FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

MODELING FOR THE FUTURE

Project status update

Tuesday, March 29, 2011

A brief update on project status: The Ithaka S+R project team shared a draft final report with GPO on March 5, received feedback from GPO on March 11, and delivered our final report to GPO after the close of GPO's business day on March 18, 2011. GPO has indicated to us that its final review process is ongoing.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (0)

Thank you for your input

Monday, March 14, 2011

Friday was the final day for input into the FDLP modeling project, and Ross and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the dozens of community members who have provided input in one form or another through the course of this project. We are now in the last revision stages to prepare the final report for acceptance by GPO as the project deliverable. Stay tuned — the final report will be released publicly via this website — before long. Thank you again for your interest in and engagement with this process.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (0)

Deadlines for feedback, preparations for DLC

Monday, March 7, 2011

As a reminder to all of you who have been following this project and providing us with your valuable reactions throughout, we're nearing the final deadline for being able to integrate your feedback into the final report. Although the latest deliverable (the value proposition) listed this final deadline as Wednesday the 9th, we will be extending the window for all feedback on this and all previous section drafts

through the end of this week. We will not, however, be able to integrate any feedback received after Friday, March 11th into the final report. This cutoff date will enable us to move into our final revisions and move towards an on-time release of the complete report. We are making every effort to allow ample time for the community to read and reflect on the final report in advance of the Depository Library Conference, to support a productive and informed discussion in early April.

At DLC, we will be presenting our work and participating in a community discussion on the proposed direction and models. According to the preliminary schedule, this presentation will take place on Monday, April 4th, from 2pm-3:30pm. For those who will be able to attend, we look forward to discussing the report together with you.

Draft Value Proposition for the FDLP

Monday, February 28, 2011

Today, Ithaka S+R is pleased to release the next component of our project to develop sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st century. In this component, we discuss the value propositions of the direction and models described in a previous deliverable, and discuss how this value proposition compares to the value proposition for the Program as it currently exists. This document is linked at the bottom of this post, but first we'd like to provide a bit of context as a reminder of how this document fits into the overall project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research:
    - *Background (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (released previously in draft form,*

- *libraries collaborate around common goals)*
  - ○ *Findings (released previously in draft form, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- ■ Analysis:
  - ○ *Direction (released previously in draft form, presenting a single direction forward for the Program that emerges from the Findings)*
  - ○ *White Paper on New Models (released previously in draft form, which lays out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
  - ○ *Value Proposition (this document, analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
  - ○ *Implementation notes (assessing approaches for implementing the models)*
- ■ Case studies (discussing how libraries might take on different portfolios of roles in these models)

This document focuses on evaluating how the proposed Direction and Models will impact the Program's sustainable accomplishment of its overall goals by considering the value proposition that they pose to libraries. Evaluating the value proposition of a given scenario entails consideration of how a library might perceive and make choices about its role in the Program based on the various costs and benefits associated with fulfilling this role. First, this document discusses the historical value proposition of participation in the Program, assessing how this has changed over time. Next, we discuss the overall value proposition presented by the broad Direction for the Program released previously in draft form, and then assess the value propositions of each of the new Models released previously in draft form.

Attached below is a draft of the analysis of the value propositions for the new models proposed for the Program that, subject to further substantive revision (including expected revisions based on feedback received on earlier deliverables after the completion of this draft) and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by March 9, 2011 will be able to be integrated into our preparations of the final paper, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review; given the timeline for this project, feedback received on *any* portion of the project after March 9, 2011, will not be able to be integrated into the final report prior to its release.

will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

The draft of the value proposition may be found at: Value Proposition draft 2 28 2011

Draft New Models for the FDLP

Friday, February 11, 2011

Today, Ithaka S+R is pleased to release the next component of our project to develop sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st century. In this component, we lay out a series of new models for the FDLP that build upon the Direction released previously. These models seek to reshape the Program to accommodate local and system-wide strategic shifts that are occurring across the library landscape with the transition to an increasingly digital environment, enabling libraries to more comfortably participate in the Program while maintaining or even increasing broad public access to government information and services to support its effective use. This document is linked at the bottom of this post, but first we'd like to provide a bit of context as a reminder of how this document fits into the overall project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research:
    - *Background (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of ways in which libraries collaborate around common goals)*
    - *Findings (released previously in draft form, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis:

> _form_, presenting a single direction forward for the Program that emerges from the Findings)
> - _White Paper on New Models (this document, which lays out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)_
> - _Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)_
> - _Implementation notes (assessing approaches for implementing the models)_

This document presents a set of new models that build directly on the previously released Direction for the Program. As a reminder, the Direction laid out two core assumptions about the environment for the FDLP; each of the models described here share these assumptions, summarized here:

- This project assumes that GPO will continue to provide an increasingly high-quality centralized and freely available access point for FDLP materials. Although many other digital access points tailored to the needs of specific user communities may exist – including digital collections developed by individual libraries and networks of them, added-value services by vendors, and more – we believe that this GPO-provided centralized and freely available system will support the needs of a wide range of users for digital FDLP materials. This centralized access point will support the development of these alternative access points by making materials available for easy reuse and integration by non-GPO service providers. And although users will have access to FDLP materials via a robust spectrum of alternative access points that may provide tailored services for particular user communities, this GPO-provided service will provide a baseline level of no-fee access to seekers of government information.
- This project also assumes that over time, the historic collection of FDLP materials will be comprehensively (or very nearly so) digitized, but that this digitization will require patience and coordination. We assume that digitization will continue to develop through a variety of GPO partnership agreements and independent initiatives but will not (unfortunately) be conducted through a single comprehensive program. Also, although there may be many access points to digitized historic FDLP materials, we assume that all these materials will also be made freely available via GPO's centralized access point as described above,

through procedures that that are out of scope of this project but whose development should be guided by the library community. Consequently, we believe that the Program's structure must accommodate a medium-term or even lengthy transitional phase in which tangible materials remain the only means of access to some content. But where digital versions of FDLP materials are available, however they are formally integrated into the Program, we assume that many (although not all) users will prefer digital access over tangible access.

This white paper on new models for the FDLP first discusses some of the broad *themes* that are reflected throughout these models, next describes a set of *building blocks* for new approaches to addressing several Program priorities, and finally arranges these building blocks into a series of cumulative *new models* for the FDLP.

Based on conversations with GPO, we believe that these models follow naturally from the findings of the research phase and the previously released Direction, and should describe a set of models that can provide the basis for a valuable conversation across the FDLP community. We would deeply value the feedback of members of the library community on these models, either assessing the individual building blocks and models or discussing which of the approaches proposed here seems to offer the best fit for the Program. The models described in this document will be at the heart of our final report, and so we will benefit significantly from community feedback on them.

Attached below is a draft of the potential new models for the Program that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by February 22, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of the value proposition and final paper, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before March 4, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report (and, please continue to offer feedback on previously posted drafts as well until that date). Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

The *full* discussion of these new models can be found at the following link: New Models draft 2 11 2011. For the reader's convenience, we have also prepared a

available at the following link: <u>Summary of New Models draft 2 11 2011</u>. Although we hope this shorter document will be valuable to the reader, it is not a project deliverable and we would therefore prefer that your feedback focus on the complete discussions of these new models in the *full* draft version of the report.

Draft Proposed Direction for the FDLP

Friday, February 4, 2011

Today, Ithaka S+R is pleased to release the next component of our project to develop sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st century. In this document, we lay out an overall direction for the Program; this direction emerges from the findings released previously, and describes a set of functional and structural themes that we believe must be addressed for the Program to be successful and sustainable in an increasingly digital environment. This document is linked at the bottom of this post, but first we'd like to provide a bit of context as a reminder of how this document fits into the overall project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces and supporting the following models and recommendations. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research:
    - *Background (<u>released previously in draft form</u>, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (<u>released previously in draft form</u>, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (<u>released previously in draft form</u>, providing an overview of ways in which libraries collaborate around common goals)*
    - *Findings (<u>released previously in draft form</u>, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis:
    - *Direction (this document, which presents a single direction forward for the Program that emerges from the Findings)*

> > > *set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
> > > - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
> > > - *Implementation notes (assessing approaches for implementing the models)*

The direction laid out in this document builds on the project's findings, integrating the feedback that we have received from the community and from GPO on these findings. This direction provides a set of themes in several major areas:

- Assumptions about the Program and its context that are outside the scope of our consideration;
- A set of functional directions, laying out priorities for the Program to effectively accomplish its mission in the areas of access to and preservation of tangible collections, access to and preservation of digital collections, and access to government information support services; and
- A structural direction for the Program, laying out priorities for the structure of the Program that will support its success and sustainability.

This direction necessarily describes these themes at a relatively high level; these themes will be developed further in the models that will follow in an upcoming deliverable. A metaphor we have found helpful in describing the roles of the direction and models is that the *direction* suggests that the Program should go (for example) southwest; the *models* will describe pathways by which the Program might go fifty miles southwest, a hundred miles southwest, two hundred miles southwest, etc.

Based on conversations with GPO, we believe that this direction follows naturally from the findings of the research phase and should set out themes that can be broadly agreed upon across the FDLP community. We would deeply value, however, the feedback of members of the library community on this direction, either affirming our belief that this direction is substantively in alignment with their priorities or identifying any places where we may be making unwarranted assumptions or problematic assertions. Our proposed models will build directly on this direction, and so we will benefit significantly from community feedback as we continue to build out these models.

