trying to do the classification. Then the SuDoc URL mapping that our subject matter experts are doing and the comparison.

Then our work area 2 is shown to the right side with the identification of the acquisition's criteria which we did early on this year in our previous meeting with them in April. Then we are trying to figure out what those measurable units are for web archives and pose those possibilities so that we can do metrics for web archives.

Now, one of the fun things that we've had that our technology team is dealing
with is how can we visualize this information that will really help us. We've tried two or three different visualizations for the data that we have and how all of these sites interlink together.

I don't know how well that you can see this from the back of the room but this is in an interactive form on our website and I encourage you to come and look at it because you can tell so much more from the interactive form. You can play with it for about 10 minutes and do nothing but just sort of pull things out and watch them spring back together.

What this is showing you is the clustering of the sites. HHS is the big green, lime green kind of blob in the middle. I should say circle, shouldn't I, in the middle. Then the other colors that you see around it are some of the really strong linked groups with HHS. For example, one of them is NIH.gov.

The breadth of the lines indicates
the percentage of links that you're seeing

going back and forth. The one that's called
cms.gov has 100 percent links going between
HHS and that is because, as we discovered,
that is a server at HHS that they used to
serve up all of their images, some of their
scripts.

They only use it for the HHS site.

You begin to see those kinds of things. Also
really strong links amongst many of these
sites. This graphs everything that has at
least 1 percent of its links going to the
site.

When you use the interactive and
point at the lines it will tell you what the
percentage is. It will also tell you which
direction the links are going in. I encourage
you to go. We've learned a lot from this so
we can see this cluster around Health and
Human Services and know that they are probably
all going to be in that group of SuDoc
numbers.

Now, one of the things that we did
that we had not planned to do in our original work plan was a survey of government documents librarians because we had keyed off of one of the questions in the biennial report that said 37 percent of the Federal Depository Libraries would like to receive digital copies of government publications.

Yet, when we started talking to Depository Libraries we were certainly not seeing that number that really wanted to receive them so we didn't understand why we were seeing that in the biennial survey and yet we were not getting an indication of that high level of interest.

We are trying to build a service model for how we might provide government information to you to help you build your collections so this is important. We did a survey and this was not obviously required of Depository Libraries but we had 416, which is 33 percent response rate. When you do surveys and research that's a really good response rate.
What we found we still are working on the analysis because this only closed about a week ago. A couple of the early findings, I think, we wanted to share with you that's very interesting. If you look at the chart on the left, in the bottom left of that is very unlikely. Then at the other end of that graph is very extremely likely, so extremely unlikely to extremely likely to acquire materials.

You look at extremely unlikely and it goes down, down, down to only 4 percent that it's extremely likely that they will acquire government information. That scale is really interesting. Then if you look at the one on the right and see the percent likely to access the materials, the ones who want to access the materials, what you see is it goes in exactly the opposite direction.

We thought this was extremely revealing. Also, though, we are seeing what they're saying is they want that person or that group, that organization, to be a very
trusted organization that they would like to link to. It has to be someone they trust to keep the information available. That's going to be, I think, a key factor as we look at analyzing all the data.

So I wanted to introduce the project team very quickly. Kathleen Murray, are you here? Kathleen. See Kathleen in the back with her hand up. Kathleen Murray is our Senior Research Fellow and our project manager. She is a great person to communicate with about the details of the project.

Then Mark Phillips who is in the center back is our technical lead and our Assistant Dean for Digital Library Services at the University of North Texas. People that are not here, Lauren Ko is our web archiving programmer who works on this full time with Mark.

We have two graduate research assistants that are funded by the project of Cathy Benton who is a graduate student in library information science. Bharath Dandala
who is a computer science graduate student.

Our project website is here. We post everything there. We don't post the data that connects anyone to any individual but everything that we can post we post there. We hope that you'll send us your feedback and your questions.

MS. LASTER: Thank you very much, Cathy.

Next up is James Mauldin from GPO to talk about GPO's harvesting practices and procedures and everything else that goes along with that.

MR. MAULDIN: Good afternoon, all. My name is James Mauldin from GPO. Can everyone hear me out there? Quick overview of GPO's harvesting over the past decade. The title of this one is FDLP and Web Harvesting - Permanent Access to Online Federal Resources.

Web harvesting defined. GPO defined web harvesting as using a crawler to scrape a website to capture electronic resources. We use multiple web crawlers and
GPO's use of web harvesting. One of the most important notes that we do, we do nonevasive harvesting meaning that we try to cause no conflicts to the agency's site by crashing their website by sending numerous bots and traffic through its websites.

What is GPO doing now? We harvest at the piece level where, for example, on Cathy's presentation it talked about what they're doing at North Texas. We actually go at individual titles and do piece-level harvesting.

We use semi-automated and manual harvesting tools as well as some automated tools such as scheduling for serials where we have our bot scheduled to go at websites routinely on different frequencies such as daily, weekly, monthly, and annually.

We also archive the harvested content using redundant storage. We have a primary server at GPO and then we have a COOP instance of all that data at our COOP site which is offsite and geographically separated.
from the main building.

We provide access to the web harvesting content through our catalog of government publication and it's available through searches that are indexed through the server such as our permanent electronic collection is also indexed by Google and bots can actually search it. The CGP is not the only mechanism to identify our harvested content.

We also assign PURLZ for almost all of our web-harvested materials. We actually harvest based on the assignment of our PURLZ so we have a one-to-one correlation. If we have one PURL we have one archived document.

Some of the challenges that we face in web harvesting. Publication versus web pages. Mr. Priebe had mentioned earlier about our EPA pilot project where we did some harvesting. One of the things we identified is that identifying what constitutes a publication can be extremely challenging for
software so you are not going to get a tool that can go out there and identify what makes up a publication on the web.

Also, PURL resource exceptions.

GPO does not harvest databases, publications that are currently on FDsys because they are already part of our storage architecture.

Things that are multi-media formats that are very difficult or very large. We do some flash drive, some video, some movie files but it depends on the format. Metadata needs.

Graphic requirements and applications within publications. Those can be problematic as well.

GPO's path forward: We want to continue to investigate and review web harvesting best practices. We would like to identify and test for automated harvest and ingest into our FDsys.

We also would like to increase partnership activity with agencies for access to born-digital publications. We are aware that we can't harvest everything and we are
looking to work collaboratively with our agencies that are posting these files.

That concludes the brief overview.

Are we going to take questions or are we saving them for the end?

MS. LASTER: We're saving them for the end. Okay. Thank you very much, James.

That is a reminder to save your questions for the end.

(Applause)

MS. LASTER: James, don't go -- other James. Don't go too far because you'll be taking questions.

Now for another James.

MR. JACOBS: Can everybody hear me? I think I might use that mic as well. It will just take me a second to switch this over.

Well, everyone has their slides in their packet. Correct? We're going to go low-fi for this.

Hi everyone. Oh, see. Now it's going to move. I think it's because it's on
a movie and I don't know how to turn the movie
off. See if you can figure it out.

I'm going to talk about the LOCKSS
USDocs. The first thing I want to do is I do
have an agenda. Everyone has an agenda,
right? I'm going to talk a little bit about
library principles and best practices and then
talk for a minute or so about what is lockss
and then talk about the LOCKSS USDocs project
specifically. Then loop back around and make
it a reflection of the LOCKSS USDocs project
based on those library principles that I'll
talk about in a second.

I'm going to put up my slides on
slideshare.net/freegovinfo. Is that it?
That's the agenda but how do you move it
forward? Oh, cool. Is that moving without
you -- oh, okay. How do you move it back.
Okay. Just leave it there and I'll catch up
to that.

So the principles. I gave a
similar talk about LOCKSS USDocs two weeks ago
at the best practices exchange in Arizona, hot
and steamy Arizona. I've tweaked some things for this talk but I realize that some of the same issues and ideas that I wanted to highlight at best practices exchange hold sway in a crowd like this of depository librarians.

Library practices don't just deal with purely technical aspects. Because of the nature and the history of libraries and archives as memory organizations we also must deal with the social aspects and impacts of and on our practices.

The social aspects of libraries are our fundamental baseline, our raison d'être. In thinking about what I wanted to say to this group about the LOCKSS USDocs project about born-digital government documents, I kept coming back to these fundamental principles of libraries because those principles are at the end of the day the criteria for judging whether or not our practices and our projects are, indeed, "best practices" or solid projects.

For me running through this check
list helps me to evaluate my work on a specific project or my daily work as I go about drinking coffee and doing things like that.

For instance, if I'm evaluating a project that seems to be valuable but I find that it uses proprietary software or the control of the content for the project is not in the hands of the library or the goal of the project seems to be profit over the public interest, then this leads me to have questions about that project.

As a reminder I would first like to enumerate some of the library principles that I use as a checklist. Then if you have others, please let me know and I would love to add more.

So the principles that I use and the question that I put to myself is does the project forward democratic ideals; does the project serve the public interest, public access, public control, public preservation; does the project serve the information needs
of the community; does the project forward the long-term institutional viability of libraries in general; and does the project promote and leverage collective action.

Keep these principles in mind as I spend the next few minutes talking about LOCKSS and LOCKSS USDocs. Then you can let me know how close I got to my ideal. Is it going to work? Woo-hoo, it does work.

So most of you know by now, hopefully you have a vague idea about LOCKSS. Lots of copies keep stuff safe. LOCKSS began at Stanford in 1999. The software itself was built to solve the problem of long-term preservation of digital content.

It's an open source distributed digital preservation system based on open standards like OAIS, OpenURL, HTTP, the Web ARCHive file format, the file format that the Internet Archive uses, that the End-of-Term Project uses, and a lot of these harvesting projects use.

Originally LOCKSS was focused on
journal literature and today CLOCKSS is going strong with 81 libraries and 30 journal publishers participating. Over the last 10 years LOCKSS has also been used by other projects focusing on things like government publications and archives, government records, theses and dissertations, numeric data and those kinds of things.

The goals of LOCKSS is to spread the economic cost and the responsibility of digital preservation across a peer-to-peer network and keep the costs low by using off-the-shelf hardware and Linux software, open-source software so that libraries and content publishers can easily and affordably create, preserve, and archive local electronic collections and readers can access archived and newly published content transparently at the original URLs.

If you think about it, a LOCKSS box is what we call the baseline, I guess. A LOCKSS Box is like a digital distributed bookshelf.
I don't know if you can see that slide very well but this is just a couple of examples of projects that are using LOCKSS currently. There's things like PeDALS, the Persistent Digital Archives and Libraries, Data-PASS, the data preservation alliance for the social sciences, the MetaArchive cooperative, the Network Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations and, of course, LOCKSS and CLOCKSS.

I would be remiss if I didn't talk about funding. Funding is always an issue and sustainable funding even more so in this time of economic uncertainty. This is an issue that I really think that LOCKSS is particularly good at. LOCKSS is primarily funded by the libraries that participate in the LOCKSS alliance.

It's also received major funding and in-kind support from several other organizations like the Mellon Foundation and the National Science Foundation, Sun Microsystems, HP Labs, and several computer
As we all know, a web is stronger and more viable than a silo and this is where LOCKSS really shines. If one note of the peer-to-peer network goes dark, the content is still preserved kind of like the FDLP. About that more in a minute.

So now we get to the nuts and bolts of LOCKSS. How does LOCKSS work. There are basically two parts to the LOCKSS system. The first part is harvest and content collection and the second part is content checking and replication. This is a sample LOCKSS permission statement. This happens to be coming from the FDSys both data repository for the Federal Register.

Once a site puts up this permission then LOCKSS go ahead and harvests it, sends out its minions, its harvester which is the Heritrix harvester built by the Internet Archive and several others and used by the End-of-Term Project, the California Digital Library's web harvesting service, and
other projects. Heritrix is really the state of the art in web harvesting.

This is really sort of the special sauce of LOCKSS software. LOCKSS goes through the process of checking and polling all of the digital content in the LOCKSS boxes on the network.

If one box has content that's different from all of the other boxes, the software fixes the content assuring that all of the content in the whole network is exactly the same. It is for all intents and purposes injecting stem cells into the network to replicate and fix content that becomes corrupted over time.

That's really it. That's why LOCKSS, I think, is eloquent in its simplicity and it's proven effective over the long term in keeping digital content safely preserved over time. In the digital world this is as close to the Unix maxim of doing one thing and doing it well.

So now onto LOCKSS USDocs. You
can see why describing how the software works that we're really excited about using LOCKSS for documents. We felt that LOCKSS and LOCKSS USDocs replicates key aspects of the FDLP in the digital environment, a network of libraries supporting access to and long-term preservation of government documents.

It makes reality, or starts to work toward the reality of the concept of digital deposit which we've written about on freegovinfo and think that is an essential component of the digital FDLP.

In the paper environment, as we know, the de-centralized FDLP is a tamper evident system so when someone tried to alter or withdraw a paper document from the system for whatever reasons, we librarians in this room and around the country were alerted and could react to the recall request in a public and open manner.

Using the LOCKSS software we are really re-implementing this tamper-evident preservation system for digital documents.
Rather than a central silo on a .gov server
digital government documents now resides on 20
servers at 20 different libraries and
counting. I hope they're counting. More on
that soon.

So currently LOCKSS USDocs is
preserving two large swaths of content. The
first chunk that we started with was the GPO
Access content from 1991 to 2007 that was
harvested by Carl Malamud at
public.resource.org with the help of GPO.

They worked together for him to
harvest all that content out and host it on
public.resource.org so then Carl just put up
a permission statement and we sucked it all
into the network.

We just started with FDsys
collections and we are currently harvesting
all of the collections that are now on FDsys
with the help of GPO who, again, put up a
permission statement in all the FDsys
collections at the collection level in the
site map on the bulk repository. We then had
the permission to harvest.

You're all familiar with GPO Access and with FedSys. We're talking about collections like the Federal Register, Code of Federal Regulations, the Congressional Record, Congressional bills, Congressional reports, statutes at large, public papers of the Presidents, GAO reports, U.S. budget, and lots more. We do have future plans as well.

We currently have 20 libraries participating in the project as well as five of those libraries are regionals, I'm happy to announce, including University of Alabama, University of Kentucky, University of North Carolina, University of Virginia, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

We're looking for more libraries, especially regionals, but we would love to have libraries of different types, different sizes, law, special public, academic libraries. All are welcome.

We've started talking about --

Vicki Reich is the head of the LOCKSS project
and we’ve talked about the idea of allowing non-LOCKSS alliance members to participate in this project because we really feel that USDocs is incredibly important and we shouldn’t just have it be LOCKSS alliance members. Even if you’re not a LOCKSS alliance member, please come and see me or email me and we can talk about how you can participate, too.

So going back to the principles, I’ll just wrap up real quick, I think we can answer in the affirmative the principles that I outlined at first. Does LOCKSS USDocs forward democratic ideals? Does it serve the public interest or public access, public control, and public preservation?

Does it serve the information needs of the community? Does it forward the long-term institutional viability of libraries? Does it promote and leverage collective action? I think we can answer all of those in the affirmative.

What’s next? So we are looking
for more participants. The more the merrier.

The more nodes on the network, the stronger
the whole network is which is sort of the idea
behind the FDLP. We're looking to expand
collections now that we've got FDsys and we've
got GPO access. We're looking at things like
the essential titles list.

Currently I think about 15 or so
collections on FDsys are listed on the
essential titles list and we would like to
target either those agencies or get those
agencies to move those essential titles into
FedSys so that we could easily harvest.

These are titles like -- we all
know what the essential titles are;
agricultural statistics, county/city data
book, foreign relations of the United States,
occupational outlook handbook, stat abs, etc.

We're also going to start
harvesting CRS reports. There are several
repositories of CRS reports around the web
including the University of North Texas, Open
CRS, several State Department websites and
other non-.gov sites.
I did a project with Archive-It to
harvest all of those sites up and so the
Internet Archive plays well with LOCKSS and
we're going to start harvesting those CRS
reports. We're looking also for collections
both on and off of .gov servers.

In conclusion, Abby Smith Rumsey
in the executive summary of the 2010 Blue
Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital
Preservation and Access -- that's the longest
title of a working group ever I think -- but
Abby wrote that, "Access to valuable digital
materials tomorrow depends upon preservation
actions taken today. Over time access depends
on ongoing and efficient allocation of
resources to preservation."

I really think that LOCKSS USDocs
is taking that efficient action today to
assure long-term preservation of our nation's
heritage. I hope that many of you will join
us in this critical work. Thank you.

(Applause)
MS. LASTER: Okay. Thank you very much, James.

So the next portion of this session will be questions and answers. The way we are going to do this is we'll take questions from council and then questions from the community. If we absolutely run out of questions, we have slides with questions on them. I will turn it over to Justin Otto to moderate the next 30 minutes.

MR. OTTO: Hi. I'm Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University. Quick thing for everybody on the council. I think everybody has heard by now it's like really cold up here. For those of you who have laptops you may not realize that the heat sync on the bottom of your laptop makes an excellent hand warmer. I'm not kidding. It's good.

I would like to start off with a question for Mr. Mauldin. A few years ago I remember, and please correct me if I get some of the specifics wrong, but a few years ago
there was a harvesting pilot project of EPA materials.

MR. MAULDIN: Correct.

MR. OTTO: And there were two different vendors with two different methods for harvesting. For the current harvesting that GPO is doing, are either of those vendor's products in use or part of what they developed?

MR. MAULDIN: No. The EPA harvest was done by two vendors who were actually looking to do an automated harvest which identified or could scope what a publication was.

The scope of the harvesting that is currently being done by GPO is actually identified through our content acquisitions and our control where we actually identify it as a true publication by human intervention where the EPA harvest was actually trying to identify a bot, to have a bot do those same things that a human would do.

MR. OTTO: Thank you.
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MS. LASTER: James, I have another
questions for you and this one came to us from
the blog. What is the current status of
agency materials being ingested into FDsys?
Specifically those from the agency websites.
What is the current status of that? Oh,
sorry. Shari Laster, University of Akron.

MR. MAULDIN: James Mauldin, GPO.
Currently FDsys is not ingesting harvested
content. That is scheduled for later release.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski,
California State Library. A few questions for
Cathy. You harvested the agency websites
before the election, right after the election,
and then after the inauguration. Did you find
that there was a lot of difference between
what you got after the election and after the
inauguration? What do you attribute that
difference to?

MS. HARTMAN: Well, that is an
exercise we're leaving to the historians and
the political scientists. With the quantity
of materials that we have, that is not
something that we can actually look at and do but we thought it would be something that may at one point be of extreme interest to us as a group. Of course to our libraries but to historians as well and political scientists.

But, no, that is not part of our research project. Our goal is to make the material available to docs librarians to collect it in ways that meet their needs as they collect for their communities for their research project. The Web ARCHive is sitting there if anyone wants to look at it. If anyone wants to take that 16-terabytes to use in other ways, we are really happy to share it with anyone.

Yes, Kate.

MS. ZWAARD: Hi. This is Kate Zwaard from GPO. I just wanted to add a little bit to what James said about harvested material. When we talk about harvesting in FDsys right now, we are actually talking about a complex set of challenges. Right now FDsys can accept any type of content. If you want
to submit harvested or converted or deposited content as a package, you can do that.

When you talk about enabling harvesting capabilities in FDsys it's more than just submission. It's discovery. It's automated scope determination. It's packaging. It's complex file types. Right now if we have PDFs that's simple, but if we're talking about a like interactive map, those require special types of requirements.

For harvested documents we are technically able to accept that but the working group that James mentioned, that's part of the activity to develop a road map, look at those challenges, and come up with ways of solving them and a timeline for that.

MS. HARTMAN: A follow-up to David's question. I just wanted to say any of the project team from UNT or any of the subject matter experts who would like to comment on David's question, I hope that all of that group out in the audience will help me as we address questions about this project.
It looks like Mark wants to say something.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mark Phillips, University of North Texas. One of the things that we noticed immediately, and this seems really obvious, but so whenever you have a new president literally the moment he put his hand on the Bible and finished they switched over WhiteHouse.gov. It was gone.

Now, there were certain considerations that NARA had made to allow people access to that content but, you know, depending on the agency and depending on how public it is and how much change is actually brought on by an administration change, it could be very quick that these changes completely overhauled the website.

It's not so much that the information is not there. It's just not in the same place that it was. We saw that wholesale with the WhiteHouse.gov. Then you also saw some really interesting things this last election that had changed .gov that came
online just days after -- actually hours after Obama was elected. That lasted until about two weeks after the inauguration and they said, "Oh, by the way, we have this other site called WhiteHouse.gov now. Just go there."

That whole site went away and so there are a lot of instances like that where when you have an administration starting to use technology in a new way and using it to try to reach a different population, or the same population in a different way, we're starting to see things churn much quicker.

By being able to capture those and the three, hopefully at some point we can go back and look at those. Those are just two solid examples we had of the change that happened really quickly this time.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Just to follow-up on that, I guess what I'm asking really is what is your perception of or your prediction was as a group between the content immediately after the election and immediately after the
inauguration before the hand is placed on the Bible. Did you anticipate that there was
going to be after the election, like the day
after the election, that things were going to
start to change at that point?

MR. PHILLIPS: I don't think --

well, so the last time we had a big change
like this was the switch from Clinton to Bush
and that was completely different technology-
wise, completely different the way that we
really looked at reaching the public with the
web. Bush to Bush wasn't too much change.

I think we were actually pretty
surprised with how much stuff did start to
change between the actual election and then
the inauguration. Whether it's meaningful
change, whether it's change that kept people
from getting to content we don't know.

Another really small story that
was interesting. When change.gov came online
it had Obama's roadmap for the White House and
it was pages long. You know, very indepth.
Within a couple of days it became one page and
four bullet points.

Then the really funny thing was that all the journalists kept saying, "We assume that libraries have taken care of archiving this stuff." We're looking around going, "Well." There's this assumption that we were taking care of this and we weren't except just by happenstance.

That was just one of those things that really caught us off guard. For us it was an indicator that this administration is going to be quite a bit different than the other ones as far as using this technology and we probably have to be more proactive than we were.

MS. HARTMAN: Just to follow up on that, I would bet that the people in this room could give you examples of changes that they saw as users of these resources on a daily basis.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. It also points to the idea that, yes, we still need to collect
"publications" but because content is going online and our users want to do different things, they want to start analyzing big chunks of data, 16-terabytes of data, we have to start thinking about beyond simple publications but publications are still really important. We still have to collect the PDFs but we have to do more.

MS. HARTMAN: We have historians who are interested in data mining, looking at trends, looking at language use, a lot of different kinds of things, just the raw data.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett, Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington. I have a question for James. This James, the James closer to me. So how does LOCKSS deal with version control? Specifically you mentioned something which always makes my ears perk up which is CRS reports and CRS reports have different versions and sometimes it can be just a matter of days, weeks. An open CRS will have the date and sometimes the different places will
have different versions and how are you going
to deal with that problem or challenge?

MR. JACOBS: It is a challenge and
the way the LOCKSS software deals with it is
it's sort of at the bit level. The harvester
goes to the site and if there are any changes
in the site or in the bits, it harvests it up
and assumes that there are changes.

Right now we are only collecting
XML so we can do other things afterwards.

You're right, the change over time is
difficult. It's sort of like an RSS feed.

MS. JARRETT: But would you have
both? Would the thing not replace one with
the other but both would be separate discrete
units?

MR. JACOBS: Yes, they would. The
CRS reports specifically we harvested from a
lot of different places so if those places had
each version of those, you know, there are a
lot of CRS reports that are published annually
which offer really nice vision of legislation
over time and we've harvested everything.
MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron. I have a question. I guess, both Cathy and non-GPO James -- sorry. Can you go into a little more elaboration about what GPO did to support your project and a little bit more about what they specifically contributed?

MS. HARTMAN: I think my answer will be shorter than James' probably since his is a collaboration with GPO. For us GPO was a member of the International Internet Preservation Consortium and so they were one of the groups that originally planned the call and some members of GPO sat in on our monthly meetings which we still have.

Then as we look at subject matter experts, we knew that if we could pull some folks from GPO who handled this material every day, that would be a real benefit and we were able to get Robin Haun-Mohamed, Laurie Hall, and George Barnum to be members of that group. I think that is how the GPO has been introduced to the project and the
collaboration they've offered.

MR. JACOBS: For the LOCKSS project GPO did not a small amount of work. They basically had to re-engineer the FDsys site to include those LOCKSS permission statements. Kate Zwaard and David Hall and a bunch of other GPO people put time into actually making sure that FDsys played well.

They also collaborated when we started looking at FDsys to look at the site structure. They worked with our LOCKSS programmer to make a site map to make it easier for the LOCKSS harvester to crawl the site.

They did not a small amount of work on that. They are continuing to participate. They are on the listserv for the project. They are not actually running a LOCKSS box but they continue to participate.

MS. HARTMAN: One thing I forgot that Suzanne reminded me. GPO has been very gracious in providing us a room the day before these DLC meetings for our subject matter
expert meetings. I want to thank them for doing that. Lance has been a great help in helping us get space to meet.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Once again to Cathy. I've been thinking about the discrepancy that you found between the institutions that said in the biannual survey that they were willing to accept digital content in your findings.

A couple of things that I've been thinking is that I can't remember exactly how the question was posed in the biannual survey but the definite impression I got when I answered that question was would you be interested or would you possibly want to, whereas your question was posed as are you likely. The second thing is those biannual survey questions were done two to four years ago and yours are fairly recent so maybe the --

MS. LASTER: When was the last biannual done? I bet Robin could tell us
immediately.

MR. CISMOWSKI: I seem to remember that two surveys in a row that question was asked but maybe I'm wrong. 2007 and 2009.

MS. HARTMAN: Kathleen, could you come to mic? We can't hear you.

Kathleen has been working with that data and comparing it to our data.

MS. MURRAY: This is Kathleen Murray, University of North Texas. The biannual survey data that we used was 2009 biannual survey data. The question that was asked and the results that were obtained from the 2009 survey questions from question 18B. It has three parts. Actually the survey responses in 2009 and 2007 were in appreciably different on the biannual survey.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. Do you remember how that question was phrased?

MS. MURRAY: I have the wording back there. I'll go get it and come back.

MR. OTTO: While we're waiting,
Robin, sorry. I skipped you before.

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Okay. Now it's working. Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Two things. Let me do the last one that Kathleen is working on. We did participate in the group yesterday and heard some interesting discussion about the way the questions were phrased.

We also heard a discussion of the way I answered it was probably not exactly accurate because what I'm hoping is my answer supports the libraries that want to do this, to move the project ahead. We are going to be having some discussion about how to ask that question again for -- guess what? The 2011 survey is coming up.

With regard to participation with the interim harvest project we had totally mercenary reasons to participate because all this information gathered together, websites, lots and lots of publications to gather.

While we can't access it and deal with it in minutiae now, we can in the future.
We are very confident of that so our participation has been one of advisory and discussion. We'll move into another phrase down the road.

I want to make sure that we included that. There is nothing nice about this. We want that information and if you haven't been to see the stuff they put forward, go to that site. It is just incredible.

Wait until you see the balls bounce around with the strings. It's really a wonderful project. I don't want to do 250 but 240 might be fun on the classification. I mean, it really looks like an interesting project so thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Just real briefly. The question from the biannual survey. Are you interested in receiving digital files on deposit? You're correct. The question is are you interested. Have you discussed this with your library director? Is there administrative support for receiving digital
files on deposit?

Our question was how likely is your library to access materials from a web archive at a repository that you trust. Then how likely is your library to acquire materials from a web archive at an institution's repository that you trust.

Those questions were different.

MS. HARTMAN: Geoff is one of our SMEs as well.

Geoff, you had a comment on that?

MR. SWINDELLS: No. Actually it's a question. Geoff Swindells -- are we doing questions from the audience?

MR. OTTO: Well, any other questions from the council first.

Please, David.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library. The automatic assignation of SuDoc numbers. A very intriguing idea whether it's possible to do that accurately or not. It will be very interesting -- it's more of a comment than a
question. It will be very interesting to see how much specificity you can arrive at automatically. I'm assuming that you're not going to try to go beyond the stem into the book number but --

MS. HARTMAN: Definitely not.

MR. CISMOWSKI: But it will be interesting within the stem itself whether you can go all the way to the colon or not or whether you're going to have to stop sooner than that.