Attached below is a draft of the direction for the Program that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to

fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by February 10, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of new models, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before February 28, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report (and, please continue to offer feedback on previously posted drafts as well until that date). Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

The draft proposed direction for the FDLP can be found at the following link: FDLP Direction Draft 2 4 2011

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (2)

Project schedule update

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Thanks to everyone for their feedback on the previously released drafts. We've received a wealth of comments from across the community – some which have been posted publicly, much of which has been emailed directly to us. We have been incorporating into the project your input on topics as diverse as digitization, service provision, education and training, types of library networks, and the role of the library, in two ways. First, we have been using it to inform our thinking on subsequent sections of the paper. Second, we are carefully tracking specific suggestions that we will use to revise the drafts as we prepare to incorporate them into the final report. So, thank you again for the feedback, please keep it coming, and we are actively at work on subsequent sections.

As many of you will know, our client GPO has had a number of significant leadership changes in the past month. Consequently, although GPO has already accepted the next draft deliverable as complete and ready for public comment, GPO has asked that Ithaka S+R take a temporary pause in releasing any documents publicly at this time. At this point we do not yet know exactly how long this pause will need to last.

The Ithaka S+R project team is committed to the thorough public review of the drafts of the project sections. We apologize for this delay and look forward to returning to the regular release of drafts for public review at the earliest possible opportunity.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (0)

Congratulations to Mary Alice Baish on

Documents

Friday, January 21, 2011

Ithaka S+R warmly congratulates Mary Alice Baish on her appointment as Assistant Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents. As GPO's announcement yesterday emphasized, Mary Alice is a long-time advocate for the FDLP, having gained particular prominence for her efforts in advocacy of permanent free public access to digital government information, most recently through FDsys, for the development of which she has provided critical support. We are greatly looking forward to working with Mary Alice, and continuing to work with the broader GPO team, in developing practical and sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st Century.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (0)

Summary of Research Phase Findings and Implications

Friday, January 14, 2011

As we come to the close of the research phase of this project and prepare to move into our analysis phase, we are eager to pause for reflection on what we-ve learned so far in this project. Today, we are releasing a summary of findings and their implications from this research phase, which will serve as a capstone on this first stage of the project and lay the final groundwork for us to move ahead into our analysis and development of recommendations. First, though, we-d like to provide a bit of background and context on the role that this document plays in the project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces and supporting the following models and recommendations. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research and findings:
  - *Background (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
  - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
  - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (released previously in draft form,*

> > > > *libraries collaborate around common goals)*
> > > > - *Findings (this document, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
> > > - Analysis and recommendations:
> > > > - *Direction (a single direction forward for the Program, emerging from the Findings)*
> > > > - *White Paper on New Models (laying out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
> > > > - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
> > > > - *Recommendations (providing a recommended model for the Program and describing how this model could best be implemented)*

This "findings" section (as we will refer to it as shorthand) serves to conclude and reflect on the research phase of this project, drawing out the major themes that have surfaced in the research phase of this project that seem especially important to structuring our thinking in beginning to develop a direction for the program. This document structures these findings into three broad categories: functional considerations with respect to collections and formats, functional considerations with respect to services, and structural considerations with respect to the network of libraries. It also provides an implication for each finding, as well as an overall implication for each category, that will help shape the Direction and New Models that come next.

As always, we will welcome community feedback on this project. As we have noted previously, the project builds cumulatively, and there has already been extensive opportunity for input into the research sections themselves. Consequently, on this document, we are principally interested in feedback that addresses whether our findings are a fair and accurate representation of the research we have already conducted and released for community review. The findings will serve to lay critical groundwork for the remainder of this project, and so we hope that you will engage thoughtfully and provide us with feedback.

Attached below is a draft of the findings and implications from the research phase of this project that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by January 24, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of a strategic direction and the modeling

grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before February 15, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

FDLP Findings 1 14 2011

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (3)

FDLP Modeling Webinar Available

Thursday, January 13, 2011

Thanks to everyone who was able to join us this afternoon for our GPO-hosted OPAL session discussing the progress so far on the FDLP modeling project! For those of you who weren't able to make it today, an archived version of the presentation is available at http://www.opal-online.org/archivegpo.htm. We hope this session has given you a better understanding of the current status of this project, but we're eager to address any outstanding questions you may have; please feel free to contact us via this website or directly at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Again, thanks, and we look forward to your continued engagement over the course of this project!

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (0)

‹ Older posts

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

MODELING FOR THE FUTURE

Upcoming opportunities to learn more about the FDLP Modeling project

Tuesday, January 4, 2011

We're pleased to announce two upcoming opportunities for the community to learn more about this project, in addition to following our releases via this website.

First, Ross Housewright will provide a brief update on the current status of the project at the GODORT Federal Documents Task Force meeting at ALA Midwinter 2011. This meeting will take place from 4-5:30pm at the Hilton Bayfront, in Aqua 304. We look forward to seeing some of you at Midwinter!

Shortly after our return from ALA Midwinter, Ithaka S+R will participate in a GPO-hosted webinar on this project on January 13, 2011 at 2pm EST. In this webinar, we will review the background and goals of this project and provide a status update, contextualizing the deliverables that have already been released and the next steps for the project. We will also provide a brief summary of the findings that have emerged from our analysis, reflecting an overview of project Findings that we expect to release in draft form shortly before the webinar. We hope you will be able to join us for this webinar; if not, we still hope that you will continue to follow and comment on our draft releases via this website.

The webinar will take place on January 13, 2011 at 2:00pm EST, via OPAL (GPO's webinar software). Space is limited to the first 100 participants on a first-come, first-served basis. GPO recommends arriving at least 10 minutes early in order to reserve your spot and test your connection. You can connect to the GPO OPAL Room at: http://www.conference321.com/masteradmin /room.asp?id=rs38bb0e4b3a5a. For more information on GPO's OPAL implementation and OPAL

Deliverable Draft: White Paper on Existing Library Networks

Tuesday, December 28, 2010

Today, we are releasing our second major draft deliverable as defined by GPO, a white paper describing and analyzing existing library networks, consortia, and depository programs. Before linking to the full draft report at the end of this post, we would like to provide you with a bit of a more complete description of this deliverable and its role in the project.

For context, it may be important to understand how this deliverable fits into the overall flow of the final report; like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces and supporting the following models and recommendations. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research and findings:
    - *[Background](#) (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *[Environmental Scan](#) (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (this document)*
    - *Findings (an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis and recommendations:
    - *Direction (a single direction forward for the Program, emerging from the Findings)*
    - *White Paper on New Models (laying out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
    - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
    - *Recommendations (providing a recommended model for the Program and describing how this model could best be implemented)*

component of our final report, further analyzing the environment in which the Program operates and providing us with a range of background on models through which libraries collaborate. Like the Background and Environmental Scan documents shared previously, this exploration of existing library networks serves is not intended to be exhaustive; rather, it focuses on developing a framework to categorize and discuss different ways in which libraries work together towards a common goal, seeking to identify themes in these collaborations that may be of value in charting a path forward for the FDLP in the 21st century. This document clearly leaves out many important networks of libraries, and the selection of one particular network over another similar one should not be read as an endorsement or evaluation of either network; to enable us to cover the wide range of different ways in which libraries work together, it was necessary for us to select exemplar networks to explore in a variety of different categories.

This exploration of existing models of library collaboration, alongside our Environmental Scan, is one of the major research components of this project, and the lessons and themes that we draw from these examples will help lay the groundwork for the development of new models for the Program.

This analysis of existing library networks is based on secondary research into publicly available materials by and about the networks discussed. In many cases, members of the FDLP community may have direct experience with the networks described in this white paper, and your feedback will be highly valuable in helping ensure that we have accurately described the examples discussed. In particular, we will greatly value your identification of any unintentional errors or mischaracterizations of library networks, as well as suggestions about other examples that may have additional explanatory value or additional lessons to be taken from the examples discussed.

Attached below is a draft of the White Paper on Existing Library Networks that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by January 7, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of findings and the modeling exercise that will result from it, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before January 31, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as

possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

Existing Library Networks 12 28 2010 DRAFT release

Deliverable Drafts: Background and Environmental Scan

Monday, November 29, 2010

Today, we are releasing drafts of both a Background section for the final report (not a formal deliverable of the project) and the Environmental Scan (which is the first major deliverable). Both documents are linked at the end of this post, but first we would like to share a bit of information about the role these components will play in the broader project.

The Background section offers a brief overview of the FDLP. In addition to a summary of the Program's structure, function, and participation, this section provides an overview of the community-wide debates that have occurred over the challenges facing the Program, the evolution of the Program since the implementation of the current authorizing legislation, and the visions that have been put forward for how it can be refined. Overall, this section is not meant to serve as an in-depth analysis of the Program but rather to provide basic background to acclimatize an unfamiliar reader to engage with the report that will follow.

The Environmental Scan provides a broad examination of the environment in which the FDLP exists. The purpose of an environmental scan is to identify the broad range of key external issues that can inform planning and decision-making. An environmental scan provides context for planning purposes, rather than an exhaustive treatment of any specific issue. The goal of this exercise is to provide a broad overview of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government publishing, identifying factors to be taken into account in the formulation of appropriate models for the future of the Program.

This environmental scan explores changes in three major areas:

- Broad societal changes in the technological and information environment that affect the ways in which users expect to discover and make use of all kinds of information, reflecting a broad shift towards a digital use;
- Environmental pressures on different kinds of libraries, and the changing priorities and practices these entail, including refinements and

- preservation, and public services, leading into a discussion of broad visions for the future; and
  - A discussion of broad changes in how the public expects to make use of government information, and the corresponding changes that both the government and libraries have made to respond to these changing user needs.

This environmental scan is based on secondary research, and relies principally on citations to available sources. This environmental scan is one of the major research components of this project, and it will lay the groundwork for the development of our recommendations by identifying important factors that must be considered as we seek to chart a sustainable future through which the Program can accomplish its long-standing mission of providing permanent, no-fee public access to government information.