MS. HARTMAN: Right now we're looking at the domain and that next level subdomain to see if we can do that. I think we may be able to do that. When you go to the next level subdomain, that second subdomain, it gets harder.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. This is a question for my colleague James. I'm wondering about the GPO harvesting and the fugitive documents process and whether you've tied those two together in any sort of fashion.
MR. MAULDIN: Absolutely. There are several different tools -- excuse me.

James Mauldin, GPO. There are several different tools that our Acquisitions and Bibliographical Control Unit uses. There is the Lost Docs process where we can identify fugitive materials. It then goes to our Lost Docs. It is then worked through our Acquisitions and then cataloging program and then harvested that way.

We also proactively go out there and mine websites. We have acquisition specialists who actually mine sites based on a list of classes so we look at it proactively.

MR. JACOBS: Thanks.

MR. OTTO: Any other questions from the council? Do we have some time for questions from the audience? Community. Not audience, community. Sorry. It's late.

Okay, please.

MR. SWINDELLS: This is Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University. This is
a question, I guess, for Cathy and James Mauldin and maybe Robin with her mercenary comment because I find that intriguing.

With the EPA harvest one of the challenges for doing that automated harvesting was collecting in-scope materials. As I understood it, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, GPO doesn't think it necessarily has the authority to do a broader grab of material. That may or may not be right.

However, we have seen that the multiple crawls that occur at the end-of-term archive created this vast rich archive. As a partner library with GPO couldn't GPO be minding those other archives for that material and sort of refining its harvesting from the end-of-term archive?

MR. MAULDIN: Good question, Geoffrey. I'll start off by answering we do sometimes when there are URL addresses that change and we can't find content, we most certainly will look at North Texas, UNT, the Internet Archives and Web Harvest to identify
harvest and captures from those type of harvesting activities.

MS. HARTMAN: And, of course, we're most -- we would be most happy to work with GPO.

Robin, do you have some comment?

We can shift those 10 million PDFs off to Laurie. She can start cataloging them with her team tomorrow.

(Laughter)

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: Robin Haun-Mohamed, GPO. Kate, are you ready for this? I think this is a good opportunity to share that the working group is meeting and talking.

What we didn't want to do is put out a set of future steps that we couldn't support so we are working diligently to come up with the next steps of what to do and getting into that type of material may indeed be part of a pilot or identification of a task to ingest.

I want to make sure people understand we do know it's there. Good
question, Geoff. Come on over. We'll help you start sorting that out with us. That was the one thing that we did learn from the EPA harvest project. It got a lot of stuff but a lot of stuff that has to be compiled.

We even did some work with the community to try and get that pulled in together and a cooperative agreement and it's really, really a difficult thing. We want to make sure the next time we put forth a pilot that we use the information that we learned from the previous.

MR. OTTO: Hey, please. You've been waiting in the light blue. Please.

MS. WILLIAMS: Rhianna Williams, Michigan Tech University. This is more of a layman's question I suppose. For the LOCKSS Docs project how will patrons be able to access that data?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. It's not a layman's question. It's fairly technical but the LOCKSS content that's harvested is not
accessed until the content goes away. What happens is somebody will go to a URL that we've harvested and if they get a 404 then it will go into the LOCKSS caches to get it.

MS. WILLIAMS: Who will be doing that checking?

MR. JACOBS: Who will be doing that?

MS. WILLIAMS: Or how will that be checked?

MR. JACOBS: It's checked by the LOCKSS software.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR. JACOBS: Yeah.

MS. WILLIAMS: And then once it's released then is it replacing that URL so people can get to it? Is there a search feature for them to find it?

MR. JACOBS: There's currently not a search feature to the content that we've harvested. This is something that I've thought about and a lot of people think once you harvest that's the end of the project.
Really what I'm starting to try to get my head around that is really the beginning of the project because once a library has that content harvested and it's public domain content, it's currently in XML so it's very easy to make public in your own web space, to put into your institutional repository, to create subject archives of public domain content and non-public domain content.

I'm really trying to get at that idea that that's the beginning of the process similar to paper documents. Collecting a paper document from GPO, that's not the end of your responsibility. That's the beginning of your responsibility and then you have to preserve it and give access to it. You're cutting me off?

MS. LASTER: Sorry. Shari Laster, University of Akron. I've been informed by our fearless leader that we have time for one more question and we would like --

MR. JACOBS: I can talk more
later.

MS. LASTER: -- the questions to be -- Cathy will not be available after this session so questions about GPO and questions about LOCKSS can also be asked at the Wednesday session, Wednesday morning at 10:30 session. Are there questions -- is there one more question specifically about the end-of-term harvest?

Okay. If not, I am told that we need to adjourn because it's 5:30. Thank you all very much for attending this session and we welcome questions Wednesday at 10:30. I know there will be other people who at least have some knowledge of the end-of-term crawl who will be there so we can at least get an idea of answers to those questions. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 5:29 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)
The Council met at the Doubletree Hotel
Crystal City, Crystal Ballroom A-B, 300 Army
Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m.,
Suzanne Sears, Chair, presiding.
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QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD
CHAIR SEARS: Okay. I'd like to get started if we could all take our seats and stop talking please. Thank you.

This morning we have a session that is going to be run by Ann Sanders but previous to that session, we are going to take just a few minutes for George Barnum to talk about the 150th Anniversary of the Government Printing Office.

George.

MR. BARNUM: Good morning, everybody.

I'm not used to doing this sitting. I can't wobble back and forth on my feet.

It's a pleasure as always to be here and to be talking to you about something that I'm pretty excited about.

In Buffalo, for those of you who were there, you heard our sort of very preliminary plans about the celebration of
GPO's 150th Anniversary and we've sort of solidified those plans a bit. I think you heard a little bit about that yesterday from the Public Printer. And I'm going to expand on that a little bit and then I'm going to make an invitation to you to participate in a couple of ways.

We kicked off the celebrations in June on the 23rd when we observed the day on which Congress actually passed a resolution that directed that GPO be created. And we were very fortunate to have the Archivist of the United States come over and speak to the current employees and an enormous group of retirees.

If you stop and think about what's happened to GPO over the last several years, we have a lot more retirees walking around than we have current employees. And they drift in and out for various kinds of events through the year but we don't actually invite them to things consciously very often. And so when we did, they turned out in droves. It
was great. We have over 1,000 people at the two events, the day side one and the night side one. It was big fun.

We had a cake. We gave every employee and every retiree a copy of the reprint of 100 GPO Years. We had tote bags for them but there weren't enough to go around and boy were they upset about that. But it was a lot of fun. That kicked us off and we are now into the heat of the real celebration.

The actual day of the anniversary is March the 4th and we will have another observance in the GOI auditorium, Harding Hall, on that day. At that moment we will officially declare the new history that's being prepared/published. That history will be in a somewhat different spirit than 100 GPO Years. It will be much more graphical, much more pictorial and it will be a narrative of the entire 150 years instead of being that funny timeline.

You all got 100 GPO Years in your shipping boxes and I want to point out to you.
If you haven't really looked closely at it, we improved it. We really changed it in only one substantial way from the 1961 edition. I indexed it. Thank you. And I'm very proud of the index. And what do you know? It works. So, we had to at that point call it a new edition, of course, because it wasn't just a reprint anymore.

We'll publish the new book on March the 4th. We'll have another celebration and on March the 4th we will open about six months worth of an exhibit about GPO's role and history in American life. We are going to be refitting space in Building C. That's the 732 North Capitol, the 1940 building. And we have hired a really outstanding exhibit design firm, Reich & Petch, International to work with us to tell the story and tell it really, really beautifully. Our designer is just amazing and joyful to work with and we're having a lot of fun.

This is where the invitation comes in. That will open on March 3rd of March 4th.
and the first invitation is please if you have any plans that will bring you to Washington, come on down and see the exhibit.

I will tell you that we will certainly do some kind of virtual spinoff to the exhibit so you'll be able to see over the web some of what is there. But there will be one kind of marquee exhibit that we're working on. We are going to be borrowing from the Rare Books and Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress one of the original printing states of the Emancipation Proclamation which we printed and which has our proofreader's marks on it. And that will be with us for probably just about 90 days. We'll have a facsimile after that but we're hoping that that's really going to spark some interest in people coming in. So, that's the first bit of the invitation.

The real bit of the invitation is that you've already seen on the desktop the call for items that we'd like to borrow for this exhibit. We'd like to involve you all in
this way. We know that there are gems hiding in your collections. Maybe not even hiding. And if you're willing to let us borrow them, we'd really love to have them.

There is a sort of notional preliminary list that appears with that announcement on the desktop and you can send me a message that way or you can send me a message at gbarnum@gpo.gov and say, hey, we've got this that or the other.

The list is not to be viewed as set in stone and so if it sparks an idea in your mind of something else that you have that we might be interested in, please do let me know and we'll make arrangements with all the proper agreements and all that sort of thing and getting it to us and back to you at the end and all that.

So, we want to have as many objects borrowed from our libraries as we possibly can because we want to be able to give you lots of credit and say, hey, this is part of what we do and aren't these depository
libraries great. This is the breadth and the depth of these collections that we appreciate so much.

After the March sort of high peak we will then continue on through the year with some other smaller events, including some historical lecture talk kinds of things at GPO. And so, you know, keep an eye peeled. I think we'll have things on the history web page and on the GPO main page of things that are going on throughout the year that you may find interesting.

If you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call or email me and we'll look forward to seeing you as we celebrate over the next several months.

Thanks a bunch.

CHAIR SEARS: I'm now going to turn it over to Ann Marie Sanders.

Ann.

MS. SANDERS: I'm Ann Sanders from the Library of Michigan. I had a committee that worked with me on this session. We're
looking at models, new models, some old models
of cooperation among depositories specifically
in regards to the tangible historic
collections.

And we have three speakers, but
first I want to acknowledge that Steve Hayes
and Dan O'Mahony and Cindy Etkin all worked
with me to put this together. And we're a
little short on time so we're going to go
right ahead and we're going to start with Judy
Russell who is Dean of Libraries at the
University of Florida.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Ann.
Good morning. It's nice to be
here with you. Seems kind of like old home
week actually to be back with all of you and
I'm happy to be here and share some
information with you about some initiatives
that I'm involved with now that I'm at the
University of Florida.

I'm going to be talking to you
this morning about an initiative that have
come out of the Deans of ASERL, the
Association of Southeastern Research Libraries. We have 28 members in 10 states; Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. And because Florida serves as the regional for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, they have become a part of this initiative as well. So, we have 10 states, 12 regional depository libraries and 248 selectives, over 20 percent of the depository program in this region.

Before I describe the ASERL project to you, though I wanted to share with you one kind of piece of late-breaking news, and we'll open this up here. Last week the Association for Research Libraries met here in Washington and enacted or approved a statement of principles on the Federal Depository Library Program. I've given copies to the Council members. There are a number of copies out at the front desk. I didn't have time to get enough copies to hand out to everyone, but you can certainly take a look at the copies.
that are on the desk. And actually if you go
to the home page of ARL.org, you will see a
link right off the home page but this is the
link if you wanted to copy it down.

ARL has had a strong interest in
and commitment to the depository program. But
Deans are very anxious to see increased
flexibility and improvements in the management
of the program. And they recognized the need
for improved access, particularly to digital
and digitized content. And have kind of
worked up this statement to indicate some of
the concerns that they have in some of the
sort of baseline positions, I guess, that they
are taking.

They recognize the great need for
cataloging to manage print and to provide
metadata for digitization and they continue to
be strong supporters of the implementation of
FedSys would like to see it certified as a
trusted repository but also perhaps to create
a relationship with a non-governmental, one or
more non-governmental trusted sites so that
there is a backup for it outside of the hands of the government.

There are some things in the statement that are intended to kind of create a baseline of where they feel the extent of the commitments that ARL institutions should be required to make as distinct from the ones that they might voluntarily make.

So, for example, the initial principle is that although we may choose to do more than is required by law, we are not obligated to do more than what is required by law. And that's not intended to be a negative but it is intended to acknowledge that this is an unfunded mandate that puts a significant burden on us. And that we should not be looking at creating new responsibilities for regionals, in particular, but for the depository program in general at this point in time.

Along with that note that we are not required by law to build comprehensive retrospective collections that many of us
choose to augment our collections, particularly as they meet local and state needs and you'll hear more about how we're following through on that interest and commitment within ASERL but, again, that that is not a requirement that is imposed on the regionals.

They are asking for a re-examination of state plans to be sure that where state plans have been enacted they don't go beyond the requirements of law in what they are imposing on the depositories. And they're particularly concerned because they value the digital collections and see a strong need for them, but they're particularly concerned that we not see a new commitment for digital deposit at regionals. They feel that that would be a significant increase in the responsibilities and probably one that cannot be taken on. And, again, that's not to say that people might not voluntarily assume responsibility for some portions of the digital collection, particularly those that
might be very relevant to their particular communities or subject interests, but that this should not become a mandate.

They also note that they believe that we probably should be building toward having no more than 15 regionally distributive comprehensive print collections. And I would ask you to listen to that very carefully. They're not saying there should only be 15 regional depository libraries. But they are acknowledging that to really truly have comprehensive collections is going to be a collaborative effort involving many regional and selective depositories and that in the end we can probably manage with 15 comprehensive sets. And that isn't to say that regionals would discard things that they have, but that we would try to document the holdings sufficiently that we would have an assurance that there were 15 copies handled somewhere within the program. And, again, you'll see that echoes the plans that we have within ASERL.
They are also encouraging a simplified withdrawal process to facilitate it. Any of you who are in regionals are certainly aware that our selectives have been doing a huge amount of discarding and the disposition processes are so variable from state to state and they can create an additional burden on the regionals. And, again, you'll see that echoes some of the same kinds of things that we've been addressing in ASERL.

So, I encourage you to look at the statement. Prue Adler is going to be here this afternoon and I believe the statement is going to be discussed in the regional meeting. So, if there are specific questions or issues that you have and I'll be around at the break and we'll be happy to talk with you as well. But I think it's important for you to be aware of the statement. And, again, I would urge you to look at it as an affirmative statement because while they are stating some boundaries if you will, they are also doing so in the
context of feeling that these are important collections for them and that they have a continued commitment to the depository program, they are just seeking to be sure that that commitment is managed in an effective way and that additional burdens are not placed on them.

So, with that, I will switch back over to -- assuming that I can get back there. Put the generic screen back up since I'm not using PowerPoint. See if I can get back. Well, I'll just leave it.

So, let me switch back and talk a little bit about ASERL. Much like the ARLs have been discussing for a long time, their role in the depository program and the commitments that they are making, we started this initiative within ASERL from a desire to improve access to these collections. All 28 of the ASERL libraries are large collections of documents and we all see them as enormous assets, but they have been managed individually and in a disconnected way. And
so we started with a very affirmative statement that re recognize the value of these collections to our individual institutions and to our communities and our states, but that we further recognize that there is a real value to them regionally and that there is a strong desire to manage them collaboratively for the benefit of the region as a whole.

And so we started out with a decision that we wanted to see some change and to find some way to collaborate but a way that was entirely within Title 44. We were interested in making sure that whatever initiatives we did were in full compliance with Title 44. We were not trying to be renegades. We were not trying to create radical change, but we were trying to cooperate as much as we could while staying within the law. And I will say that we did submit the draft proposal to GPO and it was reviewed by their general counsel and they did affirm that we have managed to create a proposal that does conform to Title 44, which
was one of our primary objectives. We started out by affirming that we see a strong need for digital access. We believe that that's the direction that our users are going, that while there is significant value in the print and we have every expectation of managing the print collections, we are also managing the print collections in the context of expecting over time to have improved digital access so that the print collections become more of a safety net and less of the primary means of access. And I'll be very interested, as I know you will be, in hearing more about the CIC project. But we are watching that very closely and in regular communication with them because we see that as complimenting what we're doing and facilitating what we're doing.

We also set a goal of improving our best practices for managing the tangible collections including the disposition process. And we wanted to work on having common practices across the 10 states. And you'll
see as I talk a little more about it why that's important. But one of the things that we're doing as a contribution at the University of Florida is developing software to manage the disposition process so that it will be easier for us to collaborate. And in order to be able to do that, we really need to have common practices. It's much more difficult to have a software system that's going to facilitate disposition and going to notify people about what's available if you've got different rules in each place.

So, those are two of the main objectives of the program.

I mentioned that we have 12 regionals in the 10 states. Each of us has a collection in excess of a million items. So, collectively we hold something in excess of 15 million federal documents. And probably 40 to 50 percent of those are uncataloged. And this is not even including the large selective collections and we have a number of those in our state.
So, when we know that the oldest and largest documents collections in the country have over two million items and UF has 1.2 to 1.4 million print items if we were truly trying to be comprehensive, that would mean that UF needed to acquire, process, catalog and house an additional 800,000 federal documents to be comprehensive.

It's not practical to even assume that there are, particularly when you look at the older and more rare documents, that there's even that many of them out there that we could possibly have 12 comprehensive individual collections. But what we're looking at is how could we share that responsibility so that while we each retain our own holdings, we selectively exert a great deal of investment and effort in building certain parts of the collection retrospectively with the idea that then within the region we would end up with at least two comprehensive collections. And, again, that doesn't mean that their people can't continue
to collect in any area that interests them, but that we will really focus our attention in trying to be sure that we have two sets that are fully catalogued distributed among an array of selectives and regionals within the southeast.

We're used a fairly engaged process to do this. We met at the ASERL meeting a year ago and agreed that we wanted to do this collaborative management. A task force of deans was named which I chair and which includes both regionals and selectives.

We drafted a document that we call a discussion draft which is linked from the ASERL home page.

We conducted a survey and it was a survey that was open to anyone with an interest in government documents so it wasn't just a survey of ASERL members or even just of regionals and selectives within our 10 states and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We used the survey to inform us about questions and concerns related to the proposal.
We did presentations at a number of both local and national meetings to get the word out and to be sure people were aware.

We used email and other communications with each of the selectives in our regions so that they were all aware of what was happening and they were encouraged, both the directors and the documents coordinators, to view and respond to the draft.

In August we had a one-day summit where we went through at a high level and talked about some of the initiatives that were going on within individual libraries. And then had a whole day working session where we literally went through the draft page by page, paragraph by paragraph and identified areas where we could improve and clarify but also where there was still some lack of agreement, particularly on specific aspects of the disposition process.

And we then identified a number of what we call parking lot issues that were
issues that we couldn't resolve in that
working session but that needed more
discussion. So, for the last several weeks
we've been having email exchanges talking
about things like:

Should we or shouldn't we be
required to list microfiche?

Who should pay the shipping
charges, the disposing library or the
receiving library?

What's the appropriate length of
time for disposition lists to be posted
because we had such a variation in practice
across the 10 states that we needed to
harmonize those things and come to some
agreement?

We're having a luncheon today with
any of the ASERL 10-states actually and the
Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, any of our
group who are here to kind of talk through
those things one or more times. The ASERL
deans will be meeting in November and we'll be
reviewing that input and coming to some
Further agreement about how to proceed. And then we'll do another revision of the document. We'll submit it back to GPO to be sure we haven't inadvertently gone outside the legal boundaries. We'll put it out again for a very broad public viewing, but hope that at that point we will have arrived at a document that can lead us through implementation and to begin this process.

One of the issues that comes up is how do you even define what a comprehensive collection is? And one of the things we've asked in the document is that GPO assist us in that partly through their retrospective cataloging initiative so that to the extent that GPO can identify everything that it has distributed, at least since it took responsibility in 1895 and to the extent that we can from other resources identify materials that were distributed prior to that, we can try to define what a comprehensive collection is. And we all know that there are materials that we have acquired in other means that were
not distributed by GPO and questions will have to be resolved about how we handle those. But they may not literally meet the terms of being a comprehensive FDLP collection, although they may help us building a comprehensive government documents collection.

We feel that if we can get some better definition of what's comprehensive, we then have a better shot at proceeding to evaluate our own holdings.

Some of you heard the presentation yesterday afternoon by Valerie Glenn and Chelsea Dinsmore about a separate ASERL project and that indicated that several of us have identified ourselves as Centers of Excellence for specific agencies. We see that as a building block where we would inventory and catalog our own holdings, where we would make every effort to do research to try to determine if there are items that were published by those agencies that we don't have and then to seek copies of those. Preferably to have print, but where that's not possible
to obtain a facsimile or a digital surrogate
or even a microfilm surrogate so that we can
identify and build comprehensive collections.

I'd like you to take away a couple of things. First of all, this is not a proposal for shared regionals. There is no change in the regional status of any of the 12 regionals. None of us are disposing of our collections. All of the building of the comprehensive segments of the collection will come from disposition from other selective depositories but not by moving around materials within the regionals.

And also remember that this is not an initiative that relies solely on the regionals. Selectives can and should be participating and we're certainly expecting commitments from many of the ASERL deans who manage selectives to take on responsibility for specific parts of these comprehensive collections.

This proposal provides an impetus for investment in the documents collection at
each participating institution. And the ASERL deans' interest in developing and refining the proposal indicates a significant interest in making that investment in a coordinated manner because we want to optimize the return on investment and improve access to and management of these materials.

At Florida we've already begun a project to catalog 300,000 documents that were in storage because they went to storage without being catalogued and we're now building a high density facility and they need to be catalogued and barcoded to move into the high density facility. That's an example of an investment in the collection. That's an effort that will help all of the selectives in the southeast and probably many of you in other parts of the country because you'll be able to know for certain that those copies of those documents exist in a safe and secure place.

So, that's an example of the kind of investment that we're making on a case-by-
case basis but we're making it in a collaborative effort so that overall throughout our region we can better manage our collections.

And I think we're going to take our questions at the end. Is that correct, Ann Marie?

So, thank you for your attention and I'm happy to talk with any of you during the break as well if you have questions that don't get answered this morning.


The next speaker is Mary Prophet who is the Deputy Director and Head of Government Documents at Denison University and she is going to talk to us about the five colleges of Ohio cooperative projects.

MS. PROPHET: Hi. I am going to use a little PowerPoint mainly to keep me on track because we don't have a lot of time and there's an awful lot to talk about.

I'd also like to point out that
the title of this particular presentation for
this particular panel is Emerging Models for
Partnership Among Depository Libraries. And
I'd like to change the phraseology of that
just a little bit and change it to emerging
and evolving models. Because over time these
models change and they change based on
experience and all kinds of other things.

Within the Ohio Five, partnerships
began developing much earlier than any of our
projects, even before the Ohio Five and all
these partnerships were based on three things.
They're based on trust. They're based on
flexibility or adaptability. And they're
based on mutual support. And those three
things are extraordinarily important in these
kinds of projects.

In the 1980s before Ohio Five was
even thought about, we did what a lot of you
do every single day. We worked with our Ohio
local association and we began meeting and we
began cooperating on the very simple things
like sharing reference research help, like
providing mutual support and understanding GPO guidelines. And supplying inter-library loans to each other which hadn't been done much within the state for documents before that.

I want to give you this history because it will show you how this trust develops.

The next thing we did was that when we started this there were no online catalogs. Documents were not cataloged. The item lists did not exist. The documents data did not exist. The only way we had of knowing who else might possibly have something would be if we knew what items they selected. So, we began our selection, our cooperation with a union list of item sections, a very simple concept. And we built trust with that because every quarter when GPO sent out the printout, everybody sent immediately to the list maintainer that changes in that list. And we kept not only the changes but the dates that such changes occurred in that item list.

Almost immediately at this same
time, we began discussions about cataloging our documents collection. Margaret Powell at Wooster. The College of Wooster was very strong in support of this. Dr. Fluber and Scott together discussed it, strongly supported it, got our directors together. Our directors weren't quite as far along as we were and the libraries were quite as far along as we were in developing that trust and mutual support and probably for good reasons.

There were not the mechanisms in place that there are now and there were not a lot of other things in place that there are now. And so only Wooster went forward with that cataloging at that particular point in time. But what did here allowed us to build on this to move into the cooperation that we developed during the 1990s.

In the 1990s, Ohio Five was formed. Our consort, our shared catalog was formed and we began cataloging government documents. Well, two things happened to that shared catalog. First, everything that
Wooster had cataloged in the 1980s was loaded into that catalog and became the basis for what we did after that.

Second, when we got to sharing the catalog, in the shared catalog we have one bibliographic record for every item, hopefully. That's the ideal. And then one attached item record for each individual institution's holdings. That worked great for non-document books monographs because they were ordered at different times, came in at different times and so the record was already there with the documents. We all got our boxes at the same time.

So, you ended up with duplicate records. So, one of our first big cooperative projects was to go in and to divide up the cataloging for institutions by item number so that each one of us catalogued a certain subset of those and then the others just attached their item records.

At the same time we thought this is a great time to do a zero-based review.
See if we really need to collect all this stuff. See if we can't reduce our selections and that part didn't work so well.

While the mutual catalog, the distributed cataloging worked great, the idea of doing the zero-based review worked only for the hearings at which point people changed microfiche for some things but for the agency materials, well, if I'm getting it, I probably need to get it. I've got a lot of time pressure right now. I don't have time to review this the way I ought to, so I won't. And not only that but oh, my goodness. Wooster is getting this. Maybe I need to get it too. So, actually, item selections went up, not down. Which was a total failure for that particular project, but we learned a lot from it.

Okay. So, the shared cataloging of card acquisitions began and then actually the cataloging our historical collections began actually even before we started the project and it began because we had Wooster
records in the catalog for all that stuff they catalogued prior and we could begin linking to that. Then there was money left over from the Mellon Grant and we began the historical cataloging project.

Moving on into the 2000s we come up with a slew of projects and I'm not going to go into any of these in detail except one. We have a joint storage facility. We did a serial set out inventory as an outgrowth of the historical cataloging project. We catalogued our Foreign Relations of the United States, and this is the one I want to concentrate on because this one gives you some examples of how that cooperative worked that we did before pays off later.

Everybody had great sets of Foreign Relations of the United States. It was catalogued under the main serial records, the main series records for it. Nobody used them. They sat on the shelves and did not circulate. We all knew there was great stuff in there. We had students studying the
Vietnam War and wanting to look at the primary sources of the Vietnam War. We had students working on China and other places and unless we hand-pulled them to the shelf they didn't know it was there.

So, Ellen Conrad at Denison decided to catalog the individual separate volumes and the subsets of the Foreign Relations for Denison so that our students would use it. But she was coordinator on the historical cataloging project. She had passwords for all of the other people's work within the CONSORT catalog. So, she called everybody up and she said, I'm going to catalog Denison's Foreign Relations. What about if I do yours at the same time? Well, everybody agreed. We all trusted her. There was a lot of trust built up. There was a lot of mutual respect built up. We had the tools already in place to do that. And so she went through and she did cataloging for all four institutions for that series.

It took her about half the time, a
little bit more than half the time to do all four schools than it would have for each school to do that separately. That was a big payoff.

Then we came up with shared policies and we have a number of those. I'm not going to go into those. And then we moved on to one of our big current projects, the collection consolidation project.

The collections consolidation project had a lot of different goals and I want to kind of go over those briefly with you. The one thing we really wanted to do was take the four separate collections and make one really good historical collection out of them. We were going to combine these four separate collections into one. Eliminate as much duplication as we can and get down to -- that doesn't mean we're going to rule out all duplication. We're all going to hang onto certain historical series. House Un-American Activities is one that pops to mind.

But there are others that we don't
need all four copies of the appropriations for
the Defense Department. So, we're going to
eliminate unnecessary duplicates. We wanted
to establish a library of record to be
responsible for certain sub-portions of the
collection and to be responsible for the
collection development, the maintenance of
those print materials and to continue to build
strong collections in those particular areas.

And when we first started out our
goal was to do this for the entire collection,
all the hearing sand all the agencies. Well,
there's good news and there's bad news. So,
we'll start with the good news.

The good news is that as of July
2010 we had transferred more than 14,000
documents from supporting libraries to the
Library of Record to build stronger
collections in those particular areas that the
Library of Record was responsible for. The
regionals will really love this, but we had
weeded more than 127,000 documents. We had
reduced our item numbers selection by 169 item
selections. And at this particular time, we have seven classes remaining to be done in the hearings.

So, just to show you what that looks like, let me pop up this little spreadsheet. This is the spreadsheet we developed to track that and this is in order by completion. Everything that's gray is done, is completed. We've gone through all the paper. We've gone through all the microfiche. We've consolidated the entire thing.

The things at the bottom in yellow over on this side, over in the first column, those are the classes that we are currently working on. The only remaining hearing classes.

The gray cells are the ones we finished. A portion of the project we finished. The yellow ones are the portions of the project we are currently working on, and the ones that remain white except for the columns that say two and three and one are the
columns that are -- this column, this column, this column, this column, this column and this column are the columns that -- the white parts are the parts we haven't started yet. That's mostly microfiche.

We expect to be finished with the entire project -- the entire hearings portion of the project in the spring. Exactly when in the spring, I'm not sure. That will depend on a lot of other things.

Now, let's go back and go to the bad news. In the bad news, the project required more time, more expertise, more energy than we ever expected it would. We did a pilot project and tried it out and thought for the pilot project we had a pretty good idea of what it would take. But the pilot project did not really show the depth and breath of the materials that we would get into and the problems that we would encounter.

We are now receiving significant pressure on our staff from other projects. We recently received a Mellon Next Generation
Libraries Grant for the five colleges and we are getting ready to set up institutional repositories, digital repositories and we're not getting any more staff. So, that's putting additional pressure on our staff and a place-- the director's are looking for some of that additional staff time to come from and guess where? Our documents departments. So, that's going to put additional pressure on it.

Our storage facility which we've had for over 10 years has suddenly declared that we are going to have to close it by October 2012. So we're going to have to bring everything that's still over there back and that is putting -- or weed. We're weeding a lot, believe me. We're weeding a lot.

So, we are in the process of coordinating that. Ellen Conrad who does a lot with our documents coordination is in charge of that particular project. And all of our document staff, Andrea and a bunch of the others are going to have to work on that a lot.
And while a considerable amount of
our shelf space was cleared, which was one of
our main objectives, it was not as much as
anticipated because even though was had a
pretty good idea from our cataloging project
how much overlap there was, there was some
historical work that still hadn't been
completed in a couple of our institutions and
it's being completed as part of this project.
But there was also more individuality among
things that had been lost over the years from
collections or things that had never been
received in the first place, or things that we
had gotten through other means besides GPO.
So, we didn't clear quite as much shelf space
as we anticipated either.

That being said, we also realized
that the hearings like in every other project
we've ever tackled, the hearings are the easy
part of the project.

The agencies are going to be even
more intense. The overlap in the hearings was
more obvious, it's more direct and with the
agencies there's less overlap in selections in the first place. And so we're going to have to step back and reconsider where we go from here.

We're still committed to the Library of Record concept. We really like that concept that one of us is responsible for collection development and maintenance in these areas. But we don't know that we can consider forward with a project where we actually work through each item, each class, one at a time and then send stuff that's not at the Library of Record over to it from the original library.

So, we're stepping back from that. We're going to assign Libraries of Record and we still have to work out the details from there. With that in mind, that's where we are and that's where we're going forward.

If any of you are thinking about cooperative processes and partnership I've got some suggestions for you. And the first suggestion I have is that do it. Don't back
off from it. Don’t not do it. Do it, but start off with some of these ideas in mind.

Begin with cooperative effort project unless you’ve got great big support from your deans, as in the southeastern project, which is great. I would really like to see how that works out.

But if you’re doing it from the grassroots, from the library ends up, start with simple projects. Because when you start with the simple projects you can build on what you’ve already done. We’re still building on that first item union list. We’re still going back and occasionally using that to build on something else. We built on it to actually get the Mellon Grant that funded the five colleges in the first place.

The serial set inventory that we did as part of the historical project is now going to be vital in clearing out the storage unit. Because as we clear out the storage unit, there was some serial sets sent to the storage unit. Do we need to keep those or are
there enough copies of those serials set
volumes at the other institutions that we've
already inventoried that we can leave part of
that? Do we need to distribute that among
part of the group or keep it in the unit?
That can all be worked out through that
inventory we already did. You can build.

Secondly, success, even partial
success builds trust. That first project we
did one of them was successful, the other one
was not. But the successful one built trust
and we learned enough from the unsuccessful
one that we were able to go forward.

We've discovered that you don't
learn much from your totally successful
projects. Where you really learn is from the
projects that you have problems with, that you
work through the problems and then you
develop. And you also develop a lot of trust
as you work through those problems and trust
is key-- really key.

From the beginning don't expect
every project to be a success. Just don't do
I would hope all of you have some suggestions for beginning cooperative projects among smaller institutions especially, and that you'll go ahead and do them.

And thank you. I'll be available to answer questions at the break on whatever you like.


Okay. Last up we have Geoff Swindells. He's the Head of Government and Geographic Information and Data Services at Northwestern and he's going to talk about the CIC/Google government documents project.

MR. SWINDELLS: I'm not used to PCs.

Good morning, everyone. I'm not sure how I wound up on the dias again. I thought I'd abandoned that. Anyway, I'll try to make this brief because there's a lot of really interesting details that we could go into and maybe some of that will come out in
the questions.

Just a little bit about CIC, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation. It's a consortium of the big ten universities plus the University of Chicago and soon Nebraska. We're stealing folks from my former conference. And within the CIC there is a Center for Library Initiatives that helps do a lot of the cooperative purchasing work and also helps organize things like the CIC Federal Documents Digitalization Project. And also within CIC we have a very active and long-standing group, the CIC Heads of Government Publications which have done a number of projects over the years. And so CIC was well prepared in many respects to take on this project and more about the project in a second.

Some of the list of members.

You'll notice Big Ten means twelve and soon thirteen. That's because Penn State came on after the creation of the original Big Ten and then, of course, we had to add the University
of Chicago, although why I don't know. Our
downtown neighbors, the Northwestern of
Chicago.

Anyway, in December 2008 at the
behest of the CIC Directors, a CIC Steering
Committee on Federal Documents Digitalization
was established. And they would work
concurrently, and I'll come back to this, with
a pilot project to digitize duplicate
materials from the University of Minnesota.

So the Steering Committee to sort of develop
the sort of whole digitization process was
working while that process was happening at
one institution. And we're responsible for
developing and overseeing a comprehensive
publications management strategy for U.S.
government publications.

This includes developing the
process for digitizing print collections of
documents, getting those digital files into
HathiTrust. In fact, making them accessible
to users. And then also once the process is
done, or sort of concurrent with that process,
starting to think about how that will allow
sort of the availability of digital files will
allow for a different sort of management of
print collections once those files are in
place.

There are members of the original
Steering Committee here including both the co-
chairs, Kirsten Clark and Marianne Ryan. And
Marianne was at Purdue when appointed so we
weren’t trying to overweight Northwestern
here. And we were assisted by the Center for
Library Initiatives staff, most prominently
Mark Sandler and Kim Armstrong.

And in October 2009 took us awhile
but we created what we called the staging plan
on how this digitalization process would work,
but it did a couple of other things.

First of all, it established the
scope of what we were going to digitize and we
had many long conversations on what is a
comprehensive collection of federal materials.
There’s lots of definitions and lots of
different sources. And so we decided that it
would be at least one of every print publication distributed to CIC libraries through the FDLP. And sort of keeping it within CIC. We still don't know what that number is because many of our publications -- many of our collections are uncataloged just like everyone else's. But we'll see and we're guessing 1 to 1.5 million, who knows.

We also established guiding principles for the project, and that's compliance with Title 44 and the disposal guidelines of the appropriate Regional Federal Depository Libraries. Because although there are regionals among CIC members, many of us are in states where the regional is not a member of CIC. So, that's true with certainly us in Illinois where it's the State Library of Illinois or in Pennsylvania where it the State Library of Pennsylvania.

But also we recognize that we needed to minimize the overall costs associated with preparing materials for digitalization. And this was sort of very
important in trying to get as much material through as quickly as possible but also not to overburden institutions in cataloging and barcoding material just to send to be digitized.

And we also recognized that a lot of the details on how this would work could only come about by bringing in sort of non-documents folks; catalogers, other people but we had Irene Zimmerman on the original team to establish an implementation team to sort of move us forward.

A couple of things about, not on the screen. This is using sheet-fed scanning so these materials are at least initially sent out to Google and disbound and fed through sheet-fed scanners. And this is not all of the materials will be scanned this way. We've already had some exceptions with some of what we think are maybe unique materials at the University of Illinois. But a couple of advantages of that: You can get a lot done quickly, and also you don't have the problem
of gutters and things like that.

And with the idea of minimizing costs, we came up with a multi-stage plan. The first stages, libraries will contribute collections of shovel ready, although I realize that has had a connotation recently. There are no such things as shovel-ready projects. But collections that were by and large, already cataloged and barcoded and that met the format, size and conditions standards adopted by Google, and we're using the pick-list approach. And of course the pick-list approach assumes that things are cataloged and doesn't necessarily assume they're barcode. And so initial stages are intended to use that approach.

In later stages we recognized that we would have to adjust if we wanted to approach this comprehensive collection of digital material and so we essentially then go into an agency approach with each library within the CIC taking responsibility for the publications of a group of individual federal
agencies and then using various bibliographic tools which you're all familiar with trying to make sure that we actually digitize a comprehensive collection of print publications.

And in those later stages we will also identify additional digitalization partners because some of the material that's not getting digitized in the first stages are because they don't meet Google's digitalization standards. Things have to be easy to digitize for Google to take them on.

Google is getting better at doing some of this. They're able to handle things more. We may have a process for dealing with inserts at some point where they can be added back in but there are a number of things that are going to come up that can't be digitized by Google. And so we'll need to do sort of more boutique scanning, and so we anticipated that.

And I'll talk a bit about what's been done but I did want to mention that our
proposal, sort of staging plan, was accepted late 2009. In January 2010 an implementation team was established and we're really pushing this process forward.

Now, during this period Minnesota is scanning, and we actually then moved to Penn State to do some scanning and started to contact others. So, a lot of this is happening while we're in the planning stages.

But the implementation team is really about getting the tools down, assisting libraries to select and deliver documents to Google because one of the challenges is knowing what's already been done and all of those things. Dealing with quality assurance for materials because if we are to rely on those, if the presence of a comprehensive digital collection allows us to make selection or retention decisions, which we hope it would, we want to make sure that the quality is there in these digital objects. And moving forward on some of those sort of strategies for materials that fall outside the parameters of Google.
Where do these things go? They all go into the HathiTrust. The HathiTrust, as many of you know, CIC is one of the founding partners with others. I won't go into the details of the HathiTrust, but we can talk about that later.

And the sort of initial access point into these materials is through essentially a beta catalog put up by HathiTrust with the knowledge that they needed to improve that catalog but it combines a catalog search and a full text search of those files.

So, what has happened so far and the numbers are a little bit off. CIC was going to post the new numbers this morning but they haven't yet. And so I may be able to get folks in the audience to help me with that. But in the end, Minnesota ended up sending about 85,000 duplicate holdings to Google. I mean, Minnesota is a regional but these were duplicate copies. And as the pick-list approach sort of is pushing you in this
direction, they're all over the SuDocs range.

Sort of things that haven't already been
digitized that Google can find in your catalog
material but they're particularly heavy in
Agriculture, Interior, Census, Labor,
Transportation and some Congressional
committees.

Penn State sent only Congressional
Hearings, about 26,000 volumes. I think
they're finished -- fully finished. I think
actually they were probably finished a couple
of months ago and so I don't know what the
final numbers are. And Illinois is about to
start sending materials, and I think the
number is 100,000. Is Mary in the audience?
It's about 100,000? Okay. A 100,000
materials.

And as I mentioned earlier, Mary
was able to identify some unique titles, at
least appear to be unique because they're
catalogued materials within the CIC. And
caution is our best watch word here. And so
about 30,000 of those are going to be scanned
using handbook scanning and those materials come back because the disbound materials do not come back. Although Google did offer to send us shrink-wrapped loose pages. I think we largely declined.

And so these are deposited with the HathiTrust. They are accessible to the entire community. HathiTrust will handle, will be the trusted repository over time. But we are also making these files available to GPO when that ingest capability is available with GPO. So, we're ready to sort of let them suck all this stuff up and play around with it.

There's a lot of things I haven't covered and hopefully we can get at some of these in the questions.

There is a project home page. It doesn't have any up-to-date numbers on it because that's what I was relying for on my numbers and they'll probably be up a little bit later today. But that has some additional documentation and you can always contact me,
of course. Did I put my name up here? No.

And my email.

I also realized that I didn't put
up the members of the implementation team. I
just noticed that now, and I can't remember
them all. But Luke Malcolm has continued from
the steering group but also includes folks
like Michael Norman at UIUC to give us some
cataloging expertise and things like that.

And that's it. And I guess we can
open it up for questions.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library
of Michigan.

I think we're open for Council
questions now.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs,
Stanford University.

Since, Jeff, you went last, I'll
ask the fist question of you. I have
questions of others as well.

The pick-list that you built, was
that also picked through by Google? Were they
accepting anything that you chose to send
them?

MR. SWINDELLS: Well, there's a
couple of things. The way pick-lists are
created is you essentially send them your
catalog records for things you're willing to
send. I mean, you may actually decide to
reserve some back. We're hoping that people
push through as much as possible. But we
recognize that some people have special needs
that may require retention of their print.
But you send them those records and they
compare it to what's already been digitized
and then send you back that list. From that
pick-list though you then need to make some
judgments on whether it fits their guidelines
because they can't tell from the cataloging
records whether they can actually handle these
materials. So, size, format, whether they're
full of lots of colorful inserts, things like
that. And then once that's back, then you
send as many of those as you can to Google.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Jill Moriearty,
University of Utah.
Mary, what are you doing with the weeded items?

MS. PROPHET: Well, a couple of things. We do put them on the needs and offers list and anybody who asked, the hearings are being weeded widely across the country right now and so there's not much request for those hearings.

If we do get requests, we send them out.

Almost everything that we weed within our collection, both documents and otherwise, we send -- there's a couple of groups, Better World Books, and those kind of places. We work through them and if they won't take them, at that point we do recycle them.

MS. MORIEARTY: It sounds like a good plan.


I've got a couple of questions, too, but I'm going to start with Geoff.
Can you enumerate for us Google's format, size and condition standards?

MR. SWINDELLS: Actually, no, I can't. Standard size books, no inserts, no problems with sort of -- well, yes. No bound widths and no crumbly paper, essentially. Oh, and that is a lot of material, we recognize that. And so we actually at Northwestern have our preservation folks are going to do that part of it.

MS. SANDERS: By non-standard size books do you mean larger than 8½ by 11? And smaller than 8½ by 11?

MR. SWINDELLS: No. The range is broader. The range is broader but for instance Atlases would be a real problem.

MS. SANDERS: Pamphlets and ephemera?

MR. SWINDELLS: Huh?

MS. SANDERS: Pamphlets and ephemera?

MR. SWINDELLS: Pamphlets sometimes can go unless they are a folded
pamphlet and then there's some problems.
Well, because pamphlets aren't always folded,
the definition of pamphlet.

But we will bring all those in.
We're getting as much through Google as
possible but then bringing them in through
other ways.

MS. JARRETT: Peggy Jarrett,
University of Washington Law Library.

I have a question for Judy. So,
this ASERL proposal which I've read that I
understand the idea of what you're trying to
get at but my basic question is, how does this
improve access to the public?

MS. RUSSELL: I think we see the
major improvement to access coming by
cataloging and by having people in different
institutions who are focused on expertise in
given areas. So, those of us who are
operating Centers of Excellence and we have
three that are in process right now. One at
South Carolina for the Department of
Education, one at Kentucky for the WPA and
we're doing the Panama Canal Commission at Florida. So, they're just prototypes of this. We then have expertise in those collections. When I got to Florida and started talking to selectives that we serve, what I heard loud and clear was that the thing that we could do that was most helpful to them would be to catalog our holdings because they're making deselection decisions assuming that we have things because we're a regional but with no real assurance. And so we're getting arbitrary management. We're getting management based on hope, you know. We hope they have it or they're hoping that when we get a disposition list we're checking and if we don't have it, we're willing to grab it which is a random process for filling in the blanks but doesn't really create an orderly comprehensive solution. So, I think the cataloging is a huge part of it and just a greater coordination among ourselves. So, we really are doing some systematic collection building.
MS. JARRETT: As a practical matter though do the ASERL libraries, and this is my lack of knowledge, do they provide inter-library loan services or basically if it's an academic institution if you're weeding your collection and you had the physical collection and a patron wanted something in a tangible form, not in electronic form, and in the old model they could go to their local depository which might have been a major research university and see that. And now another library has that some distance away. Are you then shifting the burden to the public library to provide the inter-library loan service for that public patron?

MS. RUSSELL: No, I don't think we're shifting it. As regionals we're not getting rid of anything we have. So, the change for us as regionals is instead of a sort of a random retrospective collecting, we'll have focused retrospective collecting and we'll really work in a targeted way at it and we'll draw materials from across the 10
states to fill in areas where we've said that we're going to be responsible.

But we'll still have everything we now have. So, we'll be able to deliver from that. We're expecting that we will continue to provide inter-library loan.

We are hoping that for many patrons, and this is true actually at the high density storage facility that we're building where we're dealing with monographs and serials and other types of materials as well, that the primary delivery will be digital. And so we're expecting that we'll rely heavily on what comes out of CIC, what comes out of the initiatives at GPO and other places to offer the patron first an electronic access but if that isn't suitable to meet their needs, then we'll have print.

So, I don't see it really as a lessening. I'm going to have everything I have, but the catalog part of agency "X" may be at Georgia or at the University of North Carolina. And so it will be easier to know
that Georgia or Florida has it or Georgia or North Carolina has it. But if they come and make an inquiry of Florida, we're still going to obviously check our shelves and if we have it, we'll deliver it. We're not going to send them away if we have it. Does that help?

You're not hearing us?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Judy, can you talk to us more about the Centers of Excellence idea that's in there and what are the subject focuses? I'm really interested in this, you know, Library of Record kind of idea that seems to be bubbling up around the community.

MS. RUSSELL: And it's very similar I think to what you were describing as your Library of Record. I can give you an example of what we're doing with the Panama Canal Commission.

We have inventoried our holdings.

We have catalogued our holdings. We have committed, which the other centers it's an
optional thing, but we've committed to
digitizing that collection so that we will be
able to provide digital access to everything
we have, both for our own users but nationally
and internationally.

We have done research to try to
identify publications of the Commission and
its predecessor agencies that we may not hold
so that we have an affirmative needs list of
things that were missing. And we're actively
seeking to fill in those blanks. As a result
obviously of working with that collection and
because we have a major Latin American
collection anyway at Florida, so it really
fits the parameters of institutional need and
interest. We're developing expertise so that
if people are interest in research, we're
coming up on the 100th Anniversary of the
opening of the Canal. We think there will be
a lot of additional interest about the Canal
in the coming years that we will have the
expertise to be able to assist them with it.

So, that's sort of the broad
parameters of what we're doing as a Center of Excellence. But the components of cataloging and of trying to identify what the comprehensive list of publications is, whether or not they were distributed by GPO to try to definitively determine what we should have so that we can then actively seek to fill in the blanks or at least identify the people who have things.

We've talked among ourselves. Obviously, if another regional has something we're missing, they can't transfer it to us. Their collection is locked. Our collection is locked, but we could get a digital surrogate from them or we could ask them to do a photocopy and provide that to us so we would at least have a copy of that material available.

MS. TUBBS: This is Camilla Tubbs, Yale Law Library.

I'm also curious about the Centers of Excellence and coordination amongst the reference librarians at these different
How are you working to inform subject specialists in Georgia and connecting them with subject specialists in Kentucky to make sure that there is a cohesive plan in effect? Do you have instant messaging available? Are the reference librarians working ahead of time to create electronic research guides to inform other reference librarians?

MS. RUSSELL: We are committed to doing LibGuides and similar kinds of reference materials which then can be linked from other institutions. Obviously, we're still in the very early stages of this and so we only actually have three Centers of Excellence committed to now, although we're in the process of discussing among ourselves who else is ready to proceed in this process. But, yes. We're expecting that there will have to be significant coordination within ASERL and within all of the depositories that we represent. So, not just
in the 28 ASERL members but across the entire region.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron.

Judy, I have a question about the disposition materials process. So, ASERL will be using a separate tool for its process if I understood you correctly. Are there plans to continue to offer nationally or to allow institutions to offer the materials nationally in some form, whether through the new GPO dispositions materials tool or the other existing processes that we have in place?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. There is very much an understanding that once we've done our regional process that we would then provide information about those materials to the national process.

We're looking at getting a tool and getting it up fairly rapidly and with actually probably less complexity than what GPO is having to do because if we've got common disposition processes, it's a lot
easier to develop a tool against a single set of disposition processes where GPO has the challenge of dealing with 49 processes with a considerable variation. We saw considerable variation just among our 12 regionals.

But we do see the need to extend certain things to the national needs and offers list as well but we're trying to get something that at least is workable for us across our own states first.


I've got another question for Judy. I was intrigued by this new document from the Directors with their basic assumptions or principles, I guess, is the term I should be using. Particularly the one about that state plans should be modified.

I worked in the southeast but it was a number of years ago and it was before Tennessee had a state plan. So, I'm not up to date with the individual state plans involved. But certainly our experience in Michigan is
that sign off by any institution on a state plan is a voluntary activity. And it's also been our experience that if we write a state plan that everybody agrees with, we don't achieve very much.

We've always operated on the principle that a state plan should be principles we can all agree to aspire to as opposed to something that we already agree to.

So, I'm a little intrigued by the idea that you would like to modify state plans so that none of them exceed Title 44, and I thought maybe you could comment on that.

MS. RUSSELL: And I can't speak as much for ARL on that, but let me speak for what's happening in ASERL because it's also one of our initiatives. The next phase for us is we've already begun examining our state plans where they exist. And some of us at Florida don't have state plans.

In Florida we're in the process of developing a state plan. But I guess I have a relatively different concept of a state plan
than most of the state plans I read which seem to be largely regurgitation of GPO guidelines. They don't seem to be plans. They don't seem to be action plans. So, in Florida we're working on an action plan of what are the things that we are going to be doing with our documents collections to make them more visible, more acceptable, more useful.

And so we'll start with a state plan that actually -- a lot of the ideas that ended up in the ASERL plan were things we have already identified as things we wanted to do and needed to do.

In looking at some of the other state plans, as I say, the thing that struck me was for many of them, they're not really plans. And, you know, they're kind of more restatements of what are your obligations. And we know what the obligations are. They're in Title 44. That's nothing unique or useful about that. So, trying to look at places where state plans may have obligations or restrictions that go beyond what is required.
by Title 44, I think is what the ARL Directors are asking for, that there just be a review and that we be sure that we don't have state plans that are overly constraining, particularly against initiatives like the CIC where we all are going to benefit from the work that they're doing, because it will allow all of us to link print collections to their digital collections and better serve users.

So, I don't know if that completely answers it. I'm not familiar with the state plan of Michigan so I can't really speak to that one. But that is the approach we're taking within ASERL is to compare the state plans and to compare them against the proposed process. And if there are areas where there is a conflict, to try to get the state plan amended so that it doesn't conflict with the direction that we're going in our process.

MS. SANDERS: And do you anticipate opposition?

MS. RUSSELL: No, I really don't.
You know, I think most of the state plans are like many strategic plans where they get written, filed and forgotten. And so just pulling them off the shelf and running them back around and having people look at them again might actually be helpful.

But, you know, I can't speak for what may happen in other parts of the country because I'm just not that familiar across the board with what the state plans are. But we're seeing it as part of this whole process that if we're getting our selectives and our regionals to review the ASERL proposal and to accept it, then they should have no objection to having a state plan that conforms with it.

So, the two things really shouldn't be in conflict.

MS. SANDERS: Thanks.

MS. RUSSELL: Ideally.

MS. SANDERS: Any more questions from Council?

MR. JACOBS: Sorry to Bogart the mic.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.
I'm really interested in this idea of, and this is maybe for all three of you, the idea of access today versus access tomorrow, long-term preservation. Because I'm seeing, for example, the ARL statement is saying that they're not going to focus on digital preservation. They don't think that's required. The Google scans are not preservation level scans. I know that from our project as well. And it seems like libraries are also assuming that primary access is going to be digital which I'm all for. And things like ILL are going are going to be, you know, scanning of copies. Is anyone thinking about access for the future? Preservation? Digital preservation? I'd like to hear your thoughts.

MR. SWINDELLS: Well, I can tell you that the Google scans are complicated. The fact of the matter is, CIC will preserve them over time and through Hathi. And there are preservation plans in place for those scans to migrate over time.
The initial scans you're right. They're not, they don't meet GPO guidelines, etcetera. But it's actually going to be much more mixed. There's going to be a lot of content coming in to Hathi from a whole variety of sources and including the CIC project which will bring in some materials that will probably be scanned at a much higher level.

So, we'll have to see. We do know that Hathi will make sure that the materials that it has and you're only seeing the sort of presentation copy of them, but that those files are preserved over time. So, there is preservation there.

MS. RUSSELL: And going back to our Center of Excellence. Where we're digitizing the Panama Canal materials, we are doing them at preservation level and we are expecting that we will host them locally. We've also offered them to GPO for FedSys when they're at a point where they're ready to receive them.
I think I wouldn't over-read the ARL statement. I think each of us is doing digitization and each of us has a plan for how we host and maintain the things that we digitize collaboratively through Hathi or in other ways. I think the concern is that to have an expectation that as regionals, much as we receive everything that's printed, we would receive everything with digital and take on that responsibility, I think, is where ARL is drawing a line and saying that isn't appropriate and that really doesn't deal appropriately with access and preservation, that it is better to have central facilities like Hathi or Portico and FedSys that are certified repositories and that manage those collections.

We make distinctions right now on things that we digitize. So, if we're digitizing brittle books through Internet archive, we don't load those masters back on our system. But if we're digitizing theses and dissertations, those are our content.
We're going to host them no matter who else has them. So, I think you're going to see that kind of distinction.

I would certainly love to see all the digitization being done at preservation level. I recognize when I was at GPO that as soon as Google started the Google books digitization and government documents were getting into it that it had a chilling effect on getting people to be willing to invest in the preservation level of digitization at great expense when you had free digitization relatively. No free lunch. There's a lot of prep work that goes into that. But you have the access level copy.

On the other hand I think for many needs, particularly where we're going to continue to have strong print repositories, the access copy has enormous value, at least in getting an immediate gratification to the user and very rapid access. Faster than I can ship it to them and, you know. So, you know, it's a compromise in a lot of ways but I
think, you know, I'm so happy to have access
to and will link, you know, everything I can.
And when we get a request for a loan we'll
look for a digital copy and make sure the user
at last knows that that option is available.

MR. SWINDELLS: Just one piece to
that. I mean the CIC project is only one
piece of Hathi. Hathi is only one piece of a
larger environment. And so I hope that, you
know, a thousand digitization projects bloom.
And that we have a much more variegated
landscape. But the Hathi -- the CIC project
was to get a lot up fairly quickly.

MS. SANDERS: I realize that we've
only got a couple of minutes, but if there's
no more questions from Council, I'd like to
take at last a couple from the floor. And I'd
like to remind everybody to keep those
questions because we will have an opportunity
at tomorrow's session to come back to this
topic.

Why don't you go ahead.

MR. BASEFSKY: My name is Stuart
Basefsky. I'm from Cornell University.

I applied most of what I hear going on here. I think a lot of it is logical and makes a great deal of sense.

I'm concerned though about the intentions of Title 44. Most of what I'm hearing about the partnerships here, and please explain if there's something additional, is about the cataloging and access to these publications. But one of the intentions of Title 44 is the distribution of expertise to use them properly.

And so has any of that come up in discussion? What the public often needs to know and it doesn't matter whether you're a public library, academic library, special library how are these agencies merging? What were they before? How did they change? How did policy develop? How did we get where we were?

With GPO you have a controlled American history. Are we moving to a chaotic American history with no linkage? So, if any
of that has been addressed or is on the planning board, please let me know because what I'm hearing so far is very much one-sided.