In both the Background and Environmental Scan documents, we sometimes provide several different points of view on a subject, illuminating areas where disagreements exist rather than privileging particular points of view; throughout these documents, our discussion of various themes and trends is not meant to represent an endorsement of the points of view stated, but rather a summary of existing thinking that can provide background for our own subsequent analysis. Any omissions of perspectives, or indications of a perspective of our own, is entirely unintentional, and we will welcome the reader's reactions to help us bolster the objectivity of both the Background section and the Environmental Scan.

Attached to this blogpost below are drafts of both the Background and Environmental Scan sections that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by December 17, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of findings and the modeling exercise that will result from it, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before January 31, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

Environmental scan 11 29 2010 FINAL DRAFT

Background 11 29 2010 FINAL DRAFT

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (3)

Project structure & process

Wednesday, October 27, 2010

We heard a lot of interest at the recent Depository Library Council meeting in this project and had a number of valuable meetings and conversations while there. We connected with colleagues from the ALA Washington Office as part of our effort to reach out to American libraries broadly, were fortunate to be able to hear an update on the ASERL project plans over a lunch meeting, provided project briefings and requests for contributions at both the Regionals meeting and a plenary session, and had a number of other conversations with DLC members and numerous other attendees. We're truly grateful for the interest in this project.

During the course of the meeting, we heard a lot of interest in learning more about our process for this project, so we've put together this blog post to explain a bit more about our approach, much of which has been defined by GPO. The project is structured to begin with a major information-gathering process, emphasizing the capture of a broad portrait of the environment in which the FDLP operates and seeking to draw upon the broad experience of the library community in shaping sustainable collaborations, and then it will proceed to an analysis and modeling stage. The project is thereby divided into two major phases: research and analysis. We're currently in the midst of the research phase, and will be posting some interim deliverables to this site in the near future.

Research phase

The first major step in this project is the environmental scan. The environmental scan seeks to describe the broad and rapidly changing context in which the FDLP exists, identifying the key factors and challenges that must be accounted for in modeling for a future FDLP.GPO defined several broad topics for this research, ranging from the very broad and contextual (such as the state of the economy, technological change, and corresponding changes in information-seeking behavior) to the more specific (such as changes in the library landscape, the FDLP itself, and other developments in government information provision).

Based on this broad framework provided by GPO, we developed a more detailed outline of important environmental factors to be investigated, which we outlined in a recent blogpost. We are pursuing extensive desk research on this broad range of factors, mining articles, reports, journal issues, conference presentations, and other sources. Once we have

publicly on this website next month. At that point, we hope you will help us to identify any topics that we may have missed, mischaracterized, or not given sufficient consideration. These contributions will help us in revising the environmental scan, which will both inform our analytical work and serve as one component of our ultimate final report.

While concluding the environmental scan, we are just beginning our second major research phase for this project, in which we are examining existing models of library networks, consortia, and depository programs in order to identify factors that may be applicable in considering new models for the FDLP. Based on our initial investigation into existing models, we have developed a framework to categorize different ways in which libraries come together around shared goals and asked for community input. We are currently researching these networks to identify features that may be valuable in contemplating future models of the FDLP. This research will be driven principally by further desk research, although we will supplement publicly available sources with targeted interviews on library networks that we will incorporate as exemplars. We anticipate posting a draft of this report in late November or early December, and again we hope that you will help us to identify important examples we may have missed and contribute to the analysis of how aspects of existing networks could be valuably applied in the FDLP context.

These two steps constitute the major research phases of this project. It is important to note that while Ithaka S+R has conducted a number of relevant projects previously, we do not intend to privilege any of our previous work during these phases. While we will cite our previous projects appropriately, we will attempt to do so equally alongside all the other work that has been conducted in these areas, and we will explicitly ask you to help us ensure that we treat all referenced studies and projects fairly.

Analysis phase

Building on this research, we will develop a set of findings and implications that will be shared on this website during the month of December. The purpose of this exercise will be to corral 50-100 pages of research into digestible and actionable form. We only recently determined that we would conduct this step (it was not defined originally by GPO), but it feels important to share findings and implications for discussion with and review by the community prior to the modeling exercise.

These findings and implications will lay the groundwork for the modeling stage of this project.

Some community members have been confused about the modeling stage, which actually has several components. First, we will identify a single direction forward for the FDLP, towards an ultimate objective that is consistent with the existing vision and mission of the Program and that is practical and sustainable. This direction will address the issues and challenges identified in the environmental scan and draw on the lessons learned from the existing models in the library community. Second, we will develop one or more models for setting the Program in this direction. For example, if the ultimate objective were to rely on legislative change (an anticipated possibility in GPO's project development), we would likely develop one model that achieves the objective via new legislation as well as one or more additional models that allow the FDLP to advance in this direction in the absence of legislative action. As we have mentioned previously, we will not be recommending the adoption by GPO or Federal Depository Libraries of any specific brands, products, or services in conjunction with this modeling exercise. Draft recommendations regarding Program directions and a model or models will be shared in later December or January, and again we will welcome community discussion and reactions.

Finally, we will craft value propositions analyzing how the roles and incentives associated with the overall recommended direction, as well as the individual model or models, match with library needs. This exercise will contribute to an assessment of our recommendations and, if they were to be adopted, would help in the articulation of the benefits associated with participation. A draft value proposition will be posted to this website in January for discussion and reactions.

All of these pieces, integrating further research and analysis driven by your feedback over the course of this project, will together shape our final report and recommendations, which will be released broadly (including to this website) in March.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (2)

Depository Library Council Meeting & Conference

Thursday, October 14, 2010

Ross Housewright and Roger Schonfeld from Ithaka S+R will be attending the Federal Depository Library Council and Conference next week, and we look forward to having the opportunity to meet more of the FDLP community as well as to catch up with those of you we've already met. As we're still in the early

on findings or recommendations, but we're eager to learn more about the ongoing developments in the Program. We will be around the conference all three days, please feel free to find us if you'd like to discuss the project, or email us (at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org or our individual addresses, ross.housewright@ithaka.org and roger.schonfeld@ithaka.org) if you'd like to make sure we have a chance to talk. See you in DC!

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (1)

Existing Models of Library Networks

Tuesday, October 12, 2010

First, a brief update: thank you for your initial suggestions in response to our post launching the environmental scan component of our project. We are in the middle of conducting our own research for the scan, and soon we will use this website to highlight some areas where we'd particularly value the assistance of the library community in helping us to better understand certain topics.

In parallel to our work on the environmental scan, we've begun planning for the second deliverable defined by GPO: a report on existing models of library networks, consortia, and depository programs. The goal of this report will be to explore the different ways in which libraries organize themselves to perform projects or provide services and collections, and to think about how these models could be applied in the FDLP. We don't expect that existing models will offer a perfect fit for the FDLP, but we hope that we'll be able to identify strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of approaches that might be applied to various aspects of the FDLP.

We're only beginning our planning for this paper, but we'd like to share the broad structure that we're imagining with the community, and we'll hope for both your general feedback and your help in addressing a few specific questions. Generally, we're imagining categorizing library networks into three broad buckets:

- Affinity groups of librarians: This group will contain professional societies and other organizations that bring together librarians around a common set of interests, ranging from the very broad (such as ALA) to the much narrower (such as the Federal Documents Task Force of GODORT). We will explore the implications of different scales and scopes of focus, and consider the roles played by these various kinds of library groups, including information sharing and the development of the

shared values of the library community.

- Member-driven library organizations: This group will consist of formal "library networks", that is, groups of libraries that have banded together around a shared set of goals or common concerns. In this category, we plan to examine established networks of libraries (rather than the not ad hoc networks formed around a particular problem, which would be considered in the next category). This category would include everything from institution-level collaborations that incorporate a library network (e.g. the UC system, the Five Colleges of Massachusetts) and networks of libraries with varying degree of mutual trust relationships (e.g. ASERL, the Oberlin Group) to government-organized library networks (e.g. the College Center for Library Automation, state library agency roles/networks) and larger networks where members, relationships with one another is to a great degree mediated through a central body (e.g. OCLC, CRL). We will explore the implications of different ways in which libraries elect (or otherwise come to be) allied with one another, considering the strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of groups of libraries for particular kinds of problems.

- Programmatic library collaborations: This group will contain collaborations that take action to address a common opportunity or concern. Most of the actual programmatic collaborations of the above member-driven library organizations would fall into this category. This category will also contain mission-driven collaborations that don't necessarily arise from the needs of a pre-existing set of libraries but rather identify a common problem and attempt to aggregate libraries around its solution, and ad hoc/one-off projects that bring together a group of libraries to address a single shared problem. Again, we will consider how each of these models offers unique strengths and challenges in addressing certain kinds of problems.

We are still in the process of defining, and refining, these categories as well as relevant sub-categories, so they may yet change in response to feedback we receive. At this point, we believe that many depository library programs contain elements of all three of these categories and therefore will be examining them in the context of all of these models.

Within and across these categories, we will explore a number of questions, including the advantages and disadvantages of each type of library network and its potential relevance to the FDLP. Given key values of

the FDLP (values such as preservation, integrity of collections, and broad public access), we believe it will be especially important to investigate the dynamics and components of well-functioning trust networks, including their membership, scope, governance, associated incentives, and so forth.

We would welcome feedback on the broad structure we are developing for this deliverable, and on particular questions we should be exploring in this paper. We'd also appreciate pointers to networks or collaborations you think we should be sure to understand, especially networks of state and/or public libraries, which are such an important part of the FDLP but may not have the same level of collaboration infrastructure to support them as do academic, law, and federal libraries. Thank you for any reactions or suggestions you are able to provide.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (3)

Website launch!