MS. RUSSELL: Well, certainly with the ASERL project and with the Centers of Excellence there is an assumption that if you step up to the plate and you say you're a Center of Excellence that you will have expertise and that you will make that expertise available increasingly. And we could do a show of hands, but maybe don't want to.

We're seeing government departments merged into other departments and we still have a department for government documents and maps at GPO with a Chair and, you know, as a stand-alone department. So, Florida still has that kind of a local expertise that cuts across the entire collection. But so often users are not going to the government documents department. They're going to a subject expert and so we're
asking our government documents people to be

cross training people in other areas where
they're likely to get the subject question.

So, I mentioned we have a very

strong Latin American collection. I'm

expecting that the people in the Latin

American collection will know as much or more

about what we digitize and have available from

the Panama Canal Commission as what the gov
docs people do and we're actually digitizing

other material about Panama from the Latin

American collection. So, it's not going to be

an isolated government documents collection.

It's going to be enriched by the fact that

it's part and parcel of a broader perspective

that we're providing.

But, again, that's an individual

institution. I think as regionals we all

still have responsibility and every selective

as well to try to meet constituent needs. But

I don't know if either of you want to speak to

that.

MS. PROPHET: Yes, I think part of
the way we're addressing that and it doesn't come out when I talked about it is a general across-the-board training between the institutions where we help each other in different expertises in different areas.

We haven't addressed maybe the way he's describing it, but we do do a lot of that cross training. And that cross training is also done with the State Library of Ohio and with the other depositories in the state to a certain extent too.

So, I think it's there. It just may not be as obvious as the other and it may not have been addressed as obviously in these presentations.

MR. SWINDELLS: The CIC project is exclusively a digitization and also a late down the road a sort of print management project. But the CIC heads of government publications are committed to really finding ways to further expertise within the CIC and I know that's one of the areas that John Schuler who is currently heading the CIC heads
is very committed to. So, that's certainly
within our view, not just part of this
particular project.

MS. SANDERS: Final question.

MR. WOODS: Steve Woods, Penn
State.

I did want to make some
clarifications from some of the things that
Geoff said. And when he's talking about what
we sent, we're actually sending why fors so
that does include committee prints as well.
Essentially, we have these digital
collections. We're getting rid of the paper.
So, we're sort of shipping.

To answer James' question about
this pick-list. If you sort of think about
Hathi as a really quick way to provide full
digital access, none of this snippet stuff to
these materials. Okay. And what Hathi is
really providing is copyright clearance for us
to be able to provide full access to these
materials. But that said, if you keep in mind
it's all based on a pick-list. So, it's not
going to be comprehensive. It's going to be based on a pick-list related to what Google doesn't have.

Now, that doesn't mean that we can't come back later and fill in those holes, but what it's providing to you folks is access to that material that you searched in Google Books and you got stuck with a snippet. Okay.

I guess one of the questions that I have for you folks and I know you guys have been talking about this concept of comprehensive list, to me it's not just about comprehensive list but it's a mechanism for managing that comprehensive list. And in my mind it's something that I really hope you as Council challenge GPO to help us do. Because when we talk about managing a comprehensive list, what people are wanting to do is they're wanting to determine whether or not there is a digital object that's out there so that the directors want to weed.

Is there a way that they can create a tool that allows us to manage our
tangible collections? Not only that but as these digitization projects move ahead, I've got to be assured that the digital object actually got scanned right, that it was done well. I will say, you know, where Google is going to give you the best possible at this time of mass digitization access. But I would hope that you as Council would challenge GPO to come up with some sort of comprehensive tool, not just defining comprehensive, but a tool to help not only these folks who are trying to work cooperatively to manage, but to also help us manage our collections.

MS. SANDERS: Okay. I think that we need to cut this off. We're due for a break and we appreciate everybody's participation.

CHAIR SEARS: Before you leave, just one moment.

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: We ask for more.

MS. SANDERS: Dan, we will have time on Wednesday for questions I promise. We
will be reviewing each of the sessions on Wednesday and we will have time for questions on Wednesday.

I do need to remind the audience that the regional meeting is open to everyone, not just the regionals today. It is in this room from 2:00 to 5:00 and my understanding from the agenda which, David, you can correct me if I'm wrong, is that the Title 44 revision discussion is the 4:00 to 5:30. Okay.

And the 10:30 session that's in here is a Council session on authentication. In your agenda that has been left off. And I do have one more reminder and that is that the law librarians and friends need to sign up for the 6:15 dinner by noon.

And I'm sorry. If you're going to talk, can you please go outside while I'm finishing. Thank you.

The law librarians and friends have given me an announcement. It's the sign up for the 6:15 dinner is by noon and the group will meet at 5:50 in front of the
registration desk to walk to the Sine Irish Pub which is at 1301 South Joyce Street.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, off the record from 10:06 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.)


My name is Camilla Tubbs. I'm a reference in government documents librarian at Yale Law School. This Council session is also brought to you by Sally Holterhoff, she will normally be sitting right to my left. And Peggy Jarrett from the University of Washington.

So, authentication of government information has long been a concern of law librarians and legal researchers. Now, I can remember when I first became interested in
this topic and it was during a fall FDPL Council session and one of the speakers brought up a reference to Animal Farm. And in Animal Farm seven commandments were posted and they were trying to keep order on the farm and it was the law and regulations for the animals.

Now, since not all of the animals could remember these commandments, they were painted on the side of the barn. Now, over time some of these commandments in the middle of the night were altered and additions were painted on secretly and over time about six of them completely disappeared or they were so altered that even the animals who could not normally remember the laws noticed that something was strange. And this Animal Farm concept has been a long-term concern with lawyers, law librarians and legal researchers across the country.

Now, traditionally we rely upon GPO to provide us with the authentic official version of the laws so we don't have to worry
about somebody corrupt out there changing or altering the laws that we hold ourselves to.

Normally, or traditionally we refer to the print versions of laws, regulations that were sent to us by GPO. But over time this concept has evolved and now we are looking more and more to electronic citations. The Blue Book, which is the leading publication for legal document citations by lawyers and legal researchers has recently been amended to allow to electronic citation of official Internet sources or exact digital scans of print sources.

So, law librarians have been harping on this authentication issue for a long time but it became a matter that we've noticed in Council that this issue actually could have concerns for researchers and scholars outside of the legal discipline. And so that's what we will be discussing in this Council session today starting with Scott Matheson, who is the Web manager at the Yale University Library. He'll provide a general
overview of authentication.

Followed by that, Tim Byrne to my right who is the Senior Outreach Librarian at the United States Department of Energy will continue this discussion and discuss manipulation of government data which will reinforce the importance of authentication.

And then finally Stuart Basefsky, I hope I pronounced that right, who is the Senior Reference Librarian at Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations. He will also discuss the importance of authentication in different disciplines.

After each one of these speakers has run about a 15-minute discussion I will open up the questions for Council. And then after that I would also like the conference participants to offer their questions and comments.

So, with that, I will start with Scott.

MR. MATHESON: All righty. Does
this one work or should I use the other?

All righty. So, first off I
wanted to start with some definitions. I'm
going to do some overview work on kind of
authentication, what it is, why we care and
how it works. And then Tim and Stuart will
talk more about the actual examples of how and
why it's important in work outside of law
because we thought that maybe people were sick
of hearing us talk about the U.S. Code and the
CFR and all the legal materials.

So, when we talk about "official,"
and remember those of you who have been here
for awhile will remember we talked about
little O official and big O official and if
we're talking about official, AALL defined it
in their authentication survey from three or
four years ago as an official version of
regulatory materials, statutes or session laws
or court opinions as one that has been
governmentally mandated or approved by statute
or rule. It might be produced by the
government but does not have to be.
Okay. So, somehow it's a record of data that is deemed official by an authoritative source.

GPO defines official a little bit differently because they have a defined scope under statute to only deal with certain materials, so their definition from their authentication page is content that is approved by, contributed by or harvested from an official source in accordance with accepted program specifications.

Now, when they say "official source," it's a little lower case "o" so according to program specifications kind of is what fills in the gray area and what is official according to GPO. So, things within the scope of the FDLP. So, that's official.

When we talk about authentic, I was reading a lot about this and thinking about this. And then I found through ResourceShelf actually, Mike Wash's blog post on authentication and it's very brief. I commend it to you if you want to Google that.
and read it yourself. It's brief and it is very enlightening.

Authentic is an adjective.

Authentication is a verb. It's something that we do. So, Mike's idea is that it's a two-part process and that the first part is to get an item from a source you trust, so you're going to go get a file, a digital object in our case. And then you're going to determine that that item has not been changed since the source that you trust gave it to you.

And there's some math we can do that will do that, and that's sort of how digital signatures work. We'll go through some examples and then I'm sure there will be questions and maybe Mike will help me out.

AALL's definition of authentication largely mirrors this and it hinges on trust and on the ability to determine that something is essentially unchanged since it was promulgated by whoever created the information object. So, that's official and authentic.
Now, I want to talk a little bit about encryption. Don't worry, this is easy. Because as far as I'm concerned, encryption just means that you're encoded data. You've taken some information and you've encoded it in some way. The code can be secret if you're using it for security or the code cannot be secret if you're using it for error correction or even just to communicate in a specific language. If we encode this is ASCII text or UTFA text or HTML, we all know that code and we have tools to make use with it. But the data is encoded.

So, official, authentic and encryption. I have one more definition for you at the end and that's authentication. But I'm going to do a little demo first and we're going to talk about encryption and doing some checking.

So, I have some messages here, some information packets. I'm going to pass one to Camilla because it says To Camilla. I'm going to pass one to Tim because it says To
Tim.

Now, we have all sent a fax, right? Some of us have sent faxes a long time ago when you would write on the cover sheet. This transmission includes six pages including this cover sheet. Well, there's a big number on the front of the envelopes that I just passed and what does the number say? Camilla?

MS. TUBBS: Two.

MR. MATHESON: It says two. There should be two pieces of information in that enveloped. Are there two pieces of information in your envelope, Camilla?

MS. TUBBS: Yes, there are two pieces of information in my envelope, Scott.

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. You got all the information.

Tim, are there two pieces of information in your -- excellent. So, both of them got all the pieces of information I sent. Now, we arranged a little hash, a little checksum, an algorithm that Camilla and Tim are going to perform and they're going to
then check -- I did the same thing before I sent the information and I wrote it on the back of the envelope. So, they're going to check and see if the data that I actually sent them is what they got.

So, Camilla --

MS. TUBBS: Yes.

MR. MATHERSON: -- is your checksum match the one that I wrote on the envelope?

MS. TUBBS: It does, Scott.

MR. MATHERSON: Excellent. So, your data is correct.

Tim?

MR. BYRNE: I've added this twice now and it does not.

MR. MATHERSON: Uh-oh. So, something has gone awry. Time didn't get the right information and he knows that because when he did the little checksum hash that we agreed on, it didn't add up to the number that I got when I did it when I sent it to him.

So, either I'm bad at math, that's true, or something has happened to the information in
the transmission. Perhaps Stuart did something to it while he was -- so, I'm going to pass it to Tim again. I have a duplicate packet and I'm going to send it to Tim and we'll see if it gets there right this time.

Tim, there's two pieces of information. Do the math. And the number on the back flap matches?

MR. BYRNE: It matches.

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. So, now you both have the information that I sent and, in fact, I sent the same information to both of you so you both have the same information and we know that.

So, this was a very simple hash. It just involved adding things up. It's reverse -- very easy, not particularly secure. But we knew. You know, Tim was able to say, no, I didn't get the information that you sent. That's one way to do an error correction, not quite security authentication but we checked that the information that I sent arrived intact and that all of the
information was received.

So, there's a couple of different
-- you know, there's many different technical
ways to implement that sort of correction. We
don't think about that sort of encoding and
error correction and that sort of math a whole
lot but we use it all the time. Who has
listened to a CD? There's error correction in
your CD player, it works the same way.

Routers and switches. Anybody ever use the
Internet here? No. Yes, they're full of it.
Anybody a LOCKSS participant? This is how
LOCKSS checks among all of the little boxes to
make sure that the archival units are all the
same. It does a hash and they compare hashes.
They don't send all the data back and forth.
That would be really inefficient.

So, to make sure that we're doing
data correction we can use hashes. We can
also use encryption. We don't think about
this a whole lot but whose banked on line?
Anybody ever look for the little lock when you
get to an HTTPS? All right. Anybody ever see
the message that says the certificate is expired or out of date or invalid? Okay.

Send those complaints to me if they're from the Library because that's what I spend all my days doing. Not all of the Internet. I can't fix anybody else's certificates. I'm sorry.

But we think about, you know, we use encryption. We use the same sorts of math for SSL and for our encrypted WiFi connections. All of these things are pretty easy for us to use because they've been around for quite a long time. We don't have to think about them.

All right. So, when we think about authentication, remember it's an activity. It's a verb. It's something that we do. It can make use of encryption and often it does. Helps with security. But most importantly it's based on trust and I was actually really pleased it what Mary Proffet said earlier that kind of working together and making the system work is really based on trust and infrastructure. Because
that's exactly what we need for authentication
to work for the FTPL to move into the digital
era fully is trust and infrastructure and
we're going to talk a little bit about that
now.

I'm going to pass another message

but it's going to go all the way to Sally. I
can't reach Sally so I'm going to send it via
Camilla. And so when you send the message,
sometimes the message goes through just fine
like it did to Tim and sometimes something
happens to the message in transit. Maybe
somebody naughty does something that you would
not like or just bad stuff happens. There's
a flood, there's a fire, there's an
earthquake, whatever. Bad things happen
there. Sally, you can start doing the math
and see if it adds up.

All right. So, you guys work on
the math.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: Peggy's going to
help me but we're going to add this up and
wait a minute.
MR. MATHESON: Does it match?

MS. HOLTERHOFF: No, it does not, Scott.

MR. MATHESON: All righty. So, I don't have --

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I am shocked.

MR. MATHESON: I don't have another one to send but you saw things can happen and now we know that that didn't happen. But this trust relationship, now Sally and I know something about Camilla. We know that maybe there's a trust problem there because the data didn't get through quite the way we sent it.

This is the sort of thing that we think about. I mean, does this sound like we're going to put things somewhere and leave them until somebody can come pick them up? A message sound like depository -- federal depository library program. People are going to send you information. You're going to keep it until your patrons need it and come and get it. So, there's trust there. Your patrons
trust that you are being a good steward of the
information in tangible form or not. And they
trust that GPO is acting as an official organ
of the government promulgating whatever
documents they are asked to by Congress or by
the agencies.

So, there's two pieces of trust
there. There's the trust that the Executive
Office of the President publishes the budget
and that GPO doesn't muck with it between the
time that OMB sends it out and they print it
and that nothing happens to it between GPO's
plant and your library. And that then when
your patrons come in to look at the budget in
print, then that you haven't gone in, sneakily
cut out the figures and erased all the zeroes
or something like that. So, there's trust
there and we have that in the print and it's
very evident. Because if you went in and cut
out some zeroes in the budget, your patrons
would see that, right? They'd say, hey,
there's something wrong with this page.
Either you or somebody whose gotten access to
this has fiddled with the budget numbers. In the digital world that's a lot less obvious, especially to people who are not looking for problems.

Now, when we were passing the messages around, we were specifically looking to see if there had been problems. So, we were alert for it. If you're just looking at an image, a scanned image of a page or plain text on a browser screen, it's not at all obvious that somebody may have fiddled with that information or because I like to think people are generally good that something has gone awry in the storage or in the maintenance of that information and the numbers are somehow corrupted.

So, authentication really depends on what Mary said, the infrastructure and the workflows and the trust that we build up. And to move that into the digital era part of this -- who has heard about PKI when you're attending something? Oh, the PKI. That's part of extending this trust into the digital
environment is having this infrastructure where audited workflows and audited systems are able to trust one another and move information around in a way that allows us to have the same sort of trust in digital information, whether that's laws and regulations or Census data and geo-spatial data as we have in the printed products that we would have gotten from GPO or USGS.

So, this is not new stuff. There are two great references that I'm just going to touch on so that we've got them. One is a GAO report that Stuart found. It's called Information Management Electronic Dissemination of Government Publications. Pretty relevant. And that is, of course, on their site. The other one is a CLIR, Council on Library and Information Resources report. Has essays by Cliff Lynch, David Levy, kind of all your information science superstars.

Both of these documents -- one is from 2000 and one is from 2001. These are not new ideas. But just like it took about a
A decade for us to kind of incorporate the web, the Internet, the web into our everyday lives and work and workflows, so a decade on from these reports now we're starting to think about we've got FedSys that has over a dozen kind of primary source key publications and series that are now authenticatable using a digital signature provided you trust the GPO is a trusted provider, as we do in the print world.

So, you know, a decade on it's starting to become more common place and I think we'll see as more and more collections move into FedSys and as the tools become more robust and more common, we'll see it more and more and our patrons will come to expect it just like you expect to have a completely secure connection to your online banking or your insurance when you're doing that sort of work online.

So, I'm going to pass it on to Tim now who will talk a little bit about the details of some data.
MR. BYRNE: I'm actually surprised to be here. I really don't think of myself as someone who knows a great deal about authentication. But Sally was very persuasive when she called and asked me to be on this. And the more I thought about it, the more I realized that I probably did have some talents in this area that I wasn't aware of.

I have been at the Department of Energy's Office of Scientific and Technical Information for three years now, and actually into this month it will be three years where that I spent over 20 years at the University of Colorado as the Regional Depository Librarian there. And I'm still getting a lot of people I run into at this meeting who have known me over the years who, you know, are saying, Tim, what are you doing at DOE? Tim, what are you doing at OSTI? And I thought, geez, you know, I'm going to be giving a presentation here. It's a great opportunity for me to actually reach out and tell all of them. And so if you will just indulge me for
a minute, I want to, you know, give you a little idea of what I have been doing at OSTI and then I will try to sort of relate that to authentication.

So, some people are going to be surprised that I have actually been doing a lot more research at OSTI than I was doing when I was a librarian at the University of Colorado. I brought some of the things I've done recently.

This is a page from a article that I had a small part in. You can see that my name is sort of towards the end here. I had a small roll in this but I did get my name and OSTI's name on the document here. This has to do with the pre-electron laser in Hamburg.

So, this one was a study done for the Pacific National -- Northwest National Lab. And it had to do with chinook salmon. This is interesting because when I was at Colorado our recatalog was called Chinook. So, it's interesting for both of them.

So, again, you know, a joint
Here's one that is a little bit more library related having to do with information review on chemical emissions. So, I've been, you know, working a lot with these but I still found time to finish my doctoral dissertation. Here it is on Biomask Inversion. Yes, yes. I had a real good committee on this so it really helped. And this is a presentation I did recently where I weighed in on global warming. Now, a lot of you who have been to some of my presentations here at these meetings will really believe that I would stand up before an audience and talk about global warming and quality and one that doesn't think it's real is really stupid. But probably some of you are surprised about some of these other things I've been getting into. How many of you believed any of that? I bet a lot more people believed it than raised their hands because I actually --
I went and met with the guy at OSTI who was in charge of cyber security and I told him I wanted to talk about authentication. And we talked about it for awhile and then I said, well, let me show you my presentation. And I showed him printouts of these pages and he believed every one of them. And this is someone I've worked with the last three years.

So, no, what I did. I didn't write anything, you know, those five publications except for the global warming. I did write the title of that. I just went onto the information bridge, DOE's database of full text reports, downloaded random PDFs really and brought them into a W Acrobat Professional and put my name on them. And it was really surprisingly easy. I, you know, always thought that this would be something I'd like to do but I'd never actually done it before. So, this gave me that opportunity to do so and, you know, I did have fun with this.

I don't know how many of you really looked at my dissertation committee
here, you may recognize some of the people on it.

MS. MORIEARTY: Well, Tim, I did wonder about the committee and you getting a Ph.D but we weren't going to say anything.

MR. BYRNE: And this is, you know, what I wanted to demonstrate is how easy this is but the thing is I think this has happened a lot. And we don't really know how much it happens. We hear about candidates who exaggerate their military service or they may claim to have attended a university that they just attended a workshop at or something. But the fact that I think a lot of this goes on.

If I were to apply for a job and submit with my rhizome copies of these articles that I'm claiming to have written, they're not going to go look for the articles. They've got them right there in paper. They look good. They're going to believe it. So, this happens a lot and we really don't hear about it unless it's a really big scandal.

In my first professional library
job, the library had a business manager. A very nice woman. She kept trying to fix me up with her daughter. Her daughter drove a nice car but other than that there wasn't much to say for her. But after a few years, one of the business manager's staff noticed some discrepancies in the deposits of the photocopy money and reported it to the director who then reported it to the police. And they discovered that this woman had been embezzling from the library for many years. And the estimates were between a half million and a million dollars that had been embezzled.

So, as they looked into her they discovered that not only did she not have the master's in accounting that she claimed on her original application, she didn't even have the bachelor's in accounting that she claimed she had. So, after a couple of changes at the university, first the library director was fired and secondly, the university started requiring authentication of degrees that new hires were coming in. So, they had to prove
that you actually had that degree.

And so when I went to the University of Colorado I wasn't surprised to see that they did the same thing. They required that all new faculty hires had to supply copies of either the transcript of their last degree or a copy of their diploma.

I don't think they ever really had a problem with this at CU, so it really wasn't something that they worried too much about. It was more of it was just one of those things that you had to have checked off, you could start work. Because they didn't require an official version of the transcript. They just required a photocopy.

Now, you give me the right software, I can make a nice diploma and I can do a transcript probably pretty well too. So, it would be pretty easy to fake thee things. So, until you actually run into a problem and really say, okay, we've got to have authentic versions of it, then people really don't check. They don't check real closely. So, we
really don't know how much of this sort of
ting is going on.

Now, I use this example of, you
know, taking credit for publications just
because it was easy to do and it was fun. But
the other aspect is it is as Scott was
talking, where the data in a publication can
be changed. So, I tried playing around with
this. I actually went to GPO and got the
budget and because of the authentication that
they've done, it wasn't nearly as easy as the
other ones that I had done.

I think that if I really wanted to
take the time, I could have broken the
certification and really done something with
it. But I didn't want to do that because I
can go to other spots in the government and
find the budget that wasn't authenticated.
And in those cases I could have made change
too except that the W Acrobat that I had
didn't have the same font that the budget
uses. So, I probably could have found that
font too. But I did continue on and here is
a page from the Department of Energy. I took it off of the Department of Energy's website. It's the FY 2011 Statistical Table of Appropriations. And this is a section for the Office of Science and the Office of Scientific and Technical Information is part of the Office of Science so we can go down here and see. There is a line here. Maybe I can make this bigger for you. So, here we see OSTI and these numbers look really good.

They look good for two reasons. They look good because I added $10 million to OSTI's appropriations. And then because you can't tell that I did that.

Now, it really doesn't do much for OSTI for me to just add this onto a document. But it made me feel good. And the thing is that if someone were to take a document, change the data in it and put it up and redistribute it, it's really hard to tell that this information is changed. You really have to compare it against an authenticated version.
And exactly what I was thinking would be something that could really happen is that you could take a document that may be done by a climate scientist that showed evidence of global warming. And you could change the data and you could make it so that it actually argues against global warming. And then you could take that document and you could put it up on one of the global warming doubter's web pages or blogs and say, this is a government report that was suppressed by the government because it actually proved that global warming isn't happening. And I bet you that document would be disseminated all over the world in just a matter of days.

And then even if you said this document is a fake, they wouldn't believe it. And you'd have a real mess out there with this document arguing against it. So, it's real easy to do. And it's one of the reasons why we need authentication.

So, I've given you some examples of things that I have actually downloaded from
the Department of Energy and made the change, especially from OSTI. So, why doesn’t OSTI worry about authentication of online documents that we have about the other agencies?

I talked with our cyber security specialist and it’s because it’s a theoretical issue. We can talk about the possibility of it but right now it’s a very low likelihood risk and at this point we’re unwilling to invest a lot of money on a low likelihood risk. So, that means that for this really to be something that OSTI and other federal agencies really would give a lot of attention to there has to be one hell of a scandal. And it has to be something that’s not just an embarrassment to the government. But it actually causes serious demonstrable harm to the American people.

So, a person from OSTI was saying, you know, that he really believed for anything really to happen for Federal agencies, for OSTI especially to really move in and do something about authentication, it would have
to be probably a government-wide initiative or at least a department-wide initiative before they could really start devoting the funds to do this.

So, I hope I've demonstrated that this is more than just a law librarian's concern. It's something that we all need to be concerned about and I hope I've done it in a memorable fashion.

MS. TUBBS: Thank you.

Now, we'll move onto Stuart who will show different uses and other disciplines outside of law where authenticated information takes place in research.

MR. BASEFSKY: Okay. Actually, I was a little bit surprised that this topic was on the agenda here because back in 2001 the General Accounting Office -- at that time called the General Accounting Office, did a study on information management and electronic dissemination of government publications and it was largely settled policy that the government is obligated to authenticate. But
people keep questioning the need for authentication so that's why I'm here, I suppose.

I'm giving you the prospectus from the social sciences. As you can see from my title, I'm the Senior Reference Librarian at the School of Industrial & Labor Relations. I'm also a lecturer and I'm also the Director of an Internet news service on workplace issues.

I talk fast, and remember you're listening too slow. But there are all sorts of psychological studies that indicate that if you move fast, and you wear glasses people think you're intelligent. So, I hope I don't disappoint.

Okay. In any event, this is the prospective of the social sciences and why invite me? I'm at a library, the Catherwood Library that is known as the world's largest university collection on workplace issues. We deal with all of the social sciences through the lens of the workplace. So, we deal with
labor law, employment law, arbitration, labor economics, human resources, psychology and sociology of work. It goes on and on and on. Any of the social sciences, you name it. As long as it's related to workplace in any way or another, we focus on that social science through that lens.

Now, as I make my presentation today, this is from my perspective a very, very serious issue. I'm going to define what I'm talking about. I'm going to give some specific examples and I'm going to relate the significance.

Like I say, this is a serious matter. How serious is it? Well, one of the things that we forget about is the U.S. Government issues currency. That is a government document. Don't forget it. And it's insured if it's deposited in a federally insured bank by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. Now, that is the print version of the dollar. When it goes into your bank you have the digital version of the
dollar. It doesn't look like the print version but the value is retained. The content essentially is retained. All the things that it was intended to have are there. When you go there you don't want to come out of the bank with bogus $100 bills. And you don't want to be sending stuff with your credit card realizing that it's really not working because it's not accepted.

You'll notice that there is a U.S. code provision here, regulations governing insured depository institutions that actually requires the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government to be behind that particular publication.

The Government Printing Office actually produces what I call the intellectual currency of the government, the intellectual currency. And deposits should be backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

Now there may not be a specific law requiring that but I'm going to go through
a demonstration process here indicating that
for all intents and purposes the U.S.
Government intends for the Government Printing
Office to authenticate and why.

And before I get into that, I have
two quotes at the bottom of this particular
slide that I think resonate with all of us.
One is attributed to Daniel Patrick Moynihan
in terms of the U.S and whatnot. We’re always
told, you are entitled to your opinion. We’re
hearing lots of opinions today in politics.
But you are not entitled to your own facts.

So, how do we determine what is a
fact? And if we can determine and by
authentication that that is, in fact, the
fact, what do we do with that? Well, then you
have Mark Twain who takes a kind of humorous
perspective on this and says you get the
facts, you can distort them later.

So, if we look at the National
Archives right now you can see that there is
a provision in there for the electronic
records management guidance on methodology for
determining agency unique requirements. And I give you a link to that particular publication on the net and as you go down a few paragraphs you're going to come up to what they give as the definition that they take from the International Council on Archives, the Guide For Managing Electronic Records From An Archival Perspective. But what we're concerned about here is the reliability of a record is it's ability to serve as reliable evidence. Authenticity refers to the persistence over time of the original characteristics of the record with respect to the context, structure and content. An authentic record is one that retains its original reliability.

Now, actually, one of the things--if you're going to say the federal repository system put all the federal depository documents and programs in with manuscripts and archives. Manuscripts and archives now in the electronic world have to be current. We don't wait 100 years for something to show up there.
You wait 100 days. Because in the electronic environment, everything is disposable and quick notice. And you'll get more respect because of you work with the manuscripts you get all the money in the world.