Wednesday, September 22, 2010

Today, we're launching FDLPmodeling.net, a venue for us to communicate with the community over the course of our project to develop sustainable models for the Federal Depository Library Program in the 21st century, which is being performed by Ithaka S+R on behalf of the Government Printing Office. This site currently contains a more detailed description of this project in the "About this project" post, and information about our first major deliverable, an environmental scan of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government information, in our "First task" post. We encourage you to participate by posting any questions, comments, or suggestions in the comments field of these posts or, if you prefer, by sending email directly to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Thank you, and welcome to the site!

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (5)

First task: environmental scan

Wednesday, September 22, 2010

The first major step in our research process for this project, as defined by GPO, will be to undertake a broad environmental scan of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government information. Our goal will be to identify a wide range of important environmental factors that are reshaping the landscape for government information and that must be taken into account in charting a sustainable path forward for the FDLP in an increasingly electronic environment. As

process, we want to take the opportunity to review our broad strategy for this environmental scan with the FDLP community, along with other interested members of the public, and gather as much of your feedback and guidance as we can. Community involvement in this research can only make it richer, helping us to more completely describe the context in which the FDLP operates.

Our environmental scan research will cover six major thematic areas:

- Changing social/demographic factors. Generally, how are demographics in the United States shifting, with respect to rural/urban differences, primary language, and other factors? More specifically, how are factors relating to access to and use of the internet changing, in daily life and in interacting with the government and with government information?
- Economic factors. How is the current financial crisis impacting libraries of all types, including state, public, and academic libraries? How is the current economic climate affecting government programs and funding? How do both of these connect to long-term structural changes in funding?
- Technological factors. Which trends and new uses of the internet, social media, web 2.0, mobile devices, etc. are reshaping user's online experiences, both in daily life and in finding needed information? What strategies are being applied to make online content more reusable, such as APIs, linked data, or bulk downloads?
- Political factors. How is the "open and transparent government" movement realizing new ways for the public to engage with the government and government information, either through new kinds of government activities or services or through the efforts of the broader community?
- Library-related factors. How is the role of the library in users' processes of information discovery and use changing? How are library roles and services changing in an electronic environment, in all different kinds of libraries? How are libraries working to preserve content for posterity, in print and digital form, and what challenges do they face in doing so?
- Federal Government information publishing and access factors. What challenges to the continued sustainability of the FDLP have been identified, and what solutions have been proposed over the years? What has been the impact of these challenges on FDLP as a preservation and service network? How are the efforts of GPO, the

broader government, and a variety of commercial and non-commercial players reshaping the landscape for government information publishing and access?

We are eager to integrate community feedback into the project from this early stage, and so hope that you will share your comments and suggestions with us, which will help to inform our development of this critical context for the changing FDLP. Specifically:

- While this is only a high-level outline, are there major themes that provide important context for understanding the environment in which the FDLP operates that you feel are at risk of being neglected?
- Are there significant aspects to some of these themes that you want to call to our attention, either that you don't see reflected in the above summary or that you want to make sure are addressed?
- Do you have any specific suggestions of citations that we should be sure to look at in building out our environmental scan?

Please feel free to give us any feedback and suggestions via the comments on this post, or via email at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Thank you!

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (11)

About this project

Wednesday, September 22, 2010

The Government Printing Office has retained Ithaka S+R to lead a project that will develop a model for the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) to more efficiently accomplish its mission in a rapidly changing digital environment. Ithaka S+R is deeply honored to be selected for this role, and look forward to contributing to ensuring the continued availability of government information to the American people, which is vital to the success of our democracy. This site is intended to provide regular project updates as well as a mechanism for vigorous community engagement.

Project Description

GPO has defined the objectives and structure of this project. There will be no reassessment of the fundamental mission of the FDLP, which is to ensure that the American public receives no-fee ready and permanent public access to federal government information. In this project, Ithaka S+R will conduct an environmental scan, examine other library networks, identify a practical and sustainable model

value proposition for the FDLP in the 21st Century, and provide regulatory and legislative recommendations to guide possible implementation.

With these ambitious goals, broad community engagement will be critical to the success of this project. We are therefore establishing a variety of mechanisms to incorporate into this project the expertise and perspective of federal depository libraries, other libraries with an interest in government information, the non-library government information field, and other interested parties. We will rely on community input and advice throughout the course of the project, both in guiding our research efforts and defining our recommendations for the future of the FDLP. We therefore encourage you engage as regularly and indeed vigorously as possible, via this website and other venues.

Project Plan

Throughout the course of the project, this website will provide regular updates on project progress, often accompanied by calls for input or advice on specific issues. We will welcome your contributions via blog comments or email. We also anticipate posting several surveys or focused questions, in order to gather specific attitudinal or operational data that that will inform our project planning and recommendations. Perhaps most importantly, we will share several interim papers that will serve as building blocks towards our final report, seeking community feedback on these draft documents. GPO has defined several major interim deliverables, which will be posted publicly on this site in order to gather community input:

- An environmental scan of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government publishing;
- A report that identifies and describes existing library networks, consortia, and depository programs;
- A white paper on new models for the structure of the FDLP and for depository libraries to provide access to government information; and
- A value proposition for a 21st century FDLP.

We will welcome vigorous discussion on the project blog as well as private comments and suggestions via email on these interim deliverables.

Finally, we will release our final report including recommendations via this site by March 2011.

In addition to these online mechanisms, we also look forward to discussing these issues with the government information community face-to-face. We

are already planning to attend the October Depository Library Council meeting and the ALA midwinter meeting, which will give us opportunities to discuss this project in person with the library community. Recognizing budgetary limitations, we also would welcome additional suggestions for other venues we should attend during the course of this project.

By providing your comments and suggestions over the course of this project, we can create recommendations that will best meet the needs of the community. We look forward to working together with you to define a sustainable future for the FDLP in the 21st century.

You can reach the Ithaka S+R project team at FDLP-modeling@ithaka.org, or via our individual addresses.

Ross Housewright, Research Analyst, Ithaka S+R // ross.housewright@ithaka.org

Roger C. Schonfeld, Manager of Research, Ithaka S+R // roger.schonfeld@ithaka.org

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (6)

Reaching us – project email problems

Wednesday, September 22, 2010

Apologies for any confusion this may have caused, but we've been informed that the project email address we have set up (and announced in posts below) is currently bouncing back emails. We've determined that due to a misconfiguration in the email account we set up for this project, emails from outside our domain are being returned to sender (because emails from within our domain are allowed through, we didn't notice this problem in our setup tests!). We're working to address this situation as soon as possible, but if you've sent us a note and had it bounce back, please contact us directly – we're eager to hear from you:
Ross Housewright, Research Analyst, Ithaka S+R // ross.housewright@ithaka.org

Roger Schonfeld, Manager of Research, Ithaka S+R // roger.schonfeld@ithaka.org

We hope to have the project email address up and running again within the next day, and apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. Thanks very much for your patience, and please let us know if you encounter any other technical difficulties in working with this site.

:EDIT: The problem has been resolved – you can now contact us at the fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org address. In order to clean up the navigation of the front page, I've

changed the date on this posting to effectively
"archive" it.

FILED IN UNCATEGORIZED | | EDIT | COMMENTS (0)

Newer posts >

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Project status update

A brief update on project status: The Ithaka S+R project team shared a draft final report with GPO on March 5, received feedback from GPO on March 11, and delivered our final report to GPO after the close of GPO's business day on March 18, 2011. GPO has indicated to us that its final review process is ongoing.

This was written by Roger Schonfeld. Posted on Tuesday, March 29, 2011, at 8:20 pm. Filed under [Uncategorized](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#). Follow comments here with the [RSS feed](#). Comments are closed, but you can leave a [trackback](#). [Edit this entry.](#)

‹ Thank you for your input

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Home   *About*   *Privacy Policy*

Thank you for your input

Friday was the final day for input into the FDLP modeling project, and Ross and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the dozens of community members who have provided input in one form or another through the course of this project. We are now in the last revision stages to prepare the final report for acceptance by GPO as the project deliverable. Stay tuned – the final report will be released publicly via this website – before long. Thank you again for your interest in and engagement with this process.

This was written by Roger Schonfeld. Posted on Monday, March 14, 2011, at 5:56 pm. Filed under [Uncategorized](). Bookmark the [permalink](). Follow comments here with the [RSS feed](). Comments are closed, but you can leave a [trackback](). [Edit this entry.]()

‹ *Deadlines for feedback, preparations for DLC*   *Project status update* ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Deadlines for feedback, preparations for DLC

As a reminder to all of you who have been following this project and providing us with your valuable reactions throughout, we're nearing the final deadline for being able to integrate your feedback into the final report. Although the latest deliverable (the value proposition) listed this final deadline as Wednesday the 9th, we will be extending the window for all feedback on this and all previous section drafts through the end of this week. We will not, however, be able to integrate any feedback received after Friday, March 11th into the final report. This cutoff date will enable us to move into our final revisions and move towards an on-time release of the complete report. We are making every effort to allow ample time for the community to read and reflect on the final report in advance of the Depository Library Conference, to support a productive and informed discussion in early April.

At DLC, we will be presenting our work and participating in a community discussion on the proposed direction and models. According to the preliminary schedule, this presentation will take place on Monday, April 4th, from 2pm-3:30pm. For those who will be able to attend, we look forward to discussing the report together with you.