Okay. Now, in talking about this you have to know that you're dealing here with the general concept of a chain of reliability. Now, here comes the specific example.

In the Census when you look at how Census publications are produced, they actually refer you to the Office of Management and Budget. And in the Office of Management and Budget there is a thing called the Standards and Guidelines for Statistical Surveys. The link is there.

The first paragraph states: "Statistics collected and published by the Federal Government constitutes a significant portion of the available information about the United States economy, population, natural resources, environment, public and private institutions." These data are used by the
Federal Government and others as a basis for actions that affect people's lives and well-being. It is essential that they be collected, processed and published in a manner that guarantees and inspires confidence in their reliability.

Now, when we look at that chain, there's a lot that goes on. If you read into this document, how do you collect? Well, you collect in a lot of different ways. In my school, one of the things you're concerned about is the BLS Handbook of Methodology of Methods. Statisticians, academics go to a great deal of trouble to make certain that the right processes are gone through. They collect the data based on those processes, then they process the data. What's comparable, what's not comparable, what are the variables? Then it has to be published. And if the publication is not authentic, that chain of reliability is broken. You do not want to be in the position of offering a document where you've broken the chain of...
reliability.

Now, that chain of reliability follows on to the government, and particularly GPO's very concerned about it. But academic libraries should be concerned about the documents that their scholars are looking at.

Even in the print world, we have trouble. A lot of us rely on third party publishers like CIS, Congressional Information Service. I worked with them for years. I admire their work. I've actually helped them develop some of their publications and projects. However, I've told them on many occasions as a government documents librarian, which I was a number of years ago, we used to receive corrections to hearings, to committee prints, to statistical publications. They don't put any of those corrections in there. The academy is relying on those publications. It's just too expensive to fit into their workflow to add in the corrections. So, some people are doing their scholarly work based on information that may not actually be correct.
So, that's a problem in the print world. Can you imagine what that problem is now in the electronic world? Anyway, we do not want to break that chain of reliability.

Now, one of the things that concerned me because of where I work I actually collect government documents and we put it into our institutional repository and we don't use it as an institutional repository. We have it at our particular school. It's separate from Cornell's. We have over 13,000 materials in there, more than all of Cornell University together in our separate little school repository. We have 70 percent compliance with our faculty in doing it. But we also do a lot of other things. We work with the Department of Labor. We collect collective bargaining agreements. They cover a thousand workers or more from the Department of Labor. They rely on us to put that out there. These things are not authenticated.

I wish they were. We're doing the best we can. We're collectin...
available. The reliability of these things are in question to some extent. And when you're dealing with union busters out there, they would love to change what some clauses might have been or should have been or whatever in various kinds of collective bargaining agreements.

I also collect key workplace documents, anything dealing with the workplace. I'm upset that I collect Congressional research service materials from third parties because I can't get it from the original government office.

Has it been modified since I collected it? A question that academic librarians should be asking is where are you getting your documents on the Internet? Are you getting it from the original source? Are you getting it through a third parties? I mean if you're not documenting that, what is it that you're handing to your faculty and to the world out there? We know that Google does a sloppy job. What version are they
providing? All those things are really key.

Now, I do another thing. I run an Internet news service where I actually distribute links. I don't ever distribute documents. But links to the official authentic publications of the U.S. Government. But my audience is largely Europe. They are relying, International Labour Organization, the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions for comparative public policy purposes and data to do research and study and make certain that what we say that we're doing in the United States is reliable information.

The U.S. Government doesn't distribute the information. There's a lot of political reasons for that. I don't have time to go into it. But I distribute it on their behalf. And I would like to know that these things are authenticated. Very often they are not. And people are relying on it and it makes me nervous.

Now, when you talk about the
It's the body of principles and practices used by scholars to make their claims about the world as valid and as trustworthy as possible and to make them known to the scholarly public.

Citation is a very important part of that. The purpose is to identify, distinguish and locate documentation material relied upon in producing studies. This is done so that others may validate the findings and methods used. Original source documentation is preferred, often produced by the government.

Don't forget that GPO is original source documentation. It is more valued than the general collections. Academic librarians, public librarians, they need to know that the government documents are original source documentation. They are as valued as your rare books and your manuscripts and they should be given the same deference.
Important elements of a citation in online environment. Well, we know that we have a problem with citation. Everybody in the world of scholars, we talked about scholarship and we talked about scholarship light. The cut and paste dollars. Oh, I found this on the Internet. URL. This goes in my paper. Anybody checking it, you go to their working papers, oh, that disappeared. Where is it? Oh, I got to go look for the title for someone. Did I find it from the source that you found it from? I don't know. Where did you find this doggone thing?

The title may be the same. The content may be different. Who knows. But the purpose, again, of a citation is to verify the specific authentic reliable sources used so that others may replicate the findings. In the world of the Internet without that authentication, it's a mess.

So, what we have are issues of governance, trust, reliance, confidence. In brief, the role of government is at stake as
well as the reputations of scholars and scholarship itself.

Now, there are different perspectives that you can take on this. Another one would be, most of the states of the United States have rules against tampering with government records. Have you ever heard of the legal notion of an attractive nuisance like a swimming pool without a fence around it so kids can go in there and drown?

Well, if you have laws on the books that make it illegal to tamper with government records, I mean, you create government records that are easily tampered with, you're created an attractive nuisance and we are drowning in that instability.

So, anyway, that's enough. Okay.

MS. TUBBS: Thank you to our speakers. I now invite questions from Council.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: All right. Tim, where's your diploma for Ph.D? Can we see that please?
That's Sally Holterhoff, Valparaiso.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

Tim, I never believed you previously and now I really am not. I mean, however, other than the fact that I questioned the Ph.D, your last publication did suck me in. Knowing you, there was just enough truth and I think you made a very, very powerful point in that, humorously, but you did suck many of us in and we are highly skeptical.

But also I wanted to comment on our last speaker. You make an excellent point about the quality of the material out there. At the end of the semester I'm always asked by some professor to check on plagiarism. And how they see it as absolutely rampant. But part of it is that it's not that rampant, it's the fact that you're looking for this material and it is gone, especially in the government publications and scientific area. And so they immediately assume plagiarism when actually
it's just it's no longer there.

MR. OTTO: Justin Otto from Eastern Washington University.

For the panel, I'd really like to know your opinion of the authentication of PDFs that PPO is now starting to do. Do you consider it a good first step? Do you consider it good enough? Please, I'd like to know what you're opinions are about it.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson.

I think it's a good first step. I think for a lot of things it might be enough for the sort of things that we think of as traditional documents. However, and this is where I think the summit that GPO held in June and where the Industry Day will be helpful is that we have a lot of data now that is really useful and that we depend on that can't easily be represented in a PDF. Things that are geospatial data, things that are data sets. Things that our patrons use that we can't easily wrap up in a PDF and authenticate using the Adobe tools that are kind of off the
shelf.

So, I think this is where GPO can really help break down ground in terms of validating really flexible formats like XML or in kind of validating arbitrary binary blobs, that sort of thing. The other area I see that there's some room for improvement or for work for GPO to be a leader is in terms of chain of custody. And so we talked about that a little bit, but in terms of having, and again the infrastructure is now coming up where you can have chain of custody directly from OFR to GPO to you, so you know what you got is actually not only what GPO says, the Office of Federal Register said, but actually what the Office of Federal Register said. Same thing with maybe the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House.

So, those sort of things where kind of across the government you could have the kind of continuous verification authentication. I think are areas that could be used could use some leadership from GPO but
I do think what they're doing now is at least a good first step. And it will help raise public awareness and hopefully maybe demand.

MR. BASEFSKY: Generally speaking, I go on the premise that, for example, the concept of digital preservation is an oxymoron. There's no such thing as actually preserving anything digital. It's always in a position to be further migrated into the latest technology.

You have to go under the assumption that the technology is going to change. The means of providing digital signatures, the ways of verifying information are going to change over time. I think the most that we can expect is that our government provide generally the best that's available at the time, and this is something that's going to progress over time. We're in a very fragile world where you can do a lot very quickly because of technology and because of technology it increases the risk of things can fall apart very rapidly as well. So, it's
I think that it's incumbent upon GPO and all the government agencies just to do the best they can out there with the technology that's available with the assumption that they're going to have to upgrade over time.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

Tim, if you want to be a coach, we'll find out that you don't have your Ph.D. However, if you'd like to be the Dean of Science, come on over.

I have to wonder because 10 years ago a faculty member in the business school asked for a data feed from a standard source. I think Stuart gets at this too. When he got the data, he noticed that there was an anomaly that didn't quite pan out. So, we went back and he checked and indeed the original supplier going through the vendor, who I will not name right now, it got mistranslated and the data was corrupted and we had to literally
go to the original source to get the content.

I made a note, number one, to ask Rick, okay. Did you note that? I'll find this paper and say, we had to do this in methodology. Number two, I have a whole set of discs that rely on that data and it is a common practice in accountancy to use this particular data in validating for which I'm at fault. I have not made a notation that says if you want to use this, you need to know it may not be accurate.

So, my point is two. Tim, how do we get the crisis that brings this to bear on this and the other half is, when did this become GPO's problem. I mean authentication, as Stuart has pointed out, has been with us all along. So, you know, are we solving a world problem here assuming that GPO is going to do it when, okay, GPO can have a slice of their content that indeed we can try and make sure we've done our due diligence to make it authentic. But after that, I don't know.

So, you know, the easy one, Tim,
is what's the crisis? How quickly can you produce it to OSTI so that GPO gets unlimited funding to authenticate each and everything that we've got.

MR. BYRNE: This is where I get really creative.

I think the crisis is out there. It may not be at OSTI but it's out there and it's going to happen some day.

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library.

I kept on thinking of the President's birth certificate as you guys were talking about authentication and how many different versions we've seen of that on the web. But, anyway, that's totally off topic.

Stuart, you mentioned CIS. This is something that I've also been concerned about both in print, Congressional publications as well as online. We've actually maintained our uncorrected hearings in our collection and stamped them superseded because I thought to myself if a scholar has
cited something from an uncorrected hearing
which was the authentic version at the time he
wrote his paper, and if later someone wants to
look at that citation and all of the copies of
the uncorrected versions have been disposed
of, how can that scholar prove that that fact
at that time actually existed?

So, I know that version control
which is my understanding of version control
is actually corralling the different versions
and describing them bibliographically or
whatever way so that they can be retrieved.

Version control is one thing, but version
authentication perhaps is a different topic
altogether. But how does version control and
version authentication fit in with
authentication because I see them allied?

MR. BASEFSKY: Well, you're
correct. They are allied. In the digital
world things are actually easier to manage in
a sense because you can say, well, what date
did you actually look at this thing. If you
have mechanisms -- we actually need to better
citation mechanisms so that when people pull their documents they get the information the date they pulled it, you know, they may mark it down, but there should be a digital record of that.

And if the digital background on the record they're looking at is somehow maintained, you know precisely what they've looked at. You know, nobody's bothered to go kind in that direction, but those possibilities exist. I mean, we're in a position right now in moving from print to digital world where we have to start thinking out of the box.

I've often wondered in a web world, why in the heck are we still using pagination. You know, we should be numbering all the paragraphs. So, if the paragraph number is not right, you know something got stuck in there in between from the time you looked at it or you were an idiot. You just marked down the wrong paragraph number.

But, you know, I can't solve those
problems, but the things is we need people in public policy addressing these issues. They are important to the longevity of our civilized society and there are all sorts of studies that indicate that civilizations are in trouble when they become extremely chaotic. And so it's a question of, you know, what levels of control are necessary? Some of them are costly.

Cost, you know, I like that expression. Let's see who is it by? Oscar Wilde, I believe. We live in a cynical world and the definition of cynic is the person who knows the cost of everything and the value of nothing.

MR. MATHESON: I would just add that, you know, where we have sort an elegant solution in the star print, in the print world, so even if your superseded copy were gone, you would know, oh, well, this is a correct version. So, perhaps, you wouldn't know what the data is, but perhaps they have an excuse for getting the data wrong.
That translates fairly well when we're talking about discreet digital objects, digital publications. But, again, it raises the real hard technical questions when you've got things that are data streams that change, you know, over time more or less infinitely.

And that's something that I think that's really an interesting technical question that probably needs to be solved sooner rather than later.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Thanks, everyone, for this panel. I think it was really interesting. You've really shown that authentication is a critical piece of what we do as libraries.

So, I'm wondering if the three of you want to comment. Do you see a role for FTPL libraries in digital authentication? PKI is the state of the art now but it's still trusting a third party. And do you see a role for possibly publishing all of our publications as a wiki?
MR. BYRNE: No.

MR. JACOBS: It's version control, right?

MR. BASEFSKY: My particular view is that the Federal Depository Library Program does and should continue to have a major role to play mainly because if a library has allowed itself to be designated as a federal depository library it takes on a quasi-governmental role. There are obligations that go with that. And we can question what obligations are necessary, what obligations are not necessary, but when it comes to the reliability of the publications, you're part of that chain of reliability. And if you're looking to have multiple access points for the public, those access points should be from a trusted source and the Federal Depository Library from my perspective has to be -- if those are going to be the dissemination points for agencies through the GPO, through the Federal Depository Libraries that role can be maintained.
Sometimes people don't know what they're looking for. So, just to have access to government documents doesn't help you. If you become a Center of Excellence, for example, and your specialty is a small area of transportation, and they know, well, you deal with that and they pick up a government document from there and they know that you are also a Federal Depository Library, they know they can pretty much rely on that. They don't have to go back to the agency that may or may not exist anymore to find it.

So, that's one of the rules. I mean, these agencies come and go. The depository system was created so that something would be lasting and reliable. And until they come up with an alternative of who is the third party you're dealing with? Which third parties are the most reliable third parties, you end up being like these stupid freshman in college who the world of information is all flat. They don't know the authority of things.
Oh, I found this. Oh, I found that and it makes a good paper. By whose standards?

MR. JACOBS: Just to feed on that.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.

I think Steve Hayes' point about checking data afterwards, I think that's a benefit of a FTPL library that is not currently on the benefits --

MR. HAYES: I just added it.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.

MR. HAYES: I look at it. I'm going, oh, if we had a benefit here, you know, if, indeed --

MR. JACOBS: What portion is a benefit?

MR. HAYES: -- trusted source resonates with a director of libraries in terms of we're the trusted source for fill in the blank here that you have a whole lot of content that is trusted source. Now, I have to look at the pen and ink changes that I've made or not made and the tips in and
everything else. But, you know, have they thought of this as a benefit. So, I just whipped David's note out and made a note.

MR. JACOBS: Thank you.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson.

I would just also chime in and say, well, digital authentication is kind of one more kind of tool in the tool bag of teaching students about authority and about teaching research is about authority and information which is kind of what we all do anyway. So, it's just one more piece of the puzzle that we need to incorporate.

MS. TUBBS: Any more questions from Council?

MR. JACOBS: No comment on wikis?

MR. HAYES: No more wikis.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: I have a question. Sally Holterhoff.

Tim you said that the person at OSTI was saying they're not willing to invest a lot of money in something that's a low risk. I mean, like did you show them your examples
of how easy it was to change some of the things? I mean, I guess I'm just wondering how much money would be too much or if technology -- if more tools are developed and more encryption, PKI stuff that's easier. That's one problem with state governments is, you know, in the legal field we've been trying to get the states on board following CPO's example. But it comes down to money. But there are starting to be, there are few, you know, sort of off the shelf type things that at least are some protection for states to maybe turn to. But I'm just wondering like, money-wise. How much is too much money?

MR. BYRNE: First let me point out that OSTI makes an enormous investment in cyber security in making sure that the servers that we have are protected from any sort of attack or invasion and that you can count on the documents being the authentic documents.

And that really is the attitude of the people. Because there are attacks on our servers and we get things, you know, people
coming in all the time. So, yes, they're very aware that this is a security issue and they really have to work very hard to protect the servers.

The authentication of the documents, as I said, it was a theoretical issue. There really has not been a problem that has been reported and then, you know, a big issue is made out of. So, that's why I say it has to be some sort of scandal that makes a big issue out of it. It forces the people at the top of the agencies to say, okay, this is going to be a priority.

In terms of how much money as we talked about it. He was willing to say that, you know, if GPO, you know, comes up with a system that is in a reasonable way for OSTI to authenticate documents in a fairly inexpensive manner, he'd be all for it.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

Sally was asking that question again or making notes over here. I see two
things. Number one, an academic career could be very well made on the cost of, you know, the deliberate or, you know, accidental use of non-authenticated, inaccurate, etcetera.

The second is, is I'm thinking, you know, at one time we knew people who knew people who would get someone within the Congress to ask for a GAO report to say I'd like to see a cost analysis of so what would be the cost downstream of an error of using an unauthenticated, inaccurate piece of whatever.

And third being the smart ass that I am, I'm thinking. Well, after GPO finishes the ideal marketing plan for convincing all directors on the importance of maintaining, etcetera, that you could, you know, take on the cost benefit and, you know, inaccuracies and send that out.

MR. BASEFSKY: Often you don't have to wait for a disaster to happen. You just have to give examples of what could happen.

What happens to a company if
somebody tampers with their 10-K report that just came out and investors abandoned that company because a competitor got in there purposely? What happens with military specifications where a contractor screws up because they didn't meet the specification? What if that satellite that came down that didn't work because somebody made a calculation in American math rather than using the metric system, had done so because he read a government document that said that that's how the calculation was supposed to be made? You know, to some extent I got back to my first slide. This is intellectual currency. The fear of financial chaos, military incompetence, the government -- it's just simply intolerable. That's all it is. We spend a fortune for military but if the military is basing its operations on material that can be tampered with, how secure is the military operation itself? That is a major concern, you know.

When you talk politics, you always
talk defense because everybody listens.

MS. TUBBS: Anymore questions from Council?

Anyone? Larry?

MR. MEYER: Actually two comments.

Larry Meyer, San Bernardino County Law Library.

First comment is, I think on behalf of at least some of the audience, I appreciate the fact whoever put this program together, whoever came up with the idea as well as the participants for one of the most entertaining, educational programs I've seen in a long time.

My second comment is a reminder if you want to enjoy dinner with the law librarians and their friends this evening, you've got until noon to sign up. We'll meet around the registration desk at 5:50. For those of you on tight budgets, the restaurant we are going to tonight is their prime rib special night.

MS. HARTNETT: Is there a response
Tim, I was interested when you talked about your attempt to grab and steal content from GPO that had digital signaturing on it and that it was a little bit harder. The fonts didn't quite match. If you were someone who was in a reasonable hurry, you probably would have just found the digital object elsewhere.

Even though I have not delved into LOCKSS much as a practitioner, to me that was like a LOCKSS moment where I thought, huh. Okay, that's an argument for LOCKSS.

Comments from Council.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

Yes.

CHAIR SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas.

Thank you, Cass, for saying that. I sat here and whispered over to Jill as Tim said that. I said, he said nearly. He didn't
say it was impossible. And he, you know, although he now has a Ph.D, he doesn't look to me like a computer geek like some of those I've seen hack into all kinds of things.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

I hope about a year from now, Stuart, for example, will consider writing a review of the government information that is available in HathiTrust. And anyone else who would be interested in doing that, I hope you will consider it. We will all thank you.

MS. WOLFBURG: Hello. Ava Wolfburg, University of Maryland library student.

In regards to citation, why haven't people lobbied MLA Chicago in changing citation? Major things like students could put copies of online web and attach them to their papers and it seems like that would solve a lot of issues in regards to plagiarism.

Thank you.
MR. BASEFSKY: It's basically an historical problem. A lot of these things are -- most of the citations are devised by professional associations, associated with academics and it becomes really a political issue within those associations of what they do or do not do.

The Blue Book is run by students of Harvard. It's also a political issue for them as well. If you get their ear, you get it done. If you don't get their ear, they rest another few years.

MR. JACOBS: Can I make one more comment on that?

MS. MCKNELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin. Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. JACOBS: Sorry, Michele.

James Jacobs, Stanford University.

If you're interested in citation you should check out Zotero because they allow the tool itself. It's a Firefox plugin. It allows the person who is citing a work, a website, whatever it is to take a snapshot in
time and to be able to link back and serve that out. Called Zotero.

MS. TUBBS: And I would also mention that even though the Blue Book allows for authenticated PDFs, there is for whatever reason, a miscommunication amongst students who sometimes feel that, well, I have a PDF. It was posted to the New York Times website or was posted somewhere else. So, as long as I have a PDF and it looks like it’s an authentic reproduction, I’m going to go ahead and cite to that.

So, a lot of the burden too is on information professionals to work with students to remind them what is an official, what is an authentic source that they can trust.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

I also wanted to say that because several of the professors at the University of Utah are involved in MLA. I know they have brought this issue forward time and time
again. But huge citation associations move so slowly and are made up of, can I say editorial boards who may not use the Internet in the same way their students already are? And so there's also a hesitancy to make rules too fast or make tools that might be too useful right now but are not going to necessarily stand the test of time to them.

MS. McKELLY: Michele McKnelly, University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

I would like to go back to the point that Stuart was making about materials needing to be preserved and captured immediately as opposed to this archival notion of waiting X number of years. And I was struck yesterday in a discussion of digital harvest and capture that databases and datasets are not part of the GPO's scrapes. Databases in the scientific and technical and social sciences are incredibly important and if we do not have the data, we cannot authenticate it. There's just sort of a sucking hole here that we're dancing around
and I'm very pleased with this panel and Dr. Byrne, in particular, for pointing out some of these issues. But there's more.

You know, we've made baby steps in certain areas, but there's more out here and we need to make these issue very important for everyone at every level. The political levels in our states and our congressional members, but also with the people at agencies that we know so that they understand that there is interest in making sure that this data is available for future scholars and that it is also authenticated.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: And following up on Michele's comment. I was going to say that one thought that we had for this panel and I think it's really happened is to get more people riled up about this because really it would be great if a program like this would be put on at different places besides here and besides in -- I don't know the associations of people that work in social sciences, not just the librarians because that is kind of what we
have been trying to do in the legal community is. We had a summit that AALL did and had judges there and people from state governments and some of them really, like, they were just making assumptions just like most of us do that well somebody's taking care of it. The government, you know, they don't trust the government on a lot of things. But they're trusting the .gov sites are protected and somehow it's getting taken care of by somebody else.

So, I guess that, you know, if there's anything people in this room could do would be to try to, you know, talk this idea to other people because we really got to get more support for this. It's only going to happen if enough people, you know. Unless there's the big incident that maybe doesn't need to happen, you know. The authentication needs to be worked on now and it's not going to happen unless enough people demand it.

MS. TUBBS: Dan and then --

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University.

Tim spoke of the experience at OSTI and DOE and I wondered sort of extrapolating that to the rest of the Federal Government and you probably can't speak for the rest of the Federal Government but I wondered if -- you know, at least not accurately. If maybe, I don't know if there are others in the audience from GPO or elsewhere, but I just wonder, as I understand the way you described OSTI's approach, that they're sinking their resources into their technical infrastructure to protect that so that anyone from the public or anyone at all who goes to their sites can be assured that that material is authentic, accurate and so on. And that's one approach.

And another approach is to, you know, try to build into the infrastructure that downstream use of that materials is also authentic and those things aren't mutually exclusive but they're different. So, I just wonder what -- if that's the approach that
OSTI is taking is a common approach throughout other federal agencies and to what extent, you know, when we go to other federal websites and go to those sources for things, how assured we can be that they're sinking in those same kinds of levels of resources and assurance? Just a question.

MR. BYRNE: I think OSTI’s case is pretty typical of at least the other scientific and technical agencies, the other agencies that have databases now that we're, you know, they're very, very concerned about security in those databases, yes.

And in answer to Sally, if we were to do this for another group, I could cater my rhizome to whatever group.

MS. HOLTERHOFF: It could be an MD or, you know, whatever.

MR. BYRNE: You name it. Any other questions from the audience?

MS. BAI SH: Mary Alice Baish, American Association of Law Libraries.

We actually did a program here. I
know Rick recalls it in, I believe, 2006 on legal information. And I'm delighted to see today's panel and I just want to thank everybody, all the speakers and those who put this program together.

I also wanted just to let people in the audience know, well, two points.

First, as Mike is looking at me, I hope everybody here, both on Council and the audience recognizes how difficult and how long it took for Mike and his wonderful crew at FedSys to get the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to agree to let GPO do a digital authentication of the bills.

This did not happen overnight and it's just sort of a great story as you begin to think how do you get agencies to understand what the problem is.

Sally mentioned the summit in 2007 where we did invite judges and attorneys and some of them said, wow, wow. Never thought about this. And we need that $5 million lawsuit that's thrown out because it was based
on unreliable electronic information.

I also wanted to just let everybody know that because of the work the AALL has been doing over the past several years, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws who draft uniform acts for the state has been developing for the past two years and Mike Wash is one of the technical observers to that group, has been developing what is now called the Authentication and Preservation of Electronic State Legal Materials Act. It will be a uniform law that will hopefully be adopted by incusal next July. And with that time frame would go out to all of the state legislatures to provide them an opportunity to enact that uniform state law in January 2010. And so I just wanted to alert you to that information.

You can come to the AALL website and find more about it, but, David, I really appreciated your comment about version control because we’ve been working through what, Mike, about eight drafts of the Act at this point.
And the section of preservation originally was sort of very broad and non-specific. And advisors to the committee, particularly from the courts, wanted language in that section that all primary legal resources must be preserved. It goes to your point about version control, right, that we need all versions of a draft act or we need to keep all superseded regulations.

And so because of the importance of that particularly to the legal community, it is explained in that provision that when a legal resource is altered because of an errata change or if it has been updated, at each point when that happened you're actually creating a brand new record. And I think that's a really good way to look upon version control. So, anyway, thank you very much.

MS. TUBBS: We have time for about one more question. So, you can be it.

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University.

This is a question for all the
When we look at sort of community or really any digitization projects of legacy materials, I was just wanting to get some discussion of where that places those materials in terms of authentication.

I mean, certainly we can say they came from a trusted source. They were distributed to a federal depository library. We may not be able to tell what's happened to them while they're there and perhaps create routines for our digitization partners, steps they go through. But, I was just wondering if anyone had any ideas on where sort of digitization projects come in the universe of authentic government information.

MR. BASEFSKY: Well, my take is essentially, we can't correct the past. We can say that we are using information that we relied upon in print form, we digitized it.

My major concern is not the past. My concern is the future. If you want to go back and try to authenticate everything in the
past, you've got a big bill in front of you.

But in the future if you start
taking care of things now and particularly in
this born digital age, where you are not
having any intention of publishing this
material to any large audience whatsoever,
there might be two or three publications that
are printed for the specific audience that
wants to see it. You know, it's actually
saving money for the future by acting now
because the demand in a truly digital age is
to go back and say, is this trustworthy? Is
this authentic?

At least in the digitization you
are taking the assumption of print
authenticity, even though it's always been
somewhat questioned, but that's the way life
was then. So, we aren't going to change the
historical life.

But the future life is very scary.
If we don't do the authentication up front,
it's going to cost us a fortune in the future
and it may cost us our reputations, our
reliability and I can see all sorts of very embarrassing things with the U.S. Government if they don't do it.

MS. TUBBS: I was going to -- Scott, and then, Jill, you'll be the last word.

MR. MATHESON: Just one or two examples. If we, you know, think back to your serial sets, if you were digitizing a serial set, I know, Tim, at Colorado you wouldn't have wanted to digitize that one because it had suffered many a razor blade for its maps. And I think that's what you'd find even when the ASTER set which was filmed quite awhile ago, I believe Lexis found there were quite a few things missing from that set and Readex as well had to go back in and tip things into their set, kind of digitally as they were working through it.

So, I think for digitization projects there's the opportunity both to, as Stuart said, be as authentic as the print every way, but also to make an effort to be a
little bit better and say, you know, this is what the print represented. But, hey, there was this errata sheet. I think there's a high cost to that but it might be worth pursuing or something that certainly possible in a collaborative sense that probably is beyond the resources of any one particular group.

MS. MORIEARTY: Jill Moriearty, University of Utah.

I wanted to follow up with what Stuart said just a few minutes ago. He said an embarrassing situation. It's not just the government. Does anyone remember the University of Utah and cold fusion? One embarrassing right there.

MS. TUBBS: All right. That's the conclusion of our panel. I'd like to thank our speakers today for enlightening us on authentication.

And now, Suzanne, do you have any announcements for the group?

CHAIR SEARS: I have one announcement. A Metro ticket was found on the
floor out by the dessert table. So, I'm not sure how you can authenticate that it's yours, but I will leave it at the registration table with GPO. So, if you can identify it, then you can have it. Well, if you know the amount of minutes left, maybe that can be your hash mark.

(Whereupon, the above matter was concluded at 11:59 a.m.)
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MS. SEARS: We'd like to go ahead and get started with our 8:30 session, so that we can finish on time. Luckily this morning, I have no announcements, so we can go straight into the session, and I'm going to turn it over to Debbie Rabina, who is running this session for us today.

Debbie?

DR. RABINA: Good morning, everyone.

Our last session this morning, New Librarianship Specialization and E-Government Information Services.

I'd like to first thank the people who helped me put the program together, Cindy Etkin from GPO, Ann Sanders and Steve Hayes, from the Council, and I'd like to introduce our two guest speakers, John Shuler, from the iSchool at University of Illinois in
Chicago, and John Bertot from the iSchool at University of Maryland.

MR. SHULER: Thank you, Debbie.

Good morning, everyone. I can't tell you how strange it is to be back. I thought there was at least a little bit of slack time, but here we go, and I thank the Council very much for giving this time for John and I to present our ideas, and also to all of you out in the audience for making the students who are at the conference these last two and a half days very welcome into the community of practice that we represent, and the fine traditions of service that I think we are all so proud of.

And, I believe that the remarks that John and I are going to share this morning are going to be some thoughts and some incites onto what this experience has done for our way of thinking about the future of graduate education for what we are calling e-Government Information Services, and, especially, as we keep in tandem, if you will,
in partnership with the specific changes within the electronic government sphere.

And, certainly, many of the comments that we've heard over the last two and a half days indicate that these questions are going to be with us for a while, and that nobody really has a good answer, and I'm pleased that the community, and also for the personal opportunity to try to find out what some of those answers might be.

So, John, did you want to add anything?

MR. BERTOT: Oh, I hit the green button, all right, thanks.

So, just a couple quick things. One is, yes, echoing John's sentiments, but we would also like to thank GPO for being partners with us in the educational program that we've created, and also the Government Information Online folks for being partners with us as well.

These are great people, and very willing to help us in a number of areas, as we
work with our students and with you moving forward.

And lastly, I'd like to also thank the Institute of Museum and Library Services, which funded the scholarship program for these students. Without their support, we never could have pulled this program together. It provides, you know, the tuition for them, and it also has provided the travel opportunity, because they come from all over the country. I mean, they are not -- I mean, they are enrolled in our online program, but they are from all over the U.S. And so, without their support we never could have brought them here for you to be able to work with them, and talk with them, and all those things. And, they will be back again next year, so we really appreciate the fact that IMLS funded this opportunity.

MR. SHULER: And finally, we would like to recognize the unseen member of the three professors, Paul Jaeger, who is, actually, teaching tonight, and he couldn't be
here and be back up in Maryland without
turning into a 16-18 hour day, so he opted to
stay in Maryland. But, we also want to
recognize his contributions to both creating
the grant, as well as working with the
students.

Now, Jill pointed out that I must
have drank the Kool-Aid, because you are
seeing John with a Power Point. Not true.
The other John, I'm only pushing the buttons.

Now, the Power Point, we are not
going to read the Power Point, in a sense, you
guys can look at it later, you can look it up
on the big screen, but we wanted to give you
some context of where we are coming from, and
none of this should be of a surprise. We've
talked about this in these communities before.
We've written about it. You've read about it.
You've lived it more often than not.

And, it goes without saying that
the digital changes that the government has
been putting into place for the last 15 years
has seriously altered how we think about
government documents librarianship.

And, I think the couple of big points that we want to point out with this slide is that they take as well as they give. So, in terms of taking, what they are taking from our practice, our community of practice, is how we orient ourselves, and that was based on collections. And, I think the statistic that was announced on Monday, if I got it right, anybody can correct me, it's 97 percent of what is distributed to depositories now is born digital.

These, I think this idea that we are no longer dealing with things of possession, things that we collect, also tie into what was talked about yesterday morning, on how libraries are reacting, what they do with their legacy collections, but the technologies and the softwares have set aside some other opportunities, as well as takeaways, in terms of relationships, and how we interact with our communities.

And, I believe what we are trying
to do with this particular new program is re-
image the narrative that we are using in our
community of practice to describe what we do,
and how we do it, to get the government
information to the people.

And, we are trying to take
advantage that this new technology and these
new organizational changes creates, and try to
build on what I consider to be a century of
traditions and practice, and take full
advantage of the new technologies.

John?

MR. BERTOT: The only other thing
I would add to that is, I mean, especially,
when you look at the social technologies that
exist, and the match ups, and all the
different things you can do, you have the
opportunity to really create, not just new
communities of practice in terms of
collaborations, but entirely new information
products, and ways of looking at a range of
government information.

So, there are -- those challenges
are there, but also the opportunities to
really serve our clientele on the completely
different ways exist in this kind of sphere.

MR. SHULER: So, now we come to
part two of the back story, what happens to
the students when we add them to our graduate
library programs, and again, as I was raised
as a young library pup, we were trained to
focus on particular organizational arrangement
within a particular institution, with, if we
were talking about federal depositories, a
particular relationship with a government
agency.

And, our services were limited by
time and geography. We served the people that
were in front of us, or nearby us, we
collaborated with others in a community
through long distance means, but we were
pretty much a local practice.

And then finally, what happens to
all of this when the technology and the
software enables us to skip the time geography
problem, if you will, the 24/7 librarianship,
when it doesn't matter when you are asking the question or answering the question.

And, one would have to agree or argue, in a sense, that given the fluidity of the changes of our institution, again, represented by the talk yesterday morning at the Tuesday plenary session, obviously, this thing about what we do with our collections, and what we do with our services, is being reconsidered by all parts of the library.

John?

MR. BERTOT: And, what I would -- also a slightly different variant on that question is, you know, what do you do after the last box, you know? Since we are getting to this point where the box, I mean, you know, you just pointed out, right, it's not distributed, things are stopping, you know, in terms of what's being distributed and what's coming to you. So, what happens after the last box? I mean, it's creating a completely different kind of a service context, and that we certainly need to consider as we prepare
future folks going into this profession.

MR. SHULER: So, these next few slides are going to be a bit of an outline of what we would suggest that we do about this back story, what to keep, what to consider, and what to redefined, if you will.

So, if we follow the logic of our argument, what we are truly talking about is a series of relationships between the government information services librarian, their community, and the sources of information.

And, rather than being a community of local practice within a single institution, what we are discovering is that it's becoming a continuum of providers, working with the citizens to find a specific government information. So, it's no longer tied to a particular format, but rather tied to the information needs of the community, as well as the information skills of the individual government information librarians.

And, whereas the older traditions
may have focused on one or two government agencies, we now have in play a whole series of other actors, if you will, both public, government and non-government. And, if you think about the financial crisis going through our universities, our public universities, because of the failing states financial conditions, many of our public universities are becoming de facto private universities.

And, I think this also gives the community a chance to, basically, examine what I think are the fundamental community levels that depositories are supposed to serve.

Very often you will hear people talk about communities served as being defined by the institutions, whereas, the traditional definition of a community served by a depository library is congressional district and senatorial district, as well as regional library, which is often state or multi state.

And, that just points to the idea that we are going to have to be much more nuanced in our thinking about where we serve
and who we serve.

John?

MR. BERTOT: Just to add on to that, I also think in this it's creating this new context, it's also one of the things, it's not just practice, but it's also creating an entirely new sort of controlled arrangement, you know, because when you look at the continuum that we were talking about, from libraries to agencies, to, you know, non-governmental organizations and providers, and private sector, there is sort of this loss of control, if you will, in terms of the technologies, the content and the services. We are all sort of vying in the same space, and each of these different kinds of providers provide the opportunity for people to go to them and get different kinds of services and resources, and the ability to interact with government information.

I mean, for example, you know, in town, I'm assuming most of you have looked at some of the Sunlight Foundation's work, or
Free Government Information, and we have all these different ways of interacting with this content, and it's moving it out of sometimes our traditional service context.

MR. SHULER: So, the challenge then, as we move into these new service roles, are listed here, and again, what we emphasize, that the success of the service is in finding the information, regardless of where it is.

And again, that raises a whole host of other issues of verification and authentication that we fully recognize and embrace, but we also emphasize, and again, this is a great tradition in librarianship through the development of reference tools and reference services, you take what you find and you bundle it with other information services, value-added services that are either produced by the library, or produced within this continuum of providers.

And again, to emphasize the points, the future services of the communities that we are offering here are not going to be
bound by time or geography, and it's something we need to consider.

Okay, going on, finally, the questions and key issues, and all of these have been raised before, and I think one thing we want to point out, and I think this is really what is at the heart of the issue in the tradition of the depository libraries that has grown out of the 1962 law, are we libraries of just in case or just in time?

And, I think that's still very much in debate, and very much in debate, do we mean just in time in our insularity of individual local collections, or just in time on a broad national programmatic basis?

And, of course, the issue of preservation is critical. It's one thing to be talking about the preservation of born digital and soon to be born digital, and dealing with those conditions, but also what do you do with the legacy collections, and what is GPO's role in assuring some kind of sustainability and continuity, as well as the
National Archives, as well as thousands of other government agencies with archival responsibility?

How are we going to measure what is successful and what isn't? And, I think this is a big part of our program, in trying to decide how do you know that you've gotten where you are supposed to go, what's the road map? And, I know that has been an issue in this community for a long time.

And then finally, obviously, some library directors have their own idea of what future support of document service within their collections and libraries are going to be, but I think it's more important that we remember as a community of practice that we have our own ideas, and traditions, and sustainability models for what we do as government information librarians.

John?

MR. BERTOT: And also, in terms of the key questions and issues, one of the things we are trying to do within this
program, but we need to address, I think, as a community is, you know, what policies, laws and governance structures should exist that look at the information flows.

There's been a lot of -- I mean, we had sessions here over the last couple of days on Title 44, there's been a very robust discussion of the proposed changes to Title 44, but we really need to look at that in the broader policy context, and look at, especially, since we are moving to this sort of born digital kind of a context, we need to look at a range of policies that govern access and social inclusion, so looking at the American Disabilities Act, the Executive Order 13166, which is approving services to people who are non-English speakers, and there's a whole series, I'm not going to read all these to you, but we have privacy security accuracy, the Quality Information Act, I mean, there's all these different things that we need to look at, including the defunct, you know, now Sunset E-government Act of 2002. You know,
there was movement on that a few years ago,
but, frankly, that has just sort of fallen off
a cliff, and I don't see that, you know,
resurfacing any time soon given that.

But, all of these policies, and
laws, and governance structures, have an
impact on information flows, and access, and
inclusion, and the ability to get access to
information content that's digital. And so,
we need to have a much broader discussion, and
look at all of these as they come together to
create that service environment, where we do
know that people, many of you don't have
access to the technologies, and the ability to
get access to digital content.

MR. SHULER: So, what we are doing
with these 20 lucky individuals who have
agreed to be part of this program is, we've
set up a particular structure designed around
course work practice, professional and
scholarship. And, they are learning -- I
think at one talk I was at they described what
we do as government information librarians, as
being the -- we describe the government, we
describe the structure of the government,
because if you don't understand the structure
of the government how can you expect to find
its information, and really, that is one of
our strengths.

And, what we are trying to do with
each of these parts is enable the students to
understand, not only the structure of
information policies and the digital impact,
but also how the government works. That is no
different in the 21st Century than it was in
the 19th Century.

But, we also want to raise and
continue to highlight this idea that we are a
community of practice, in both our
professional activities, which is the reason
why they are here, this is the highest
concentration of government documents
librarians we can think of that's close by.
Of course, if you think about Washington, D.C.
area, I guess that works, too, but it's also
an opportunity for them to give back, to think
about what they are doing at a critical level
and say to themselves, well, that was then,
this is now, what can we do that might be
interesting, different, and in some cases
might even enhance the situation. So, we are
encouraging them to participate in the
activity and the scholarship that is
represented by the various journals that
represent our community of practice.

We are also giving them an
opportunity to have what are called digital
internships, residencies, through the
mechanisms of the Government Information
Online Project. I believe Geoff Swindells
mentioned yesterday, when one of the questions
that came up in the course of the discussion,
what about the public services aspect of these
ideas of community of excellence, the
Government Information Online represents one
of those communities of excellence, where
about 25 academic public state libraries have
bound together to host a digital reference
desk that is freely available on the web for
anybody to use.

And, that’s where we hope to place the students amongst these different institutions across the country.

John?

MR. BERTOT: So yes, I mean, so those are the cornerstones of the program, but just to give you a flavor of the specialized course work, because, of course, we have core courses as part of an MLS program, but the first year for the students is really to imbed them within sort of the specialized concentration course work, and we deal with, you know, information policy, they will be taking a course on E-government, planning and evaluating government services, E-librarianship, and, of course, as John mentioned, the internship.

And, actually, we’ve had people come to us, especially, for students who are near their own institutions, and want to talk about possibly sort of imbedding students within their organizations as well as part of
that internship process.

So, we are looking at that, and the idea, of course, is to bring all these strands together, right, the community of practice, the course work, which is both conceptual as well as practice, to create these future individuals who will come out in a couple of years and have been exposed to you folks, the community, the work environment, understanding the distributed work environment now, especially, as we go more collaborative through a range of services, as well as actual being involved in an actual practice as part of this program.

So, we are trying to hit all the bases with this, within a two-year period, you know. So, you know, you only have a couple of, you know, two years, the students will be kind of tired, but they will be really well prepared to come into your organizations when that time comes.

And, the other thing I'll say is, and it's almost like one of those
infomercials, wait, there's more, you know, if you order now you also get the other set of knives.

IMLS has been really good to us. We recently received, with a partnership with ALA, I see Jessica McGilvray out there kind of hiding in the back, but we just received another grant that is, actually, looking at how do you actually create this public service for people and libraries to provide E-government services to the communities that they serve.

And, this new grant is looking at creating a collaborative web resource that's for librarians to provide E-government services to their constituents, through partnerships with government agencies. And so, what we are doing is, we partnered with the IRS, and Customs and Immigration Services initially, as well as GPO, to look, because we know that those are a lot of the services that people provide, to look at how do we create a collaborative space with government agencies,
as well as libraries, because we know so many people end up in libraries trying to, actually, do E-government, whether it's applications, looking for information, or other things, so what's that resource look like.

And so, we'll be incorporating our students into that process as well over the next couple of years, so that we can think about, how do we put that resource up, what should it look like, how do we create this collaborative environment.

Working with agencies, as some of you well know, is touchy, you know, partnerships is kind of a different word for them, depending which agency you are working with, and so, I think a good chunk of this is going to be looking at how do we foster that collaboration and that partnership, and then also think about, how do we lay out that resource for this new community of practice and this resource that we are trying to build.

MR. SHULER: So, what we are
suggesting that we are doing here are the early days of what we call a civic information service, and it is in the broadest sense of civic work, and building an infrastructure, a public infrastructure on the excellent foundations of the depository library system, as well as other public systems of information distribution.

And, the idea is to connect the communities to the information that they need and that they also produce on behalf of their governance structures.

We believe that this new service philosophy, if you will, will rest very solidly on three pillars of what is a century-old tradition in our group, professionalism, expertise, and collaborative work.

And, we also think, and again, this is a very old tradition, of learning to bundle the found information in effective ways through other value-added services.

And then finally, to develop a set of librarians, if you will, who will be
flexible, who will be fluid in the same way that the government infrastructure is fluid, and be able to change either according to organizational changes or to technological changes, and we hope to give them the skills and the talents necessary to survive that constant shifting.

John?

MR. BERTOT: I mean, so what we are really trying to do at the end of all of this is really look at and create a future practice through education and collaboration. I mean, so we are trying to pull all these different strands that we know exist out there through this program, and through the resources that we are trying to build. And, it's a big challenge. I mean, you folks know this better than we do, trying to encapsulate this in a two-year program, you know, an MLS program, is a real challenge, right? I mean, so we are trying to create all the pieces that will give the students the ability to work within this community.
But then, it's going to be up to you folks to pick up those students and work with them within your own institutions, in these new, you know, collaborative kinds of context, and the new network technologies, to see how we actually imbed that in a practice that will continue to change over time, and give us new ways of servicing the public.

So, I think with that, you know, I guess we accept questions, or discussion, whatever folks want to do.

So, thank you for your time.

MR. SHULER: Thank you again.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MR. SHULER: Thank you again to the Council and members in the audience.

DR. RABINA: Questions from the Council?

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

This is all great exciting stuff. I wish I could take two years off and join your program.
I wonder if you could just talk a little bit about the E part of the E-government stuff, the technology side of this. I'm just curious to what extent, if any, the technological skills that need to accompany those value-added enhancements of services and electronic government environment, where does that fit, if anywhere, within the programs?

MR. BERTOT: Yes, sure, so we can tag team this.

It fits in a couple of ways. One way is, I think through the Government Information Online internship, because they will be exposed to a variety of technologies, particularly, digital reference tools, which make use of other, you know, aspects of presenting information to users.

That's one way.

The other way is, actually, through this other grant. I mean, we were going to build this web resource anyway, but don't ever tell IMLS that, okay, because, you know, we needed the start-up funds, to be
honest.

But, the idea was that through that tool we would start using and exposing the students to a range of social technologies, and looking at how we, actually, want to embed those E-government kinds of services through those technologies.

And granted, we are serving the library environment through this resource, as opposed to users, but so many of the libraries now make use of, you know, Twitter, Facebook, and various other social technologies, and mashups, and a whole range of other tools, and our challenge is to see what's the best way to embed those kinds of tools to help libraries, you know, do even more public service, if you will.

So, it's through practice. The course work, we actually do have a core class, which is an information technology class, but that one is a bit more of a general kind of class. And so, we see the combination of
these two really giving the students,

hopefully, a much stronger background and the
tools to use.

MR. SHULER: And, in my

experience, the students, actually, bring with
them a certain set of social network skills

that, you know -- well, it's somewhat -- I

will confess to you as a professor -- it's

somewhat disconcerting that we use a

particular version of Blackboard at the

University of Maryland, and on the screen it's
divided up into these big blocks. And the

professors have the biggest block, and then

there's this little running side screen where

the students can type in text messages.

I'm getting used to this, it's

been a couple months, but I'm getting used to

it --

MR. BERTOT: This is part of

John's 12 step program.

MR. SHULER: Yes, I mean, I

handled Power Point, now I'm getting used to

this.
So, when the professors are holding forth, the students are often having a completely different conversation in the small text box. They are ordering pizza, talking about what they watched on TV last night. So, I think this is -- they know this multi-tasking world that they are going to have to work with, and I think they demonstrated it.

And, some of the things we are going to add to the curriculum, to sort of mix it up a bit, is to use podcasts. We also would like them -- one aspect of this technology that I think about the civic information practice is, we are moving the idea of learning how the mechanics of the software and technology work, to the idea of production, we are moving it to producing things. It's like producing a radio show, a theater, and you are bringing the information and you are packaging it in a particular way that makes it sustainable and usable by your community, and that's another step beyond, by
just understanding how the mechanics work.

And, you are going to have to do

that, because if anybody catches the social
software and the social sendings from the
White House, for instance, they are already
well down this road, where they are constantly
throwing things through various bits and
pieces, tweets, and blogs, and other we
combinations and mashups of what had been
traditionally defined through paper and print,
such as the public papers of the presidents,
or the weekly compilation of presidential
documents and statements.

MR. BERTOT: I just want to add

one add on to that, though.

I think one of the challenges we
face is, it's not just that you have to be
familiar with the tools, right? I mean, we all
get that. But, it's really, how do you use
those tools in a public practice, and in a
service context, because it's one thing to
tweet about, you know, your goings on, it's
another thing completely to use it as a tool
to deliver a service, or some kind of information sound byte to someone. And, that's the real challenge.

I'm less -- personally, I'm less concerned about the technology tools than I am about, how do you implement it, you know, strategically and smartly for the services you are trying to provide. And, that's why I think trying to bring it into a real, you know, service, that's going to be out there is going to be critical.


I know the IMLS grant for the web resource you are talking about was recently awarded, but you also said you were going to do it anyway. So, I'm a little -- I'm interested in a time frame for that. The students will be working on developing it, or working on operating it, I mean, what -- how it works.

MR. BERTOT: Yes, a good question. The grant was just awarded. It
officially starts December 1. And, John and I, and other folks who are involved in our program have already started working on how we are going to have students work on analyzing, and developing, and preparing content for it, beginning with the spring semester.

So, we have our -- you guys don't know this yet, but we have our E-government and planning and evaluation of government information resources class next semester, so it's perfect timing, actually. It works out really well for us.

The grant itself is just shy of three years, it's a 33-month grant. So, in the spring it's really a range of information gathering. We are, actually, going to do some site visits to some libraries that have some really interesting partnership programs with government agencies already existing, and we want to look at what makes a successful partnership, you know, how do you put the services together with these agencies.

And, we also realize that it's not
just the Federal level, I mean, there's state and local aspects of this, too, I mean. So, this is a fairly complex environment. We are starting at the national level, before we even think about state and local resources, but we know that that piece is out there.

So, we have about a three-year time frame, but it will be in the second year that we, actually, start making the website available, and testing it, and asking for feedback.

DR. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt Institute.

Beyond the time frame for the initial grant for the students, how do you plan to continue this?

MR. BERTOT: That's a good question, and so, we have -- this was, actually, a kick off, because we got -- this ended up being sort of seed money to start off an online program at the University of Maryland, right? So, we now have, you know, the official permission by the University to
have an online program. We had to go through all these approvals, and it will continue after this.

What is up for discussion, you know, just to say, is it's a cohort based program, right, so we bring in, you know, 20 students in this cohort, and we shepherd them through as a group, and that, actually, I think helps build cohesiveness and continuity, and we are doing a mix of ways of delivering the instruction and bringing people together.

So, what we've talked about at the college is sort of an alternating cohort, where we would have sort of a general cohort, and then a specialized cohort. So, I expect that this will continue probably on an every-other-year cycle, you know, and that's still -- we are still working through that through our various curriculum committees and that kind of stuff.

But, that's the initial plan at this point.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Temple
University. I really admire the fact that you are engaging students in a rigorous academic query of the field, and appreciate that you maybe can't do everything that you would want to do within a two-year period.

Given the fact that librarianship is an iterative and often artistic process, and that there's a growing and robust field of digital curation, digital preservation, what do you -- have you thought about the implications of focusing strictly on services without collections?

MR. BERTOT: Yes, actually, this is what we talk about a lot, actually. I mean, it's not a -- we are kind of threading a bit of a needle, right, because, you know, we have to have one foot somewhat in the past, because there's a huge tradition. I mean, you know, as John indicated, and we have those collections, and there's all this discussion with another foot firmly, you know, planted at looking to the future.

So, what we are doing -- I
probably should have said this, but, you know, what we are doing for now --

MR. JACOBS: Can I say -- can I add digital collections?

MR. BERTOT: You know, I totally agree.

You know, so one of the things we are doing for -- and John can chime in, but for next semester is, we are also bringing in sort of guest lecturers from a variety of perspectives.

So, we have people coming in from Archives, from the digital humanities areas, we have, certainly, some -- so, we are trying to bring in that flavor, to at least make students aware of it, right, knowing that these issues are out there, and it's something that we need to be mindful of.

MR. SHULER: I think, too, it isn't a matter of technology, it's a matter of political will and professional leadership, and it strikes me that if in the next generation of trained librarians we impress
upon them the nuance of understanding the importance of preservation within this larger context of government information overall, they would be much better prepared to react to the challenges, rather than be specifically trained in a technology or technique of preservation.

Preservation technology is going to be constantly changing, and it would be almost impossible, as it would to be writing a text book about it, to keep it on the mark. And, I think what -- especially, since the focus of the Maryland program, and correct me if I'm wrong, John, is, is heavily -- not heavily, but its central emphasis in some ways is policy and implementation, and decision making at a leadership level, what we are hoping to do is aim for this idea of creating this discussion and this set of knowledge that looks at preservation, not on an ad hoc basis, this institution, or this group of institutions, is going to preserve something, and then what are you going to do
about that, but actually try to build a professional approach that says, given this here's what this organization should do, this organization should do, and this organization. It's a continuum of care process, very similar to other professions that are dealing with crisis or failures in systems.

DR. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt Institute.

Just from conversations that I've had from some of your students, I understand that many of them are already working in libraries. So, I guess placement isn't going to be a measure of success for the programs.

So, I'm just wondering, in terms of how you are going to evaluate if you have, you know, your outcomes have succeeded.

MR. BERTOT: So, we have a really lovely outcomes-based assessment plan as part of the grant, so if you want to -- no, but I think a couple things.

One is, yes, a number of our students are already working in various
libraries, but also other institutions or elsewhere. And, I think that there will be some of these students, actually, several, who are probably going to look to, you know, change paths, I think, after this program. I hope I'm not like putting words in your mouths, guys.

So, I think one will, in fact, be, you know, sort of where some of the students end up will be part of it, but I also -- one of the things that we were looking at is sort of a two years, three years after graduation down the road kinds of measures, like where have you ended up, what are you doing, what changes have you influenced or been influenced by in this kind of career.

So, we are not doing like a one point in time kind of measure, because I think, you know, one of the things that -- and, actually, I know that it caused some angst amongst our students initially, was, you know, we keep saying the world is kind of shifting around you, so they kind of panicked
a little bit there. But, it is changing all
the time, why are we doing -- you know, all
this kind of stuff.

But, we do want to look at, you
know, like, well, where are you in a couple
years, what are you working on. We expect
that our students will be going into some
government agencies, some, you know, Federal
libraries, other places, GPO, you know, and
we'll see what -- where they are in a few
years down the road.

DR. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt
Institute.

You mentioned government
information online as one of the structures
that will help support this. I'm wondering if
there will be room for others in the LIS
community participate in this, and what I'm
thinking of when I ask this is the Drexel
model for IPL to be used as a teaching tool
for, you know, throughout the LIS community.
So, I'm wondering if that's something that you
plan to incorporate.
MR. SHULER: It has always been the dream of the GIO managers, founders, to extend this service in an effective way that would include the graduates of library and information science schools, in that this partnership with Maryland represents the first step, not the last one.

So, I would welcome an opportunity to talk, as well as the other folks that are involved in GIO, to talk how we could manage that, yes.

MR. BERTOT: And a second step in that process is also going to be with the new grant that we received. We are looking at ways to embed the GIO service within that, so librarians who go there can actually get that help, you know, if they are looking for certain things.

And so, one of the things that we hope will be an outcome of that will be that GIO will continue to grow, I mean, that librarians will see that service and want to participate in it, so that we can finally get
to a deeper level of assistance at that state and local level, you know.

So, we are kind of working all these things, but, you know, I'm -- how shall I say it -- the sausage is kind of being made at this point, right, you know, so we have to see where it takes us a little bit further down the road.

MR. JACOBS: They don't look very excited about the sausage.

MR. BERTOT: There's probably some vegetarians out there. It's a vegan sausage.

DR. RABINA: Other questions from Council?

Other questions, from the students, perhaps?

MS. MORIEARTY: I would like to hear from some of the students what their perspective is, and don't worry, it won't affect your grade.

MS. SMITH: I have a question always, Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.
You do have a traditional reference course, don't you? They are still going to know what's in the Federal Register, and, you know, how to use the statistical abstract, because I feel like in my training in the stone age I was building a pyramid. You know, I would learn one resource at a time, and you had a nice big stack of rocks, and then the country flooded, and now we are just all sort of floating in this, you know, digital soup, and I think your students are learning to PURD dive, you know. They are on the surface of the soup.

But, I want to make sure that they still know where all that big stack of rocks is, you know, the real basic core sources.

MR. BERTOT: Yes, in fact, what we put up in terms of the core -- that really was the concentration course work, so that's the specialized course work for this program.