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Monday, March 7, 2011, at 11:28 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

‹ *Draft Value Proposition for the FDLP*   *Thank you for your input* ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Draft Value Proposition for the FDLP

Today, Ithaka S+R is pleased to release the next component of our project to develop sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st century. In this component, we discuss the value propositions of the direction and models described in a previous deliverable, and discuss how this value proposition compares to the value proposition for the Program as it currently exists. This document is linked at the bottom of this post, but first we'd like to provide a bit of context as a reminder of how this document fits into the overall project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research:
    - *Background (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of ways in which libraries collaborate around common goals)*
    - *Findings (released previously in draft form, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis:
    - *Direction (released previously in draft form, presenting a single direction forward for the Program that emerges from the Findings)*
    - *White Paper on New Models (released previously in draft form, which lays out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
    - *Value Proposition (this document, analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
    - *Implementation notes (assessing approaches for implementing the models)*
- Case studies (discussing how libraries might take on different portfolios of roles in these models)

This document focuses on evaluating how the proposed Direction and Models will

impact the Program's sustainable accomplishment of its overall goals by considering the value proposition that they pose to libraries. Evaluating the value proposition of a given scenario entails consideration of how a library might perceive and make choices about its role in the Program based on the various costs and benefits associated with fulfilling this role. First, this document discusses the historical value proposition of participation in the Program, assessing how this has changed over time. Next, we discuss the overall value proposition presented by the broad Direction for the Program released previously in draft form, and then assess the value propositions of each of the new Models released previously in draft form.

Attached below is a draft of the analysis of the value propositions for the new models proposed for the Program that, subject to further substantive revision (including expected revisions based on feedback received on earlier deliverables after the completion of this draft) and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by March 9, 2011 will be able to be integrated into our preparations of the final paper, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review; given the timeline for this project, feedback received on *any* portion of the project after March 9, 2011, will not be able to be integrated into the final report prior to its release. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

The draft of the value proposition may be found at: Value Proposition draft 2 28 2011

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Monday, February 28, 2011, at 10:51 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

2 Comments

1. **LAURA HORNE-POPP** *wrote:*

   After reading the draft models and value proposition, I agree with the value proposition that model 3 is the "best" fit for how to reconstitute the FDLP for the future while realistically considering what should be done with the historical print collections.

   I also agree that Model 4 doesn't seem likely due to huge constraints involved with trying to create complete collections that can be page verified.

   Tuesday, March 1, 2011 at 7:44 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **JIM JACOBS** *wrote:*

   The volunteers at FreeGovInfo have posted an analysis of the Values Proposition and suggestions for improving it at FGI: http://freegovinfo.info/node/3207

   Friday, March 11, 2011 at 5:33 am | Permalink | Edit

DLC ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Draft New Models for the FDLP

Today, Ithaka S+R is pleased to release the next component of our project to develop sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st century. In this component, we lay out a series of new models for the FDLP that build upon the Direction released previously. These models seek to reshape the Program to accommodate local and system-wide strategic shifts that are occurring across the library landscape with the transition to an increasingly digital environment, enabling libraries to more comfortably participate in the Program while maintaining or even increasing broad public access to government information and services to support its effective use. This document is linked at the bottom of this post, but first we'd like to provide a bit of context as a reminder of how this document fits into the overall project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research:
  - *Background (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
  - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
  - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of ways in which libraries collaborate around common goals)*
  - *Findings (released previously in draft form, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis:
  - *Direction (released previously in draft form, presenting a single direction forward for the Program that emerges from the Findings)*
  - *White Paper on New Models (this document, which lays out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
  - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
  - *Implementation notes (assessing approaches for implementing the models)*

This document presents a set of new models that build directly on the previously released Direction for the Program. As a reminder, the Direction laid out two core assumptions about the environment for the FDLP; each of the models described here share these assumptions, summarized here:

- This project assumes that GPO will continue to provide an increasingly high-quality centralized and freely available access point for FDLP materials. Although many other digital access points tailored to the needs of specific user communities may exist – including digital collections developed by individual libraries and networks of them, added-value services by vendors, and more – we believe that this GPO-provided centralized and freely available system will support the needs of a wide range of users for digital FDLP materials. This centralized access point will support the development of these alternative access points by making materials available for easy reuse and integration by non-GPO service providers. And although users will have access to FDLP materials via a robust spectrum of alternative access points that may provide tailored services for particular user communities, this GPO-provided service will provide a baseline level of no-fee access to seekers of government information.
- This project also assumes that over time, the historic collection of FDLP materials will be comprehensively (or very nearly so) digitized, but that this digitization will require patience and coordination. We assume that digitization will continue to develop through a variety of GPO partnership agreements and independent initiatives but will not (unfortunately) be conducted through a single comprehensive program. Also, although there may be many access points to digitized historic FDLP materials, we assume that all these materials will also be made freely available via GPO's centralized access point as described above, through procedures that that are out of scope of this project but whose development should be guided by the library community. Consequently, we believe that the Program's structure must accommodate a medium-term or even lengthy transitional phase in which tangible materials remain the only means of access to some content. But where digital versions of FDLP materials are available, however they are formally integrated into the Program, we assume that many (although not all) users will prefer digital access over tangible access.

This white paper on new models for the FDLP first discusses some of the broad *themes* that are reflected throughout these models, next describes a set of *building blocks* for new approaches to addressing several Program priorities, and finally arranges these building blocks into a series of cumulative *new models* for the FDLP.

Based on conversations with GPO, we believe that these models follow naturally from the findings of the research phase and the previously released Direction, and should describe a set of models that can provide the basis for a valuable conversation across the FDLP community. We would deeply value the feedback of members of the library community on these models, either assessing the individual building blocks and models or discussing which of the approaches proposed here seems to offer the best fit for the Program. The models described in this document will be at the heart of our final report, and so we will benefit significantly from community feedback on them.

Attached below is a draft of the potential new models for the Program that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by February 22, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of the value proposition and final paper, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before March 4, 2011, can be accommodated in the final

until that date). Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

The *full* discussion of these new models can be found at the following link: New Models draft 2 11 2011. For the reader's convenience, we have also prepared a shorter summary overview of the new models, available at the following link: Summary of New Models draft 2 11 2011. Although we hope this shorter document will be valuable to the reader, it is not a project deliverable and we would therefore prefer that your feedback focus on the complete discussions of these new models in the *full* draft version of the report.

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Friday, February 11, 2011, at 9:50 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

6 Comments

1. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

   Overall, I like your draft. However, I see a basic problem with your "short-term changes to tangible collections roles and responsibilities." These roles are set out pretty clearly in Title 44 of the U.S. Code and I believe it would difficult, if not impossible, to change "tangible collections roles and responsibilities" without first making changes to Title 44. Changing the law may be necessary in any case to implement the other models you suggest, but it likely won't happen quickly. Nor is it certain that the changes we would suggest/request would be what would actually end up in the law. So, any relief to the pressures in the system would likely come in the long-term, rather than in the short-term.

   Other than that, I like how you've established different responsibility levels for service, digital preservation, tangible collection preservation, and so on. I think my library would be an S2/D1/T2. I do think there's a danger that the "T" classification within Service might get confused with the "T1," "T2," etc. classifications within tangible collections, so you might want to call the training component in service "ST" instead.

   There are a number of typos and minor errors in the report, but I trust you'll do a final proofread and catch those.

   I think you've definitely given us a good launching pad for further discussion.

   Wednesday, February 16, 2011 at 4:14 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **PEGGY JOBE** *wrote:*

   Librarians from Colorado discussed this report today at our monthly meeting. Overall response to the report was very positive, but some in the group suggested that omitting checkmarks for libraries that choose the D1 option (records in catalog) do not appear to make a contribution in the summary table on p. 14. There also needs

level of tangible collection while migrating to electronic only for new receipts. Like the D1 libraries the T1 libraries do not appear to be making a contribution in the summary table on p. 19. The group suggests that you add additional levels to both tables so that there is a checkmark for every level of participation. While it might appear to be a minor matter, a couple of selectives in Colorado observed that they aren't "holding any balls". It is important for a depository coordinator to be able to visibly demonstrate to his or her library director that the library is contributing.

Friday, February 18, 2011 at 10:00 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **DAN O'MAHONY** *wrote:*

I think the authors have done a good job in deconstructing the different component pieces of the program (current and future) and allowing for flexibility in how individual libraries might configure these building blocks to define their level(s) of contribution/participation.

I especially like the report's specific identification of TRAINING in the use of government information as a special emphasis. I think this is an area of specialty in which FDLP participants can make great contributions, and it provides, in an increasingly electronic environment, enormous opportunities for expanding the reach of the program to non-depository libraries, non-specialist librarians, and others.

Re: the D3 option, I wonder if there is room for more granularity. Perhaps I'm misreading the intent, but it seems to be an "all or nothing" approach to the option of building and maintaining digital collections. I could envision libraries that might be reluctant to take on the responsibility of collecting the entirety of the FDLP digital collection, however, they might desire to build digital collections that focus on one or more areas (e.g., driven by local needs and interests, similar to the motivations of D2 libraries) and also willing to commit to being part of a permanent network of digital preservation (for that subset of digital materials).

It is also intriguing to see the "model-Ts" that focus on preserving tangible collections (i.e., T4 and T5). As the report points out, this takes us from "reliance on the hope that largely uncoordinated overlapping collections will effectively ensure the preservation of materials" to a real system of "providing for truly long-term continuity of access to tangible collections." In other words, taking us from a system designed to provide "permanent public access" to one that actually preserves tangible materials. Given that we're 150+ years into the life of the FDLP, it is high time such a coordinated system of preservation be developed. Like others, however, I wonder if the existing law enables the kind of system envisioned here. Also, while it is obvious that these new preservation responsibilities may be felt as an additional burden by the T5 libraries in particular, I wonder how realistic it is to rely on "extrinsic incentives" to accomplish this. If this means some sort of payment to libraries, then wouldn't that diminish their independence in carrying out this function (i.e., when the government funding decreases/stops, so does the preservation activity)?

Finally, the linchpin in making the immediate future workable (as libraries and the program develop and transition into these new roles) seems to be the "simple, national needs and offers process." This indeed would go a long way to alleviating some of the burdens felt by regionals and selectives in maneuvering through the current disposal process, and perhaps more importantly, would provide the necessary infrastructure to support the coordination of building comprehensive collections to preserve.