But, I think it's actually in the first part of the next summer -- you know, the summer 2011 where they are going to get that.
So, yes, we have a course on all that. It is a more block building, if you will, government documents, reference kind of course. So, yes, they will be getting that as part of this.

MS. MONGEAU: Deborah Mongeau, from the University of Rhode Island.

I'm very impressed by this program. It seems to be very intense. The impression I'm getting is that it's also pretty much aimed towards the traditional student, the student who can afford to spend two years immersed in a program, being willing to travel to different places for internships, be willing to take a few days off to attend a conference, but yet, many of the library school students who enter the programs are non-traditional students. And, I'm just wondering if there's -- you know, they have family and work obligations, and have to work around that. And, I'm just wondering, are there any accommodations in the program for the non-traditional students?
MR. BERTOT: Yes, actually, I think out of our students there's -- I don't think anybody is not working, actually, so they are all -- I mean, yes, and also with the online environment, we set this up so that it was only two classes per semester, and it continues over a two-year period, because we figured that a fair number of the people who would apply, actually, had other obligations, right, and so we were trying to accommodate that from the get-go.

The one thing that we did ask, and, actually, we went back and forth with a couple of students because of time commitments, was for the deposit -- you know, to be able to come here, right, because it's a four-day commitment, you know, a day to travel, right, two and a half days here, a day to travel back, we all know the routine, especially, from the West Coast. So, we knew that, but we let people know that really way up front, you know, we tried getting that information out, gave them the dates, you
know, and said that, hey, we want you to be able to come to these meetings and all that.

So, we tried to accommodate that as best as possible, and deal with sort of the non-traditional student. And, actually, what's really been interesting, I mean, because there's different ways to measure non-traditional, right? Our students are from a range of places right now, they are not all in libraries, which is really kind of interesting.

So, I think that we've been able to attract that as part of this.

Now, moving forward, once we've moved beyond this grant, some of the time commitments may go away. We would encourage people to come to the Depository meetings, but, obviously, we wouldn't be able to fund people, you know, those kinds of things.

But, yes, it's a really big concern, and it's a great issue for us, because we want to make sure that we can pull in people who are really interested in this,
and are good, and may have other commitments as well.

MR. SHULER: Do any of the students want to listen to Mistress Jill, and come to the mic?

MS. REGAN: Alison Regan, University of Utah, also in the program, Jill's colleague.

I have to say that it's been a remarkably engaging six weeks for me, and to answer the question of non-traditional, I think there's about -- there's as much as a 30 year age gap between our youngest and our oldest students, and, yes, all of us are working full time, as far as I can tell. Many of us have children, ranging from -- I think Lawrence has a one-year old, and a couple of us have -- four or five of us have teenagers. So, we know the commitment, the time commitments involved.

And so, I think the program, actually, is remarkably flexible, and as somebody who said she would never go back to
school again, I have to say that I -- and I
heard this from my classmates, so we are
pretty much all glad we came.

MS. SANDERS: Ann Sanders, Library
of Michigan.

I'm kind of putting everybody on
the spot here, but is there anything either
the students or you all would look to from
Council or from the community that would be of
use at this point, or don't you know yet?

MR. SHULER: I think the critical
issue before Council, obviously, is one of
education and continuing education within the
community.

And, certainly, at the afternoon
session yesterday there was this other --
University of Maryland is only one school --
there is a constellation of library schools
out there that are training the next
generation.

And, what I would hope Council
would work with the library associations, with
the library schools, is establish some kind of
best practice sort of beyond just the simple accreditation, not that what ALA does is simple mind you, but to get into this idea that there are specific skills and interests that are tied, specifically, to being a government information librarian that should be embedded, if you will, within the teaching programs, and further we accredit it as the person goes through the course work, and then into their professional life.

We see this kind of model in other aspects of the library profession. The one I think that is the most robust in my experience are the medical librarians. They have a continuing education component to their further knowledge building that I think we, as government information librarians, with this complexity of organization and technology, would sorely benefit from. And, I think there's a leadership role here for Council, there's a leadership role for the schools, and there's a leadership role for the associations as well.
MR. DAVIS: Rick Davis, GPO.

I just want to commend you guys again for the work on this program, and also the students, for your participation.

I also want to mention, and John and John know this, I want to make sure all of you know this as well out in the audience, that there are a lot of opportunities at GPO for virtual internships as well. We recently were on a recruiting visit out on the West Coast, and we had a number of students who were interested in GPO, and then we talked about the opportunities and they said, now I don't have to move to Washington, do I? And, the answer is no, there are virtual opportunities.

So, even if you are not based in this area, we'd like to talk to your students about some opportunities that we have.

MR. BERTOT: Thanks. Thanks for that, and, actually, GPO has been a great partner in this, I mean, really willing to help us out on any number of levels.
And, you know, one other thing in terms of Council and all know as well, we really would love to have your participation and feedback on what we are doing. I mean, you know, this was -- you write this stuff -- you know, we wrote this grant three years ago, I mean, it was -- it was our best shot at what we thought was going to be in place, you know, a couple years down the road, you know.

I mean, and so, there is a certain learning process, in terms of the curriculum, and how you deliver things, and a whole host of other factors, and we don't make the claim that we have it.

So, you know, building on John's comment about, you know, that leadership, what should be in here, what are some of the things, I think we would all welcome that.

Also, we'd welcome your participation. I mean, one of the things we talked about doing away with, you know, space and time, and sort of the profession, but we've done away with space and time to some
extent in our course work, because of being online, and we would love to have folks, if you are willing and interested, to come in and give presentations.

You know, we use WIMBA and a range of other tools. It would be great, I think, for the students to hear even more perspectives on what is happening.

So, I think they would benefit greatly from that.


This is more by way of a comment than anything else, but I'm assuming that for the students, especially, this being their first year and they've only been in it six weeks, at this point they are still, you know, basically, trying to catch up with the acronyms.

But, I would be, just myself, I'd be really interested to see next year at this setting what kind of involvement they have, and, you know, I'd like to see some of them
maybe doing some of the presentations and that kind of stuff, because that would be really interesting.

MR. SHULER: In fact, that was one of the things that we had talked about for the next year, is to have the students put on a theater production of what we did with our first year, and offer it up to the community on what they've learned in the course of all this fabulous turbulence.

MR. BERTOT: Names will be changed to protect the innocent.

MR. SHULER: Yes, that's right.

So, we would hope that the Council, as well as the community, would welcome that kind of presentation, and I think it would be, you are actually right, it would be a good way to show progress in what we've learned, and what we all might learn in the future.

We were going to tell you that next week, guys.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes at Notre
As you can tell, those of us in academia have no concept of how much time we are imposing on you. It's what we need you to do, you've got the time.

MR. SHULER: It's an honorable tradition, regardless if there's no time or geography involved.

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University.

In many ways it's a sort of double-edged sword here. You are trying to create professionals for a future profession, but we also have sort of existing libraries and services, and we need to move those forward as well.

And, I was wondering if you were bringing in library leaders, especially, university librarians, sort of to talk about their visions of organizational structure and moving forward, and how sort of the kind of changes you are talking about in this part of the profession might work into those
organizations going forward, because what I'm a little worried about is, is moving very dedicated people, with really great perspective, and lots of skills, into organizations not prepared to sort of take advantage of those.

I mean, we see that in our organizations already.


We love the directors. In fact, John and I have talked about involving the directors in different ways, either through guest lectures, and certainly their statements indicate that they are fully engaged in reshaping the government in the future, and would be remiss of us, as professors, to not include their perspective on the shape of the program in general, and the future of government information services within their buildings.

I think it's a very important voice to include.
And, you are absolutely right.

Geoff, we do -- we are preparing them for this future role, but they are going to be grounded in the present, if not in the past.

And, the metaphor I use with them, and this is where John gets all Zen-like, I pose this question to them, I say, can you be a doctor without a hospital, and they say yes. And, I say, can you be a lawyer without a courthouse. Now, they wait a few moments before they say to that. And then I say, can you be a librarian without a library, and there's a huge debate about whether or not we can be librarians without libraries, and I think your question points to this long tradition of service within a particular type of organization we can't ill afford to ignore.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.

Sort of taking the other side of Geoff's question, you know, the government information environment in many ways just reflects the larger information world out
they there. So, have you begun to have
c onversations within the school about how what
you are dealing with here trickles out into
the broader library community, and how you all
then prepare future librarians generally?

MR. BERTOT: That's a really good
question, and I should say that we also have
a face-to-face E-government program in
Maryland, and right now there's between 40 and
-- I don't have the latest number, so I'm
giving you a range -- let's say between 40 and
55 students that are in that particular
concentration. It's, actually, one of our,
other than school media, it's one of our
largest, and Archives, our largest, you know,
student bodies, if you will.

And, you know, a fair number of
those students don't go to libraries, you know
what I mean, they are working in agencies that
we can't talk about, you know, although they
may be listening. They work -- so, I mean,
they work in a range of organizations. Some
have gone into non-profits, some have gone
into areas that work with government services and resources, but aren’t in government, you know, so I’m thinking like some of the consulting firms and other places.

So, I think, you know, what we see preparing our students for is the ability to work in that government information context, but that context could be in a wide range of organizations. And, I think we need to realize that.

I mean, you know, is anyone from Florida here? Well, I know some of our students are, yes, but, you know, Google has been doing some interesting stuff with state documents, you know. Florida was a test bed, this was a few years ago, I don’t know if that program continued on, but they were becoming, in essence, the state documents provider for the State of Florida, you know, and that raised a whole bunch of flags for me, you know. It’s like wait, wait, what’s going on here, you know.

But, there’s a range of players
out there that are working in this context,
and we need to work with our students to
understand that broad perspective, and it
could be libraries that are changing. On our
campus, I have to say there's a big -- our
library just released its new strategic plan,
and they are talking about, you know, what are
we doing with the documents department, you
know, what are we doing with that collection,
and there's a large discussion around that,
and it's not a settled issue, all right?

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

I'd be curious, as a returning
participant to government information online,
about the role with that, because we are
finding that those questions are among the
most challenging and legally tricky questions
that we are getting these days. I mean, I'm
really honing my skills on, you know, finding
things on line, and knowing the line to walk
between -- among copyright, and law, you know,
what's the newest addition of this regulation
kinds of things.

So, I'd be curious about the interaction with the students with GIO.

MR. SHULER: Well, it's one of the reasons why we suggested it, because in my experience as a librarian, as all of you well know as we serve at reference desks, we sharpen our skills on the hardness of the questions, if you will.

And, in my experience with GIO, it is the one serious concentration of these kinds of tough questions that are coming into our life on a national basis, and it's an excellent forum to sharpen those skills.

And, I fully -- I fully expect it will be the proper harnesses and relays, in a sense, as they initially get started with it, just as we all learned in that same fashion, will have the same support structures in place when they begin to serve in this fashion.

But, I'm very excited that we can begin to extend the learning process in this direction for this group of students.
DR. RABINA: Debbie Rabina, Pratt Institute.

GIO does not, as far as I recall, have a kind of like archived question component to it, does it?

MR. SHULER: It does. It's not obvious. It is what might be called a dark archive.

MR. BERTOT: Although, actually, one of the things John and I have talked about, and, you know, it's a question of resources, is they have received several thousand questions at this point through that, and one of the things we've talked about is doing more of a qualitative study of what are those questions, can we do some FAQ kinds of things, and other, you know, build resources around the resource, if you will, that sort of answer and help answer some of the questions that have been asked in the past, and build sort of that archive of kinds of things.

I mean, I can't speak for the GIO community, but we've looked at it, I've been
trying to see if I can get some doctoral students or some others interested in possibly looking at that, you know, and seeing what we might be able to get out of it.

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

Can you speak a little bit about any public library outreach that you are doing?

MR. BERTOT: Yes, actually, several of our students are, actually, in public libraries.

In terms of the other grant that we just received, a fair number of the partners, library partners that partnered with us on that, are public library partners.

So, we are looking at trying to build in a range of library types, into the program, right, so we are working with, for example, on the last E-government we had five state library agencies that are working with us, you know, Connecticut, Florida, New Jersey, Maryland, Texas, did I miss anyone,
did I hit five? I hope someone is counting for me.

Anyway, and we have about ten different public libraries that are working with us across the country, Hartford Public Library, Austin in Texas, particularly, because they do a lot of work with immigrants and those kinds of things.

So, we are trying to build in -- so we are working with the public library community, and some of the site visits we'll be doing on, in terms of the collaborations between libraries and agencies, are, actually, going to be with public libraries, particularly, as they increasingly perform a range of social services that governments no longer provide. I'm trying to be tactful. They've gotten out of the business of serving the public, and so the public ends up where there's people who are willing to help them.

So, yes, we are very much aware of the public library component.

MS. FISHER: Hi, Janet Fisher,

The focus I'm hearing is people in the E-government program working in different libraries, doing different things, but what about the E-government courses being part of the core courses, at least one or two? Have you thought about that?

MR. BERTOT: I mean, for like the general students, I mean, like everyone else in the MLS program?

MS. FISHER: What I constantly work with in our state is trying to get every librarian to understand that they have a responsibility to get their community to the government information. They can't say, oh, it's them, they are the ones that know how to do it, or pass it off on someone else.

For every librarian, every library school student, to have that knowledge is really powerful, and I think it's something everyone should do.

So, are you thinking in that
MR. BERTOT: I'm thinking in that direction, whether the rest of the faculty is thinking -- I mean, any of you who have ever dealt with curriculum issues knows exactly what I'm talking about.

Yes, I mean, and so, okay, I'll give you an example. One of our core courses is information services and resources, it's part reference, but it's also understanding user needs, you know, so it's a combination of reference and understanding how people seek information. 601 is what we call it.

The students will be taking that, but as I taught it a year and a half ago, we did a whole module on E-government to introduce students to that.

That's probably not universal across the faculty, right, I mean, so we are trying to interject that as ways we can. Whether or not our E-government class, which is a specific class to the concentration, face-to-face and in this
program, would become a course within the core curriculum, that's a much longer discussion, you know, that would have to unfold.

MS. FISHER: I think you've got a group here, and others throughout the country, that would send letters in support.

MR. SHULER: Well, we appreciate that.

MR. BERTOT: Please send them, I will give you my dean's address and contact information.

MR. SHULER: But, I'd also like to speak to, from my experience at the University of Illinois, there is another next where E-government initiatives are coming from, and that is from public policy -- public planning and public administration.

There's a huge amount of graduate students taking their places in our government bureaucracy who are being trained by, not librarians, but by public administrators and public policy makers, with a heavy dose of computer technology, that would deeply benefit
from our knowledge about information management and organization.

So, I think we could reach out to each other, as well as reach out to these other disciplines that are training future government information people, and infest them with librarianship, as we would infest librarians with E-government.

MS. FISHER: Thank you.

MR. HAYES: Steve Hayes, Notre Dame.

My official title is the Entrepreneurial Spirit Endowed Business Librarian. I did 20 years government information specialty.

When I was moved to the business information center, which is, as I put it, all singing, all dancing, all electronic library, the thought process my director went through at the time was two. Number one, I wasn't afraid of the business faculty. Number two, I had worked in government documents for 20 years. Government people were early adopters
to just about everything, you know, technology, virtual, paperless, you know, all of that.

So, I would second, number one, it should be part of the curriculum, and I have 300 books, the rest of it is nothing but electronic.

Second, it would be encouragement for the students, in terms of you will be so marketable when you are done with this, you know, because as John has pointed out, the political science people, et cetera, but you can also join the dark side, in that the business people, the other question that gets passed, you know, oh, it's a documents question, oh, it's a business question, are out there, believe me, they'll take you very quickly because you've got the skill set that they want.

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

I was just coming up to say, we have a science technology and society
curriculum that's in the engineering school, and they -- I had a student in who wanted to talk about E-government in Mongolia, and that was her project. So, you know, it's all over the place.

MR. SHULER: I think we can safely say, as librarians, all librarians, we are all government information librarians now. We just got there first.

DR. RABINA: Anymore questions?

MS. SEARS: I want to thank our speakers. I think this was a very informative session, and we really thank you.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MR. SHULER: Thanks, everyone.

MS. SEARS: And, remember, we do have one more session at 10:30, where we will be discussing what we feel we've learned over the last few days, and ask you for input also for the sessions that ended early, that we weren't able to get all of your questions in, this would be the time that you can ask those questions.
I would ask Council to briefly meet with me before you run off, and the rest of you are adjourned until 10:30.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:42 a.m., a recess until 10:30 a.m.)

MS. SEARS: If we could begin to take our seats, please.

I have a few housekeeping tasks and announcements before we get started.

Lance always gives me this -- or, always gives the chair, this lovely attendance sheet. Keep in mind that this is kind of like the Census, if you filled out your registration form incorrectly then our statistics are only as good as how you filled out your registration form. So, if I say there are so many public libraries, and you say, oh, there were more than that here, well, some of them didn't put public on their registration form.

There were 421 people registered, and there were 385 that actually attended.
This is an increase from fall of last year, there were 336 last year. So, thank you all for taking the time to come.

Break out by library type, some of you are interested in that. We had 150 academic, 30 law, 18 public, 25 special or other, and 162 who did not fill out that particular question.

We had 39 regionals, 48 first-timers, so I want to clap for them.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: And, 37 speakers.

In addition to actual attendees, we did have people tweeting from the audience. I want to thank those people who were helping us with that, and if you could please stand when I call your name, so that if you are still here you can be recognized, and give your Twitter handle when you stand.

Starr Hoffman. Starr's handle is artgeeklibrarian, for those of you who couldn't hear her. Oh, librarian.

Kirsten Clark, is she here? And,
what's your handle, Kirsten? kjclark.

Rebecca Hyde.

MS. HYDE: altair77.

MS. SEARS: I couldn't hear her, so what did she say, James? Altair77.

Jennie Burroughs, jmburroughs, is that right?

Sanai Wood. She may already have gone home.

Roger Schonfeld. You are rschon.

And, the number of readers we had, we had 51, so 51 who were virtually attending. That is less than Buffalo, but we did not have PR for this conference that we were going to be offering it. So, I talked to James, and we will have PR for San Antonio.

Okay, I also want to ask you to please take the time to fill out your evaluation. The conference is only as good as what you put in on your evaluations. If you let us know what concerns we need to be focusing on, then we know what we need to have sessions on. So, you really need to take the
time to fill them out.

I do want to point out to you, as I just let slip a minute ago, that on the question about whether or not you are attending the spring conference in Buffalo, we are not asking you to be in a time machine, and we are not going back to Buffalo in the spring. That's just an error. We are going to San Antonio, Texas, and we plan to be there April 4th through the 6th of 2011.

The hotel has not been identified yet, so that announcement should be coming out from GPO whenever they get the procurement.

I apologize, I had some dental work before I came, so sometimes you are going to get a lisp. It won't be there in April.

Also, Lance wanted me to remind you to pick up your certificate of attendance if you asked for one on your registration form, it's out on the table.

I do need to inform you of a few votes that we had. We do have business meetings at the end of each day, Monday at
5:30, and Tuesday at 5:30 we had Council business meetings. You are always welcome to attend those business meetings, but it's a silent attendance. You can observe, but we are voting and discussing things among ourselves, and we won't call on people from the audience. To anybody, it is an open meeting, anybody is welcome to attend.

In the meeting on Monday night, we did have two votes. One was on the charter changes, and Dan had posted those to govdoc-l, and put them on the web so that people could look at those prior to the conference. We did vote to accept those changes. Probably -- the one that is dear and near to my heart is that Council members will begin their appointments on June 1st instead of October 1st. That's important to me, because we are trying to plan a conference the middle of October, and if they start October 1st they don't really have a whole lot of time to get caught up on what they are supposed to be working on for the conference. So, I think that was a really
good change.

The others were to just bring the
document up to date, because it was more than
ten years old.

We also had a vote on chair elect.

This person has agreed to begin their
appointment in April, following the Buffalo
conference -- the San Antonio conference, I'm
sorry. I am in my time machine.

Following the San Antonio
conference -- no, James, it's not October --
I will give it to you on April 6th, and the
person who won that election is James Jacobs.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: As many of you are
aware, a few years back Council recommended
that GPO hire a consultant to look into new
models for the FDLP. Ithaca was recently
awarded the contract, and it was due to the
logistics of planning such a large conference,
it was done after we already had the agenda
set. So, I did want to take just a few
moments to let Ross come to the mic and talk
very, very briefly about what they've done so far about the scope, and ask for your participation.

He did this in the regional meeting yesterday, but that was sparsely attended by anybody but regional, and it wasn't in the official record for the conference proceedings, so I would ask that if you could please come to the mic and give us just a brief overview.

MR. HOUSEWRIGHT: Good morning, everyone. Thank you, Suzanne.

I'm Ross Housewright, just for those of you who I haven't had the chance to meet.

And, as Suzanne said, I work for Ithaca Strategy and Research, which is a non-profit organization based in New York City. We also include the services JSTOR and Portico, as other parts of our organization, and David was kind enough to invite us to come out to the regionals meeting yesterday and talk a bit about the project there, and so I
appreciate having the opportunity to do so here as well.

So, a bit about, just very briefly, I will keep this short, but to just give you a bit about what this project is. GPO has hired us to develop a sustainable model or models for how the FDLP can continue to achieve its mission, traditional unchanging mission and values in a digital age, and I emphasize that to say, that specifically part of this program is that the mission and values of the FDLP are not -- those are a given for us, those are not up for question or discussion, those are a given, and those are the basis around -- we are trying to figure out models, a model or models, by which the FDLP can achieve these goals in a sustainable and effective way going forward.

And so, what we are doing, the way that this project has been defined by GPO, there's several steps along the way that I'll go through very quickly, but the first thing I would say is, we have put up, and I give
Cindy all credit for this good idea, but it's a great idea, we have a project website that we've set up at fdliemodeling.net, all one word, which we are using both to sort of inform the community about this project, what we are doing, what questions we are asking, you know, what we are looking at, and also as an opportunity to get your input into this project. So, it's going to be a very sort of transparent process that we are really hoping we can get as a broad participation from the community as possible, which will only improve this project.

So, very briefly, there's a few pieces I just want to walk through that structure this project, very, very briefly. So, it started off, we were working on an environmental scan, which is, basically, looking to see all of the issues and factors impacting the FDLP in this changing environment. So, that's a big project.

We've posted sort of an overview of where we are going with that. We'll soon
be posting, in the next, I don't want to tie
myself to a specific date, but in the next
month or so I'd say, there will be a draft of
this environmental scan which we are going to
make available on the website, and ask for
your input and your comments, to help us -- I
mean, there's, you know, it's a broad thing,
and there's pieces of this that there are
people in this room that know a whole lot more
about it than I do, so the more input you can
offer to tell us what we've missed, you know,
where we are not reflecting everything
accurately. That will only serve to improve
the end product of this.

The next step is going to be --
and we are just sort of kicking this off now,
is developing a sort of framework or doing an
analysis of the different ways in which
libraries collaborate with each other,
throughout the sort of library world. What
are the different ways in which libraries work
together towards a common goal, and which of
these could be feasible for the FDLP in some
pieces, what can we learn from these models.

So, you know, what are the different ways in which -- what are the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches, where are there lessons we can learn from the ways that libraries organize themselves to achieve a common goal.

And so, these are sort of the research pieces, the major research pieces of this project, and that’s the stage we are in right now.

We are doing research. We don’t -- we don’t have a -- we don’t know where this is going, we don’t have a preconceived notion of what the end result of this is going to be, we are doing this research, and we are hoping that you will be able to contribute as much as you can to this research, to help us give the information we need to make recommendations.

So, that’s going to be what’s going to follow out of that, is developing a new model or models for the FDLP that’s going to build on this environmental scan, and it’s going to
build on these networks to say, okay, well, here's -- you know, let's see a model or some models going forward for how the FDLP can continue to achieve its critically important mission in this complicated and changing environment.

So, that's, basically -- and then that will lead into a final report, and things like that, and so this is all going to be, we are going to be sort of narrating this through the website and posting plenty of times when we are looking for input. And, like I said, the more input -- input from the community is only going to make this project better.

So, I said this in the regionals meeting yesterday, I encouraged in the regionals meeting for them to -- for the regionals to do what they can to reach out to the selectives in their region, and encourage them to participate. We are really hoping, I would echo that today, you know, I would really hope that you'd all participate in this, that you would reach out to others in
your community, be those, you know, the other people in your library, your directors, your other people in your library who have an interest in this issue, the other depositories, I mean, how many, there was 300 some of you here, but there's a lot more of you that aren't here, so reaching out to people who aren't here to make sure they are aware of this project and are participating in this project.

And really, that's going to be critically important. There's a lot of voices in this community, and there's a lot of people who don't necessarily, you know, get to share their voice that often, because they don't get to come to things like this, and we want to make sure that this is a project that can bring -- that we can hear all of that, and take that into account as we sort of move forward with this.

So, fdlpmodeling.net, all one word, it's a beautiful fancy site design, with black text on a white background. Yes. I
would really encourage you to participate yourselves and encourage those in your communities to participate as well.

And, thank you.

Sorry, that was probably too long. (Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: Thank you, and I don't think I heard you say anything about your handout, but Ross has left handouts on the back table with the other extra handouts from the other sessions on this project. So, feel free to pick up more than one, and take them back to libraries who were unable to attend.

Okay, so now we are done with the housekeeping stuff.

For those of you who have been to previous Council meetings, we are going to do things a little bit differently. For all you new-timers, then great, you won't know we are doing something different.

In previous years, Council has been tasked with coming up with recommendations for the Wednesday session, the
10:30 session. What this entails is, a great deal of consternation and staying up past midnight in Council rooms, and trying to come together with recommendations. I didn't want to get lynched, and my children wanted to see me again, so I decided that, you know, it didn't make a whole lot of sense either to pull together recommendations when you are brain dead, that it makes a lot more sense to go home and to reflect and to pull together what we were able to get out of this meeting, and what the concerns we heard from you, and put together recommendations.

So, I have given Council a very aggressive timeline to get recommendations drafted by next Friday, a week from this coming Friday, not two days from now. Then we will hash those out via email, and, hopefully, we will have something that we can post to the community no later than the end of November, and you will see those recommendations. So, instead of presenting
recommendations in the Wednesday session,
which was done before, what we are going to do
is use this session to summarize what we have
gathered from the last three days, not only in
the sessions from the speakers, but also from
the questions that you've asked, and from the
questions that you've asked us outside of this
room.

So, we wanted to give you the
opportunity to give us more feedback,
especially, on items we may have missed, and
we know that some of the sessions lasted a
little longer, and that the audience was not
given an ample opportunity to ask questions,
so we wanted to give them -- give you an
opportunity to ask those questions.

So, what we are going to do to
keep this kind of orderly, is we are going to
do this session by session in the order that
we presented them to you, and give you a brief
summary of what we feel we took from the
session, and then let you come to the mic, ask
questions if you have questions from that
session, or also point out to us issues or concerns that you think we should be focusing on that we maybe didn't hear during the session.

So, without further ado, we are going to start with the session that was a review of our April recommendations, and I'm going to ask Jill Moriearty to come to the mic.

MS. MORIEARTY: Those of you who know me, Jill Moriearty, University of Utah, know that I can talk fast. We are short of time, and so get ready.

Along with my colleagues, Helen Burke and David Cismowski, we reviewed the draft recommendations that had been issued in spring Buffalo.

You have a copy of these recommendations and GPO's response in your packet. Please go to the Power Point.

Council, are there any recommendations or comments for draft one through ten, drafts one through ten? Any
additional changes?

Seeing no changes, community, are there any comments or changes? Any issues on draft recommendations one through ten?

I'm so happy.

Let's go to the recommendation 11, recommendation 11 also led into a presentation by Ted Priebe, Director of Library Planning and Development of GPO, and Kelly Seifert, Lead Planning Specialist, Office of the Director, Library Services and Content Management, GPO.

Now, one moment. In this session, we did run over, and we did tackle four questions. We did not, actually, discuss the fifth one, and that's why I'm hurrying to give us some time.

From Council, do you have any comments or questions about the question put forward by GPO, do you have suggestions for Phase II potential services that would increase the benefits of the FDLP?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs,
I think from what I've seen from Phase II, it seems like Ingest will be coming along, things like OAI-PMH will be coming along. So, I don't have suggestions for other potential services, but I'm really looking forward to some of these new things that are coming in Phase II.

MS. MORIEARTY: All right.

Thank you, Council.

Community, do you have any comments?

Now, let me -- while you are thinking about it, let me also remind you that at any time you can contact myself, my colleagues on Council, and get questions or comments to us. I suggest email. I stopped Twittering, gladly.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

I'm not sure where this fits in, but I think that the databases that we have access to, because we are depositories, which
was noted as one of the benefits in the ten benefits, there's got to be a way to make that easier.

If we can't have IP recognition for those, maybe we could have like a master page where we just log in with our FDLP internal password, and we can get to all of them, or there's got to be something that's easier to get access to those.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. MORIEARTY: Thank you.

MS. MALLORY: Mary Mallory, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

I wondered if GPO could look into having, or negotiate, a license for all Federal depository libraries for LibGuides. I know it's not the kind of thing that they normally do, but I wonder if they could negotiate with LibGuides, or, what is it, Spring -- Springshare, and have a low-fee access for depository libraries.

Thank you.

MR. JACOBS: If I could comment on
that.

MS. MORIEARTY: Yes.

MR. JACOBS: Mary, I don't know if folks know, but the FDLP community site is available, and so maybe rather than LibGuides would you be interested in maybe having some more robust tools within the FDLP community site that's already there? Would that be an option, because I can certainly look into that. I think that's one of my charges for this year anyway.

MS. MALLORY: Yes, please do. I guess I was thinking of the advantages of LibGuides, as we are already sharing guides, and if we went off on our own than that would be separating government information from what's there. So, I'd rather it was part of the mainstream, but I'm sure there's rationales for doing it the other way, too.

Thank you.

MR. JACOBS: Yes, sure, thanks.

MS. MALLORY: But, the point is that you have some reference tool. Okay.
MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas.

James is correct, he is being charged and working on the FDLP community.

We are -- our reason for looking at FDLP community, and we are doing this for all of our Council conversations, as well as anything else, is that we are assured a little more of the functionality and the preservation of the material if it's on FDLP community.

If we are using something that is a private entity, then it's possible that they could decide to change things, and we could lose information.

This is -- actually, what is happening, we switched to Google Groups last year, to try and do our listserv, and they are changing some things on Google Groups, so we are trying to get the community to do what we need it to do, so that we can preserve that information.

And, I don't see any reason to not put the LibGuides, both places maybe, or
something. I don't know if we could do that, but I do think they need to be on the community side, just for preservation.

MS. MALLORY: Any further comments, please.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron.

I think that the more robust tools for searching and discovering government information, while they are -- they are not an exclusive benefit in and of themselves, but I suspect that there may be ways to enhance access, enhance participation, that would give depository libraries a chance to, for example, craft their own landing pages for these discovery tools down the road, and be able to fully integrate them into their services and their web access to government information.

MS. MALLORY: Thank you.

Hearing no more comments, Helen, David, have I forgotten anything?

MR. CISMOWSKI: David Cismowski, California State Library.
You haven't forgotten anything, but I would really appeal to all of you out in the audience to think about -- think out of the box, think about benefits that would be exclusive to depository libraries, that would enhance service to the public, that would make -- that would add value to the program, to the point where you could point to those when your director calls you in and says, why are we a depository, you could point to those and say, we have these things because we are an official FDLP depository. And, other libraries do not have these things.

MS. MALLORY: Geoff?

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells, Northwestern University.

In terms of Phase II, I mean, and I'm really glad that OAI-PMH is on the horizon, because we like to get stuff nowadays, but I'd also recommend that GPO start working directly with vendors for products like Summon and Ex Libris' product, so that that material appears, public material
appears in those cloud services that they are providing to all their clients, which I think would dramatically increase use of government information, the discovery of that.

And, there may be issues with that, I don't know, and we certainly can pull in that information to a lot of these services, using things like OIA-PMH, but if you get it in their cloud and it's part of the general materials that they pushing out to people, I think we'd see a dramatic increase in usage of a lot of these resources.

MS. MALLORY: Thank you.

All right, with that, we are actually under, and you didn't think I could do that.

Good day.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: So now, I'd like to call James Jacobs to the mic, to talk about the Born Digital session.

MR. JACOBS: Hi, everyone.

MS. SEARS: Note to Lance, October
next year you may need a longer mic.

MR. JACOBS: Yes.

I'm James Jacobs, Stanford University.

So, our session, which was put together by myself, Shari Laster, and Justin Otto, my esteemed colleagues to my right, stage right, I guess, we wanted to do a session on Born Digital At Risk Government Documents. The goal was to learn about the various projects that are going on in the community, outside of the FDLP community, and how GPO is facilitating those projects, working with those projects, helping those projects along.

So, there were three speakers, Cathy Hartman, from the University of North Texas, talked about the end-of-term project, the end-of-term harvest, and that was a project of UNIT, the Internet Archive, the Library of Congress, were any of the UCs involved in that? Don't think so? CDL, yes, CDL was involved in that.
They harvested the -- they went out and harvested broadly the .gov, .mil, .com, .org, .edu domains of government agencies. They harvested, approximately, 16 terabytes of data, that's a lot for those of you who -- a terabyte is a lot of data.

They -- can I say a buttload, is that -- anyway, you have a foretaste of the things to come -- they gathered that data, not knowing, necessarily, what that data is going to be used for, but they think that it would be used for future research and other uses, for things like data mining and those kinds of things, where CS faculty, researchers, may want to get at that -- that information.

They put together a system of automatic SuDoc assignment for the seeds that they used, and that was just the SuDoc assignment, the top level domain like state.gov and one domain down. So, state.gov/whatever that next one would be. So, they did do some automatic SuDoc assignment to maybe help us get access to that
content in the future.

They had about a dozen subject experts working on the project. I won't name them all, because I don't know all of them, but some of them are in the room, and that's on the slides that are available.

The second speaker was James Mauldin, at the GPO. What is James' official title?

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

James' official title, Manager, Office of Archive Management.

MR. JACOBS: So, James gave a brief talk about GPO harvesting activities. I thought it was really interesting, the things that James put forward.

For example, he said that GPO is currently -- it's part of their whole documents discovery process, is part of that whole process is harvesting of digital documents, and there is an OPAL session available on Lost Docs document discovery, so
please go to the OPAL site if you want to know more about that.

He noted that they do manual, as well as automated and semi-automated, processes, but there is still a lot of human intervention to find, and collect, and describe the publications that they get.

They do serials as well as monos, so that was interesting.

He noted there are harvesting challenges, and it's mostly for GPO generally format-based. So, for example, they don't catalog databases or applications within publications, like if a video is embedded in a publication, and those are, you know, challenges that the harvesting community has in general, it's not a GPO issue, it's a web issue. I could talk about that for about a half hour.

They are working to increase cooperation and communication with other agencies, in order to grow their identification and access processes, and they
are planning in the future to test the ingest of documents into FedSys, the documents that they harvest, but that is a future plan.

Then the third talk was by this guy, I don't know who he is, James Jacobs I think his name was, and he -- can I talk in the third person, that's kind of odd -- James talked about LOCKSS-USDocs. This is a project using LOCKSS, which is Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe, software developed by Stanford.

Currently, there are 20 libraries participating in the LOCKSS-USDocs project, including five regional libraries, which James thanks very much.

They are harvesting known structured government publications, and they started with the GPO access content, that Carol Malamud harvested, so that was GPO access content from 1991 to 2007.

And then, with the help of GPO, they started collecting the FedSys collections as well, and so they are currently harvesting, and collecting, and preserving FedSys in a
distributed archive.

GPO did have active technical participation in the project. They had to do some significant changes to FedSys in order to embed permission statements that are sort of the special sauce that makes LOCKSS run.

And, James is also looking for more participants, so you can email him at jrjacobs@stanford.edu, if you are interested.

We are thinking of -- and this is a quick pitch off -- we are thinking of, not only allowing LOCKSS Alliance members to participate in this, but because government documents are such an important piece of our democracy we are looking to include non-LOCKSS Alliance members as well.

So, even if your school is not -- or if your academic institution, or your library, is not a LOCKSS Alliance member, please let me know if you are interested.

And, those were the three speakers that we had, and I'll open up the floor to see if there are further questions, or comments,
or ideas.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

I'm glad we are doing this, because I had wanted to ask the three speakers if any of them prepared for their harvesting projects by playing Farmville on Facebook.

I did, though, want to compliment GPO on their harvesting, because I have been amazed over the past year how often I click on a PURL, both for recent things and for pretty old things, and it goes to one of those permanent addresses that it has been archived, and I have hardly, I think, ever found something that was not there, you know. It has been archived and staged, and keep up the good work.

MR. JACOBS: Yes. A comment to that, thanks, Lori, I think it would be really interesting to the community if we could see a list of exactly what titles have been harvested. I think it would be really great, because I think, like you, there's a lot there
that GPO has done to harvest both serials and one offs, that we don't realize the work that GPO is doing, and the work that goes into that. So, it would be really great to have a little bit of public PR on, hey, look at all the documents we are actually harvesting.

Robin is shaking her head. Okay, we can talk later.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of Akron.

MR. JACOBS: Hi, Shari.

MS. LASTER: I just want to add to that, that one of the things that I really got out of these sessions was the immense amount of work that GPO has both formally and informally done in support of these projects. And, I think that in both cases, certainly, without GPO's help the LOCKSS-USDocs project could not have come about, and in both cases the project seemed to have benefitted immensely from this kind of support, and that's just a very encouraging thing, and I want to say that, you know, I think that we
are grateful for that support.

MR. JACOBS: It really points to the idea that GPO and the community is working together on these issues, to make our community, our whole community, better and to make access to government information better.

So, thanks.

Nothing further. Excellent.

Thanks, everyone.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: We're on time, I'm so pleased.

I'd now like to call Ann Marie to the mic, to talk about the new model session.


Myself and my Council partners, Steve Hayes and Dan O'Mahony, and also Cindy Etkin, put the session together yesterday on emerging models for partnerships among depository libraries.

Just to kind of recap it, it was Judy Russell speaking on the ACRL proposal,
and also there was a side piece that she brought us, an ARL statement on principles and FDLP that came out last week.

We also heard from Mary Prophet, from the Five Colleges of Ohio, and their incredibly long, rich and interesting history of collaborative projects.

And finally, from Geoff Swindells, from Northwestern, as recapping the CIC government documents project, to digitize government documents, and enable a different management of print collections.

The session ran a bit long, and I had a sense that we didn't, perhaps, get everybody's questions in. I know Judy Russell isn't here, but there are other people involved in the ACRL project here.

As Council, we don't really see an -- while we appreciated the session, and got a lot of information out of it, we don't really see an action item for us out of this session, unless someone here has something to offer, and I wanted to open up the opportunity
for further questions tied to that presentation.

I just put you ahead of schedule.

MS. SEARS: Council or community?

I'm not seeing any movement.

MR. STEVENSON: John Stevenson, University of Delaware.

One of the questions that I've seen come up, and I didn't hear it answered or addressed in the session, with the HathiTrust Library, some people have observed that some of the records have no holding libraries, and I wasn't sure if this was because the libraries share the information, and just feel that it's sufficient to have a record in OCLC to provide access, and wondered if someone who is more familiar with this might address that, because holding symbols mean something very important, if someone is using WorldCat as a finding tool, and if one uses WorldCat local, if you put your holding symbol on it, it weights it and brings it up higher, giving it more prominence. And, these look to be very
valuable resources, so it's surprising how low
the numbers are for holding libraries.

MS. SANDERS: Jeff, can you speak
to that?

MR. SWINDELLS: Geoff Swindells,
Northwestern University.

No, I, actually, can't. I'm not -
what I suggest is, if you email me, that
John and I can push that to the HathiTrust
folks, and see what the issue is there,
because I'm not really sure.

I see plenty of holding libraries
-- well, you see the source library. You are
looking for all the holding libraries of a
particular title?

MR. STEVENSON: Libraries that put
their symbols on it, you know.

MR. SWINDELLS: Right, yes, and I
don't know what Hathi's policy is in terms of
those MARC records, so I can ask John Wilkin.

MR. STEVENSON: Okay.

MR. SWINDELLS: But, you send it
to me and I'll send it to him.
MR. STEVENSON: Thank you.

MR. JACOBS: James Jacob, Stanford University.

I'm hearing that there needs to be a HathiTrust presentation at a future conference, and so I will -- we will look into that as we can.

Thanks.

MS. SANDERS: All right, thank you very much.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: The next session that we had was on authentication, and so Peggy Jarrett is going to come and present that.

Camilla, unfortunately, ate something bad last night, so that is why she's not here this afternoon. Hopefully, she's getting better.

MS. JARRETT: Well, we had three engaging speakers educate us on the value of authentication of government information. And, one of the things that we learned is that authentication is a verb, it's an activity
based on trust and based on infrastructure.

And, through a couple of rather entertaining examples, for those of you who were there, we learned that it's possible to easily alter data, and it's not always easily detectable to the user of the data.

Most agencies aren't worried at this moment about the chain of reliability after the information leaves the agency source, because it's expensive, and because nothing scandalous and awful has happened yet. So, when the agency does the risk assessment, it's not worth the money right now.

We learned the chain of reliability is important to researchers and scholars in a variety of fields, including scientific, and technical and social science. This isn't an issue just for -- brains, and that was really the point that all of the speakers made.

We also learned, and this was something that had never occurred to me, that there are international implications, since
researchers and scholars outside of the U.S. rely on U.S. Government information.

And, we concluded that the original source document in depository collections are an important resource, and should be valued as much or more as the rest of the library collection.

So, out of this discussion we got the idea that what GPO provides, and I must say that GPO does a fabulous job with the authentication that they do, what they provide is trusted original source material, is really a taut benefit of the Federal Depository Library program.

And finally, may I pick on Mike Wash, would you be willing to come up and -- there you are -- and tell us briefly about the interagency group dealing with authentication, just come up for a second?

MR. WASH: Thanks. I was going to add that after you were finished, so thank you for the prompt.

There's a couple of interagency
things that are going on that I wanted to share, just so that everybody is aware.

GPO has been involved in the IdP activity since it really got started, and we've been a member of the National Strategy Advisory -- National Digital Strategy Advisory Board, and we are also -- we have been invited members of the National Digital Stewardship Board, which is forming now, and the first meeting is going to be in December, and I see this as a continuation of activities on digital initiatives, and I think it's a good recognition of the role that we all play in digital materials.

But, the activities, specifically, as it relates to authentication that are underway, one is a digitization subgroup that the library group, as well as the IT organization within GPO participates in, along with a number of other agencies, National Archives, the Library of Congress, and others. And, the digitization initiative has done things like the creation of a standard for the
scanning of information, and they also talk about the metadata requirements to capture with the scanning of information, and it leads into the chain of custody of digitized material, so that we can start to create an understanding of, you know, a level of authenticity, if you will, of material that could be collected.

Another thing that this group has been doing is, actually, collecting materials. As we shared in Buffalo, there's been an activity on the statutes at large, dating back to 1951, and, you know, those come directly from the Library of Congress, and they have scanned to the specifications, so it's a good example of a partnership within the government of collecting materials, scanning materials, and, eventually, making them available for access on FDSys and other systems.

Another group that is now forming is an authentication group, specifically, part of the subgroup of NDIV, it's a peer group to the digitization group, and they asked GPO to
lead that, which is, I think, very good. And, we are in the formation process right now of finding other agencies within the Federal Government to participate on this, but it's going to be a continuation of the type of dialogue that we had here yesterday on authentication, and helping to understand what the attributes are for authentication. So, I think it's a very positive step forward.

MS. JARRETT: Okay, thank you.

And, for the court reporter, that was Mike Wash from GPO.

So, does anybody have anymore questions, comments, thoughts?

MR. CISMOWSKI: This is David Cismowski, California State Library.

I would really like to commend the committee on Council that put on this particular program. For me, even though it sounded on the agenda like a program that would be akin to watching grass grow, those of you in the audience who attended this I think might agree with me that it was one of the
most intellectually challenging, and yet, practically engaging programs that I have ever seen here, and it truly brought --

(Whereupon, applause.)

MR. CISMOWSKI: -- it truly brought to my consciousness the importance of authentication for scholarship, for research, for factual information gathering and reporting, in a way that I had never really thought of before.

And, it's kind of a shame to me that this wasn't recorded, so that it could be watched again, and again, and again, and also presented to audiences who don't even have a conception of how important this is.

So, thank you very much.

MS. JARRETT: Thank you, David.

MS. SEARS: Suzanne Sears, University of North Texas. I second what David said. I have sat through, I cannot tell you how many meetings on authentication, trying to get a grasp on it, and trying to understand it, and
I feel like after that session I really do have a good understanding of why it's important and what it is.

I'm wondering, as David said, it wasn't recorded, I mean, do you have the transcript, which is not going to read as well as it played out? I'm wondering if maybe the three Council members that put this session together would maybe see if there's a way to make an OPAL session out of it.

MS. JARRETT: We will take that under advisement, although, I'm not sure in the OPAL session you could have Camilla pirouetting as she's editing the data, and giving it to Sally.

So, I think that -- and for me, I'm a law librarian, and this is supposed to be one of our issues, I learned so much, and it is one of those things that, frankly, my eyes glaze over when I hear people say it. It's a horribly long word even.

So, I really appreciate Sally and Camilla, and, particularly, our speakers, for
doing such an entertaining job. The speakers were fabulous.

MS. BURKE: Helen Burke, Hennepin County Library.

As the lone public library in here, I agree with David's assessment. I had to be here, because they'd notice if I was missing, but it was the singular session that really brought it home to me as a public librarian, and it's not just to an audience of law libraries, or academic libraries, it's an issue that concerns all of us. And, I think the session really brought that home.

So, I'm going to share it with everybody that I can.

Thank you to Camilla and Shari -- or, Camilla, and Peggy and Sally, for putting that together.

MS. JARRETT: Anybody else?

I think from here the real question is how to spread the word that this is important and this is a benefit, other than having, you know, Sally call everybody
individually and try to convince them that it's an important issue. I think that's really our charge.

MR. MEYER: Peggy, you don't want me to speak?

MS. JARRETT: Larry?

MR. MEYER: Larry Meyer, Law Library for San Bernardino County, and, actually, my state regional took away my original question which was, was it recorded.

I am just wondering if GPO, because it really was perfect, if GPO would be willing to redo this at the spring meeting in San Antonio, and this time record it as a YouTube video that they could then broadcast.

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

The only problem with that might be getting the speakers to San Antonio. I'm not sure if their travel budget would allow that, but we'll certainly look into it.

MS. JARRETT: Yes?

MR. McCLURE: Kevin McClure,
I just want to echo everything that has already been said, and add that at the FDSys update yesterday GPO staff ran through some examples of check summing that showed how it works in a way that I could understand, and I think if this program is redone in any way that would make a very good compliment piece to it.

MS. JARRETT: Thank you.

Any further comments, questions, thoughts?

Okay, thanks.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: I have my little clock here, so I’m trying to find someplace to put it.

If you haven’t noticed from this conference, I’m a little bit anal retentive about time, so that’s why they all keep looking at me. It comes from having four children, you have to stay on schedule.

The last session was one that
Debbie Rabina held with -- who were your committee members again, Cindy Etkin and Ann Marie, is that correct, and Steve Hayes, on E-government.

Since that session was immediately preceding this session, and it ended early, we didn't really feel like there needed to be a summary, but if somebody has a comment or a question that now with further reflection they would like to ask, if they want to come to the mic and speak on that session.

Okay, so the next thing that we wanted to do is open the floor up to all of you, to bring up issues or concerns that you would like us to pursue in the coming months before the April session, that were not covered in any of the sessions this time.

So, I'm opening the floor.

MS. SMITH: Lori Smith, Southeastern Louisiana University.

I just have some sort of marketing kind of issues. One thing we are talking a lot about at my university is QR codes, and I
can see a lot of uses for those on GPO marketing materials. So, if nobody at GPO is investigating QR codes, I would like to bring those to your attention, because they are really kind of spiffy.

And, the other thing is, I'm not sure if there are mobile friendly versions of the GPO sites, so if there are not mobile friendly, that might be something we want to encourage GPO to work on, because a lot more people are accessing things on their phones these days, and that's the direction that our databases, the commercial ones, seem to be going, so that's probably what GPO needs to be doing as well.

MS. SEARS: Any further comments?

I see Mike getting up.

MR. WASH: Mike Wash, GPO.

We've been working on a framework for mobile applications, and that's about as much as I can say about it right now, but we've been investigating a lot of the mobile readers that are out there, tracking what's
going on with the various applications that are providing mobile reader file formats, for example, as well as applications, iPhone applications, Droid apps, et cetera, and we are still very much in the early stages of our development work. And, it's really more of an investigation phase, but we are looking and trying to become prepared to provide some mobile applications as required.

We developed a very primitive type of prototype of a Federal Register iPhone app, which was very interesting. It's not fully functional yet. We've really only discussed it with the folks at the Federal Register, to see if they liked, you know, the way it was going to work, and the type of features that it could provide in a typical framework of an iPhone, and they really liked it.

So, I think it was validation that it was on the right path, and also utilizing the datasets within the repository of FDSys.

So, I think there's something there, and we are working on it. So, it's
still in the emerging stages.

MS. SEARS: Arlene?

MS. WEIBLE: Arlene Weible from the Oregon State Library.

One issue, not an issue, that I haven't heard a whole lot of official talk about, is the article that appeared in the most recent American Libraries, "Wither the GPO." And, I am wondering, I was very disturbed to find out that one of the selected depositories in my state has read that article and then started thinking maybe they should be getting out of a dying program.

So, I was wondering if there should be some consideration of doing some kind of official response to that article, and I know Council member James Jacobs wrote a very nice rebuttal piece to that piece on his blog, but I think that needs to get out, and if there is something that we can do to respond to that it needs to get out in the more mainstream library literature, because that's what directors read, they don't read
every of our specialized blogs.

So, I just was wondering -- and I
guess it's as much of a question for GPO as it
is for Council, is there anything being
thought about to officially respond to that
article?

MS. SEARS: Ric, do you have a
response to that?

MR. DAVIS: Ric David, GPO.

GPO does not traditionally respond
to articles like that, but again, I think that
-- I read that article, and, obviously,
there's a lot of information that was missing
about the role of GPO and what this program
provides, and I'd be happy to talk with the
people who developed it, but there's not going
to be an official rebuttal from the Government
Printing Office.

MS. SEARS: I also feel that
Council walks a very thin line on what is
appropriate and not, and, you know, James, not
representing Council, but representing his
free government information, did a wonderful
I am willing to talk to Ric to see if he feels that it's Council's role to do such a rebuttal, because I agree with you, Arlene, but I'm just not sure that it's Council's role either.

James, do you have any comments?

MR. JACOBS: Yes, thanks, Arlene, for that.

I wanted to let folks know that it wasn't just me, it was me, and my doppleganger, Jim Jacobs, and Daniel Cornwall, and Rebecca Blakeley, who collaboratively wrote that on this cool little tool called PiratePad, if anybody wants to know I'll let you know.

We did post it to the blog, and we are looking into a contact at the American Libraries to see if they'll publish either the post as is, or some iteration of the post as a response. So, look for a response in the more traditional avenues as well.

MS. SEARS: Yes?

MS. SEARS: Can you speak a little more into the mic, I can't hear you up here?

MS. McGILVRAY: Sorry, Jessica McGilvray. I work at the American Library Association, Washington Office.

If you have issues getting in touch with Headquarters and American Libraries, yes, talk to me after and I can help you with that.

MS. SEARS: Thank you.

MS. BRAUNSTEIN: Stephanie Braunstein, Louisiana State University, and thank you, Arlene, for bringing this up. It has been on my mind ever since I read the article, which I happen to have in my hand.

The one sentence I'm particularly concerned about and would like to see some response to from GPO is, why are we still talking about depository libraries when they
are far outnumbered by all the other libraries that have just as much access to government information as do the depositories. 

That is fighting words.

MS. SEARS: I agree, Stephanie.

Yes?

MS. CHILDS: Hi, Miriam Childs, Law Library of Louisiana.

This is a different topic. I'm kind of a new depository librarian, so this might also be incredibly naive, but I'm hearing a lot at this conference about all the work GPO is doing, tracking down all of the Born Digital documents with the crawlers and all that, and I was just wondering if there is some way to get the agencies to be a little bit kinder and work with us a little bit more, you know, understanding what, you know, the principles are with government information, that it's a democratic ideal. It just seems like they are kind of doing what they want to, and we are chasing after them, like trying to herd cats, which is
a very difficult thing to do.

So, I don't know, maybe it's naive
to just try to get the agencies just to, you
know, kind of be more aware of the information
they are putting out, that it's really
government information, it's not just, you
know, having it on a website and then taking
stuff down.

MS. SEARS: And, I think Ric has a
response for you.

MR. DAVIS: Ric Davis, GPO, on a
subject near and dear to my heart, because I,
without mentioning the agency, I often bring
up an example of about 15 years ago when I was
with an agency, and I asked them how long they
were going to keep content up on their site,
and they said, well, when our usage statistics
go down, we are just going to get rid of it,
and 15 years later, almost a year ago, I had
that conversation again.

So, you know, we've tried a couple
of different activities, one of which is to
police it through lawyers, and have legal
staff force the issue.

What I've found that works better is what we are doing now, which is to communicate, collaborate and educate, and the staff in Lori Hall's area, under Joe McClane, we have a contingency of 15 or 20 people, along with contracting officers up in our customer service operation, who are doing that on a daily basis.

And, it's a real different challenge than it was 15 years ago, because we had one or two print officers to deal with, now in some agencies we have hundreds of webmasters whose first question is, what is the FDLP. So, it's an ongoing educational process we're finding, to get that information, to ensure ongoing access and permanency, collaboration is working better than force, but force is always a last resort that we'll use if we need it.

MS. SEARS: Thank you.

Anymore comments, suggestions, something that we left out?
I'd like to take this opportunity
to thank Lance Cummins and his staff for
putting on, yet again, another wonderful
conference.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: I would mention all of
them, but I would leave somebody out I'm sure,
and then I would feel awful. They worked
tirelessly to make sure that everything runs
smoothly for all of us, and I really
appreciate all of the hard work that they did.

Another reminder to turn in your
evaluations, and when you do, just tell them
thank you. They really appreciate that.

So, another reminder I want to
give you is that you can always contact any of
the Council members directly. Our contact
information is in your packets, so you do have
our email, snail mail, phone. We are here to
represent you, and to advise GPO, the
Superintendent of Documents and Public
Printer, on your behalf, and we can only do
that if you are communicating with us.
So, I also would like to say that
I planned on eating lunch by myself, so if any
of you are staying and would like to have
lunch with me, I am more than happy to do
that, and I can meet, if you'll let me run
upstairs and change into something that is not
a three-inch heel.

Larry, you have another comment?

MR. MEYER: Yes, moment of
personal indulgence, Larry Meyer, Law Library
for San Bernardino County.

I've been coming to these meetings
for a long, long time. There is somebody here
today who is at her last meeting, who has been
at many of those meetings, who really, really
helped teach me the ropes, and I think we
should recognize Mary Jane Mallonee before she
-- Mallonee, I can never get it right -- Mary
Jane, please stand up. This is her last
meeting. She says she's retiring.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: Since we are speaking
of retirements, we have lost two members of
Lance's crew to retirement, Nick Ellis, who -- unless you were here on Sunday you did not see, and his wife, Yvonne, who was here on Tuesday.

Council is working on commendations that will be presented in April on the retirement of those two very valued employees from Lance's staff.

(Whereupon, applause.)

MS. SEARS: So, someone once told me that a successful conference is one that you can go to and learn at least one thing, that you can take back with you to your institution, that will benefit you or your institution.

So, I hope that you have found the last three days to be both informative and successful, and I thank all of you for your input, and again, please feel free to continue to contact us, and we will see you all in the beautiful State of Texas in San Antonio, not that I'm biased, on April 4th.

(Whereupon, applause.)
MS. SEARS: And, I'll try to do this better than I did opening the session, but the session is adjourned.

(Whereupon, applause.)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 11:38 a.m.)