As others have said, I think the report gives us much to consider and helps further the discussion considerably.

Monday, February 21, 2011 at 7:43 pm | Permalink | Edit

4. **FREEGOVINFO** *wrote:*

FGI volunteers have sent Ithaka S+R our comments for the draft directions and draft models documents but feel that a more in-depth analysis and response is warranted.

While there is much to like about this draft — as other commenters have rightfully pointed out — it has some serious gaps that could have potentially dire consequences for the future of the FDLP.

To read our comments and in-depth response, please go to http://freegovinfo.info/node/3193

Tuesday, March 1, 2011 at 5:20 pm | Permalink | Edit

5. **JIM JACOBS** *wrote:*

Ross and Roger,

the comment below was originally posted on FGI in a continuing discussion there about the issue of centralization. the complete comment and thread are at

I think we didn't do a good enough job in describing our concerns about centralization, however. For us, simple "participation" does not automatically create a distributed system that focuses on users. Even with the participation of more than a few libraries in cooperative projects such as you describe (T5 and D3 and D4 collections and S3 services) we think that the Models will still result in fewer, larger collections and fewer service points with the staffing or resources or collections to focus on specific user communities.

In terms of services, as we read the report, the models allow and even encourage libraries to play a diminished service role by setting up a hierarchy of service. S1 and S2 libraries will have little or no dedicated staff and almost certainly no digital or tangible collections. Their role is the low end of a hierarchy where questions are referred up, ultimately to S3 libraries. It isn't clear that users will benefit from or use such a service. It is clear that existing services that are useful and popular are built on collections of information that they select, control, organize, and deliver. We would anticipate that the "unbundling" of roles that you recommend will almost certainly encourage libraries to attempt to provide services without collections, which is the opposite of the

different?

As for digital collections, as we understand the report the models effectively eliminate the very concept of "selective" depositories. D2 libraries are allowed to build digital collections, but are under no obligation to do so, may discard at will, and have no formal status in digital preservation. How does this differ from what any library (with or without FDLP designation) can do today? We don't see how giving such a role a name (D2) makes it effective or sustainable or will attract libraries to choosing it.

The centralization that we see in the report is in the relatively few libraries that will participate in S3, T5, and D3 and D4 roles. These are, by definition, national and system-wide roles.

We see no place where the models encourage smaller libraries that wish to build selective collections and provide services for a focused user-community (not necessarily geographically based). We are not saying that it is impossible for such libraries to emerge. We are saying that the report is designed without such libraries in mind, that it discourages such participation, and it encourages and envisions an FDLP made up of only a few institutions that provide "top priority" and "high value services" and attempt to ensure the preservation of digital information.

We believe that is a mistake. We believe that a robust community of libraries in which all participate actively in preservation and service will be both more sustainable and more effective. Such a community would certainly include some few that take on extra responsibilities (such as your S3, T5, D3, D4), but it would also encourage, facilitate, and include smaller libraries doing on a smaller scale for specific user communities what the larger libraries would do for the nation and the system as a whole.

- Jim Jacobs

Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 5:36 pm | [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#)

6. **J JACOBS** *wrote:*

The comment below is a modified version of a comment that I originally posted on FGI in a continuing discussion there about the Models document and the issue of centralization. The complete comment and thread are at http://freegovinfo.info/node/3193

I have some concerns that the Models will result in more centralization and will minimize the importance of most FDLP libraries. For me, simple "participation" does not automatically create a distributed system that focuses on users. Even with the participation of more than a few libraries in cooperative projects such as you describe (T5 and D3 and D4 collections and S3 services), I think that the Models will still result in fewer, larger collections and fewer service points with the staffing or resources or collections to focus on specific user communities.

In terms of services, I think the models allow and even encourage libraries to play a diminished service role by setting up a hierarchy of service. S1 and S2 libraries will have little or no dedicated staff and

end of a hierarchy where questions are referred up, ultimately to S3 libraries. It isn't clear that users will benefit from or use such a service. It is clear from what I see of user behavior that the existing services that are useful and popular are those that are built on collections of information that they select, control, organize, and deliver. I would anticipate that the unbundling of roles that you recommend will almost certainly encourage libraries to attempt to provide services without collections, which is the opposite of the models of success I have seen.

As for digital collections, as I understand the report, the models effectively eliminate the very concept of "selective" depositories. D2 libraries are allowed to build digital collections, but are under no obligation to do so, may discard at will, and have no formal status in digital preservation. How does this differ from what any library (with or without FDLP designation) can do today? I don't see how giving such a role a name (D2) makes it effective or sustainable or will attract libraries to choosing it.

The centralization that I see in the report is in the relatively few libraries that will participate in S3, T5, and D3 and D4 roles. These are, by definition, national and system-wide roles.

I see no place where the models encourage smaller libraries that wish to build selective collections and provide services for a focused user-community (not necessarily geographically based). I am not saying that it is impossible for such libraries to emerge. I am saying that the report is designed without such libraries in mind, that it discourages such participation, and that it encourages and envisions an FDLP made up of only a few institutions that provide "top priority" and "high value services" and attempt to ensure the preservation of digital information. I worry that the report blurs the distinction between, on the one hand, a library outsourcing responsibilities to others and, on the other hand, a library collaborating with partners and actively participating in the provision of services or building of collections.

I believe that is a bad idea to encourage only such centralization and outsourcing. I believe it would be better to recommend a mixed model in which some centralization and some outsourcing complement, but do not replace, a more distributed system. I believe the Models would be stronger if they emphasized and encouraged a robust community of libraries in which all participate actively in preservation and service. Such a system will be both more sustainable and more effective than a system designed to minimize the roles of the larger community. Such a community would certainly include some few that take on extra responsibilities (such as your S3, T5, D3, D4), but it would also encourage, facilitate, and include smaller libraries that (either on their own, or by collaborating with other libraries) would do on a smaller scale for specific user communities what the larger libraries would do for the nation and the system as a whole.

- Jim Jacobs

Wednesday, March 9, 2011 at 9:30 pm | [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#)

Draft Proposed Direction for the FDLP

Today, Ithaka S+R is pleased to release the next component of our project to develop sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st century. In this document, we lay out an overall direction for the Program; this direction emerges from the findings released previously, and describes a set of functional and structural themes that we believe must be addressed for the Program to be successful and sustainable in an increasingly digital environment. This document is linked at the bottom of this post, but first we'd like to provide a bit of context as a reminder of how this document fits into the overall project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces and supporting the following models and recommendations. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research:
    - *Background (released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of ways in which libraries collaborate around common goals)*
    - *Findings (released previously in draft form, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis:
    - *Direction (this document, which presents a single direction forward for the Program that emerges from the Findings)*
    - *White Paper on New Models (laying out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
    - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
    - *Implementation notes (assessing approaches for implementing the models)*

The direction laid out in this document builds on the project's findings, integrating the

This direction provides a set of themes in several major areas:

- Assumptions about the Program and its context that are outside the scope of our consideration;
- A set of functional directions, laying out priorities for the Program to effectively accomplish its mission in the areas of access to and preservation of tangible collections, access to and preservation of digital collections, and access to government information support services; and
- A structural direction for the Program, laying out priorities for the structure of the Program that will support its success and sustainability.

This direction necessarily describes these themes at a relatively high level; these themes will be developed further in the models that will follow in an upcoming deliverable. A metaphor we have found helpful in describing the roles of the direction and models is that the *direction* suggests that the Program should go (for example) southwest; the *models* will describe pathways by which the Program might go fifty miles southwest, a hundred miles southwest, two hundred miles southwest, etc.

Based on conversations with GPO, we believe that this direction follows naturally from the findings of the research phase and should set out themes that can be broadly agreed upon across the FDLP community. We would deeply value, however, the feedback of members of the library community on this direction, either affirming our belief that this direction is substantively in alignment with their priorities or identifying any places where we may be making unwarranted assumptions or problematic assertions. Our proposed models will build directly on this direction, and so we will benefit significantly from community feedback as we continue to build out these models.

Attached below is a draft of the direction for the Program that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by February 10, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of new models, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before February 28, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report (and, please continue to offer feedback on previously posted drafts as well until that date). Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

The draft proposed direction for the FDLP can be found at the following link: FDLP Direction Draft 2 4 2011

---

2 Comments

1. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

   By George, I think you've pretty well got it. There is one typo near the bottom of page 3: "…through procedures that that are out of scope…"

   Thursday, February 10, 2011 at 8:45 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **GKLOCKENGA** *wrote:*

Excellent summary of the FDLP and of future directions.

Friday, February 18, 2011 at 10:35 pm | [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#)

‹ ***Project schedule update***   *Draft New Models for the FDLP* ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Project schedule update

Thanks to everyone for their feedback on the previously released drafts. We've received a wealth of comments from across the community – some which have been posted publicly, much of which has been emailed directly to us. We have been incorporating into the project your input on topics as diverse as digitization, service provision, education and training, types of library networks, and the role of the library, in two ways. First, we have been using it to inform our thinking on subsequent sections of the paper. Second, we are carefully tracking specific suggestions that we will use to revise the drafts as we prepare to incorporate them into the final report. So, thank you again for the feedback, please keep it coming, and we are actively at work on subsequent sections.

As many of you will know, our client GPO has had a number of significant leadership changes in the past month. Consequently, although GPO has already accepted the next draft deliverable as complete and ready for public comment, GPO has asked that Ithaka S+R take a temporary pause in releasing any documents publicly at this time. At this point we do not yet know exactly how long this pause will need to last.

The Ithaka S+R project team is committed to the thorough public review of the drafts of the project sections. We apologize for this delay and look forward to returning to the regular release of drafts for public review at the earliest possible opportunity.

This was written by Roger Schonfeld. Posted on Wednesday, January 26, 2011, at 6:13 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Home   *About*   *Privacy Policy*

Congratulations to Mary Alice Baish on her appointment as Superintendent of Documents

Ithaka S+R warmly congratulates Mary Alice Baish on her appointment as Assistant Public Printer and Superintendent of Documents. As GPO's announcement yesterday emphasized, Mary Alice is a long-time advocate for the FDLP, having gained particular prominence for her efforts in advocacy of permanent free public access to digital government information, most recently through FDsys, for the development of which she has provided critical support. We are greatly looking forward to working with Mary Alice, and continuing to work with the broader GPO team, in developing practical and sustainable models for the FDLP in the 21st Century.

This was written by Roger Schonfeld. Posted on Friday, January 21, 2011, at 3:12 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

‹ Summary of Research Phase Findings and Implications *Project schedule update ›*

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Summary of Research Phase Findings and Implications

As we come to the close of the research phase of this project and prepare to move into our analysis phase, we are eager to pause for reflection on what we-ve learned so far in this project. Today, we are releasing a summary of findings and their implications from this research phase, which will serve as a capstone on this first stage of the project and lay the final groundwork for us to move ahead into our analysis and development of recommendations. First, though, we-d like to provide a bit of background and context on the role that this document plays in the project.

Like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces and supporting the following models and recommendations. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research and findings:
    - *Background (*released previously in draft form*, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (*released previously in draft form*, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (*released previously in draft form*, providing an overview of ways in which libraries collaborate around common goals)*
    - *Findings (this document, an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis and recommendations:
    - *Direction (a single direction forward for the Program, emerging from the Findings)*
    - *White Paper on New Models (laying out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
    - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
    - *Recommendations (providing a recommended model for the Program and describing how this model could best be implemented)*

This "findings" section (as we will refer to it as shorthand) serves to conclude and reflect on the research phase of this project, drawing out the major themes that have surfaced in the research phase of this project that seem especially important to

structuring our thinking in beginning to develop a direction for the program. This document structures these findings into three broad categories: functional considerations with respect to collections and formats, functional considerations with respect to services, and structural considerations with respect to the network of libraries. It also provides an implication for each finding, as well as an overall implication for each category, that will help shape the Direction and New Models that come next.

As always, we will welcome community feedback on this project. As we have noted previously, the project builds cumulatively, and there has already been extensive opportunity for input into the research sections themselves. Consequently, on this document, we are principally interested in feedback that addresses whether our findings are a fair and accurate representation of the research we have already conducted and released for community review. The findings will serve to lay critical groundwork for the remainder of this project, and so we hope that you will engage thoughtfully and provide us with feedback.

Attached below is a draft of the findings and implications from the research phase of this project that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by January 24, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of a strategic direction and the modeling exercise that will result from it, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before February 15, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

FDLP Findings 1 14 2011

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Friday, January 14, 2011, at 2:43 pm. Filed under [Uncategorized](). Bookmark the [permalink](). Follow comments here with the [RSS feed](). Comments are closed, but you can leave a [trackback](). [Edit this entry.]()

3 Comments

1. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

   My impression is that digitization of the historic collections is happening somewhat haphazardly, and until the pre-1976 materials are cataloged by GPO, no one can really know if digitization efforts are comprehensive in any case. I suggest re-wording this part to say, "The Program should attempt to ensure the comprehensive digitization of historic collections to accompany its nearly comprehensive born-digital collections, and GPO should continue and enhance its work to bring digitization outputs into the formal structure of the Program alongside born-digital materials…"

   Other than that, I think your findings pretty accurately reflect what I had expected you to find.

   Wednesday, January 19, 2011 at 5:18 pm | [Permalink]() | [Edit]()

Thank you for addressing the wide range of issues, opportunities & barriers facing the current FDLP in ths compact Findings document. Placed in context of the earler reports, Findings highlights the essential points so insightfully and thoroughly described in the Backgound, Environment Scan, and Networks documents. Thank you for presenting each issue with such clarity.

Friday, January 21, 2011 at 5:47 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **FREEGOVINFO** *wrote:*

In addition to emailing our comments by the FGI volunteers (Jim Jacobs, Daniel Cornwall and myself) to Ross and Roger, we've posted them publicly at http://freegovinfo.info/taxonomy/term/1402. Our comments offer a critical look at the findings with constructive suggestions for a strong and vibrant FDLP.

Wednesday, January 26, 2011 at 6:22 pm | Permalink | Edit

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Home   *About*   *Privacy Policy*

FDLP Modeling Webinar Available

Thanks to everyone who was able to join us this afternoon for our GPO-hosted OPAL session discussing the progress so far on the FDLP modeling project! For those of you who weren't able to make it today, an archived version of the presentation is available at http://www.opal-online.org/archivegpo.htm. We hope this session has given you a better understanding of the current status of this project, but we're eager to address any outstanding questions you may have; please feel free to contact us via this website or directly at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Again, thanks, and we look forward to your continued engagement over the course of this project!

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Thursday, January 13, 2011, at 8:27 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

‹ ***Upcoming opportunities to learn more about the FDLP Modeling project***
Summary of Research Phase Findings and Implications ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Home   *About*   *Privacy Policy*

Upcoming opportunities to learn more about the FDLP Modeling project

We're pleased to announce two upcoming opportunities for the community to learn more about this project, in addition to following our releases via this website.

First, Ross Housewright will provide a brief update on the current status of the project at the GODORT Federal Documents Task Force meeting at ALA Midwinter 2011. This meeting will take place from 4-5:30pm at the Hilton Bayfront, in Aqua 304. We look forward to seeing some of you at Midwinter!

Shortly after our return from ALA Midwinter, Ithaka S+R will participate in a GPO-hosted webinar on this project on January 13, 2011 at 2pm EST. In this webinar, we will review the background and goals of this project and provide a status update, contextualizing the deliverables that have already been released and the next steps for the project. We will also provide a brief summary of the findings that have emerged from our analysis, reflecting an overview of project Findings that we expect to release in draft form shortly before the webinar. We hope you will be able to join us for this webinar; if not, we still hope that you will continue to follow and comment on our draft releases via this website.

The webinar will take place on January 13, 2011 at 2:00pm EST, via OPAL (GPO's webinar software). Space is limited to the first 100 participants on a first-come, first-served basis. GPO recommends arriving at least 10 minutes early in order to reserve your spot and test your connection. You can connect to the GPO OPAL Room at: http://www.conference321.com/masteradmin/room.asp?id=rs38bb0e4b3a5a. For more information on GPO's OPAL implementation and OPAL requirements, visit: http://www.fdlp.gov/outreach/onlinelearning/68-opal.

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Tuesday, January 4, 2011, at 10:08 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

One Comment

1.   **S T E P H A N I E   B R A U N S T E I N** *wrote:*

at the Federal Documents Task Force meeting at Midwinter—Saturday, from 4-5:30 at the Hilton Bayfront, Aqua 304.

Thursday, January 6, 2011 at 4:13 pm | [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#)

‹ Deliverable Draft: White Paper on Existing Library Networks   FDLP Modeling Webinar Available ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Deliverable Draft: White Paper on Existing Library Networks

Today, we are releasing our second major draft deliverable as defined by GPO, a white paper describing and analyzing existing library networks, consortia, and depository programs. Before linking to the full draft report at the end of this post, we would like to provide you with a bit of a more complete description of this deliverable and its role in the project.

For context, it may be important to understand how this deliverable fits into the overall flow of the final report; like the previously released documents, this deliverable will form the basis for one major section or chapter of the final report, building on the preceding pieces and supporting the following models and recommendations. We anticipate that the final report will be structured roughly as follows:

- Executive Summary (providing a high-level overview of the findings and recommendations of the report)
- Research and findings:
    - *Background* *(released previously in draft form, providing background and context on the Program)*
    - *Environmental Scan (released previously in draft form, providing an overview of the changing environment in which the Program operates)*
    - *White Paper on Existing Library Networks (this document)*
    - *Findings (an overview of the major findings and implications of these components)*
- Analysis and recommendations:
    - *Direction (a single direction forward for the Program, emerging from the Findings)*
    - *White Paper on New Models (laying out a set of new models that would implement the Direction to a greater or lesser degree)*
    - *Value Proposition (analyzing these models and their viability for the Program)*
    - *Recommendations (providing a recommended model for the Program and describing how this model could best be implemented)*

This section thus contributes to the research component of our final report, further analyzing the environment in which the Program operates and providing us with a range of background on models through which libraries collaborate. Like the Background and Environmental Scan documents shared previously, this exploration of existing library networks serves is not intended to be exhaustive; rather, it focuses on

developing a framework to categorize and discuss different ways in which libraries work together towards a common goal, seeking to identify themes in these collaborations that may be of value in charting a path forward for the FDLP in the 21st century. This document clearly leaves out many important networks of libraries, and the selection of one particular network over another similar one should not be read as an endorsement or evaluation of either network; to enable us to cover the wide range of different ways in which libraries work together, it was necessary for us to select exemplar networks to explore in a variety of different categories.

This exploration of existing models of library collaboration, alongside our Environmental Scan, is one of the major research components of this project, and the lessons and themes that we draw from these examples will help lay the groundwork for the development of new models for the Program.

This analysis of existing library networks is based on secondary research into publicly available materials by and about the networks discussed. In many cases, members of the FDLP community may have direct experience with the networks described in this white paper, and your feedback will be highly valuable in helping ensure that we have accurately described the examples discussed. In particular, we will greatly value your identification of any unintentional errors or mischaracterizations of library networks, as well as suggestions about other examples that may have additional explanatory value or additional lessons to be taken from the examples discussed.

Attached below is a draft of the White Paper on Existing Library Networks that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by January 7, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of findings and the modeling exercise that will result from it, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before January 31, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

Existing Library Networks 12 28 2010 DRAFT release

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Tuesday, December 28, 2010, at 8:09 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

4 Comments

1. **SARAH EREKSON** *wrote:*

   Great job elaborating on library networks. One type of library network not discussed in depth was the whole Central Library and Branch(es) or Satellites concept. Is that not a similar principle to the Regional and Selectives model?
   Unlike the consortial systems were members are all equals and separate, the central library and branch model means that all members are not equal.

   Thursday, January 13, 2011 at 9:29 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **SARAH EREKSON** *wrote:*

Great job elaborating on library networks. One type of library network not discussed in depth was the Great job elaborating on library networks; sometimes the systems and structures we take for granted are the ones that are hardest to assess. One type of library network not discussed in depth was the central library and branches or satellites concept. Is that not a similar principle to the regional and selectives model? Unlike the consortia where members are all equals and separate, the central library and branch model means that all members are not equal. Also unlike consortia, central libraries and branches may operate under one central administration. Does that make it less successful than the Five Colleges or CIC models? What are the implications for branches when the central library's collection is no longer physical? Do branches then become more than subordinate facilities that provide convenience but limited access? What about "floating" collections? Do these collections work?

Thursday, January 13, 2011 at 9:31 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **SHARI LASTER** *wrote:*

I'm emailing extensive comments on this draft this afternoon, but I do have a question that others may be interested in. In the final sections (particularly "Incentives" and "Trust") in which you sum up the trends that you've seen in the systems that you've investigated, as well as others you've explored, there is sometimes not very much supporting evidence for these trends provided in the text. Is this something that will be a component of the final product, is this perhaps an oversight, or is there some other role for these sections that we should be aware of?

Friday, January 14, 2011 at 9:48 pm | Permalink | Edit

4. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

Thanks for the footnote shout-out. 😃 But, the reason I suggested LOUIS be included is because they've done some very specific things to help the FDLP libraries in the consortium. We all use SirsiDynix software and LOUIS has worked closely with our record vendor, Marcive, to ensure that records for documents load correctly into our catalogs. They worked with us to get our records from Marcive customized to include a code that identifies which load each record came in, and to replace the SuDoc number for online-only titles with a note that says "See electronic address." They added a prefix to the PURLs in our records that allows them to log usage of documents hotlinks in our online catalogs. Each month the FDLP members get a report that shows the titles and URLs of online documents that were clicked in the catalog. It would be great if GPO could somehow provide those sorts of services on the national level. (I know, it's a tall order.) And, even though it's pretty out-of-date at this point, I did want to mention a book I co-authored titled _Tapping State Government Information Sources_. It was published by Greenwood in 2003 and discussed state depository programs in detail.

Wednesday, January 19, 2011 at 4:43 pm | Permalink | Edit

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Deliverable Drafts: Background and Environmental Scan

Today, we are releasing drafts of both a Background section for the final report (not a formal deliverable of the project) and the Environmental Scan (which is the first major deliverable). Both documents are linked at the end of this post, but first we would like to share a bit of information about the role these components will play in the broader project.

The Background section offers a brief overview of the FDLP. In addition to a summary of the Program's structure, function, and participation, this section provides an overview of the community-wide debates that have occurred over the challenges facing the Program, the evolution of the Program since the implementation of the current authorizing legislation, and the visions that have been put forward for how it can be refined. Overall, this section is not meant to serve as an in-depth analysis of the Program but rather to provide basic background to acclimatize an unfamiliar reader to engage with the report that will follow.

The Environmental Scan provides a broad examination of the environment in which the FDLP exists. The purpose of an environmental scan is to identify the broad range of key external issues that can inform planning and decision-making. An environmental scan provides context for planning purposes, rather than an exhaustive treatment of any specific issue. The goal of this exercise is to provide a broad overview of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government publishing, identifying factors to be taken into account in the formulation of appropriate models for the future of the Program.

This environmental scan explores changes in three major areas:

- Broad societal changes in the technological and information environment that affect the ways in which users expect to discover and make use of all kinds of information, reflecting a broad shift towards a digital use;
- Environmental pressures on different kinds of libraries, and the changing priorities and practices these entail, including refinements and new approaches to collections management, preservation, and public services, leading into a discussion of broad visions for the future; and
- A discussion of broad changes in how the public expects to make use of government information, and the corresponding changes that both the government and libraries have made to respond to these changing user needs.

This environmental scan is based on secondary research, and relies principally on

components of this project, and it will lay the groundwork for the development of our recommendations by identifying important factors that must be considered as we seek to chart a sustainable future through which the Program can accomplish its long-standing mission of providing permanent, no-fee public access to government information.

In both the Background and Environmental Scan documents, we sometimes provide several different points of view on a subject, illuminating areas where disagreements exist rather than privileging particular points of view; throughout these documents, our discussion of various themes and trends is not meant to represent an endorsement of the points of view stated, but rather a summary of existing thinking that can provide background for our own subsequent analysis. Any omissions of perspectives, or indications of a perspective of our own, is entirely unintentional, and we will welcome the reader's reactions to help us bolster the objectivity of both the Background section and the Environmental Scan.

Attached to this blogpost below are drafts of both the Background and Environmental Scan sections that, subject to further substantive revision and copy-editing, will be incorporated into the final report. We welcome reactions and feedback via comments in the box below or via email to fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Reactions provided by December 17, 2010 will be especially helpful in our preparations of findings and the modeling exercise that will result from it, so we will be most grateful for your immediate review. In addition, we expect that any further comments made before January 31, 2011, can be accommodated in the final report. Thank you in advance for the feedback we hope you will provide to help make this project as useful as possible for the FDLP, its participants, and its users.

Environmental scan 11 29 2010 FINAL DRAFT

Background 11 29 2010 FINAL DRAFT

---

3 Comments

1. **SHARI LASTER** *wrote:*

   I have detailed (and mostly minor comments) I will be emailing to Roger and Ross. I do want to bring up the following for public discussion – particularly because I hope others who are taking the time to review this report will have their own perspectives on this issue.

   To me, a significant omission in the environmental scan is the changing nature of the role academic libraries play in the teaching and learning environment. At many institutions, our missions and our resources go beyond research support to include teaching support and learning support. This extends to creating and supporting information literacy instruction, and government information plays a significant role in this process. For example, I often teach undergraduate and graduate students how to use government resources in order to successfully complete their assignments. This work is separate from supporting

guidance for using known resources.

It's an important part of the environment that academic libraries are in: how can we best help our students succeed?

Monday, December 6, 2010 at 4:40 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

In your section on Technological factors and access to the internet, I didn't see a mention of municipal wireless networks. Many cities now provide free wi-fi hubs in a variety of locations and I think that's a growing trend. I'm not sure what impact that is having, or will have, on libraries but it's another ingredient in the technological stew. You can likely find some articles on this trend pretty easily, but you might also want to see this site: http://www.muniwireless.com/

As for Shari's comments, I think the report does touch on the role academic libraries play in both teaching support and learning support, but it could be emphasized a bit more. My colleagues not only teach a credit-bearing introduction to research class, some have taught graduate-level research courses, and others have taught the "Southeastern 101" course which all freshman are required to take. Still others have been "embedded" in online courses to assist students (and the instructor). Teaching and instruction do take an awful lot of our time. And, with Louisiana's stated intention to fund higher education based on performance (mostly graduation rates), retention and progression of students has become an even higher priority. Our instruction helps the students succeed in their other courses, so we may have to devote even more time to it in the future.

Thursday, December 9, 2010 at 8:56 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

Shari and Lori, thanks so much for taking the time to read these through, and for your feedback. We'll make sure that these topics are addressed as we revise the scan. Looking back over the draft, I definitely agree that we could do more to describe the roles that academic librarians play in supporting teaching and learning, we'll look into this, but if you or others in the community have any suggestions of specific references we should be sure to see, we'd appreciate the suggestions!

If others in the community have further suggestions or feedback, we'd appreciate it if you could post these soon! We'll be glad to take into account feedback received further down the line, but if there are reactions you think would be valuable for us to have in mind as we're preparing our findings and developing new models, this would be an opportune time to share those with us.

Thursday, December 16, 2010 at 11:54 pm | Permalink | Edit

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Project structure & process

We heard a lot of interest at the recent Depository Library Council meeting in this project and had a number of valuable meetings and conversations while there. We connected with colleagues from the ALA Washington Office as part of our effort to reach out to American libraries broadly, were fortunate to be able to hear an update on the ASERL project plans over a lunch meeting, provided project briefings and requests for contributions at both the Regionals meeting and a plenary session, and had a number of other conversations with DLC members and numerous other attendees. We're truly grateful for the interest in this project.

During the course of the meeting, we heard a lot of interest in learning more about our process for this project, so we've put together this blog post to explain a bit more about our approach, much of which has been defined by GPO. The project is structured to begin with a major information-gathering process, emphasizing the capture of a broad portrait of the environment in which the FDLP operates and seeking to draw upon the broad experience of the library community in shaping sustainable collaborations, and then it will proceed to an analysis and modeling stage. The project is thereby divided into two major phases: research and analysis. We're currently in the midst of the research phase, and will be posting some interim deliverables to this site in the near future.

Research phase

The first major step in this project is the environmental scan. The environmental scan seeks to describe the broad and rapidly changing context in which the FDLP exists, identifying the key factors and challenges that must be accounted for in modeling for a future FDLP.GPO defined several broad topics for this research, ranging from the very broad and contextual (such as the state of the economy, technological change, and corresponding changes in information-seeking behavior) to the more specific (such as changes in the library landscape, the FDLP itself, and other developments in government information provision).

Based on this broad framework provided by GPO, we developed a more detailed outline of important environmental factors to be investigated, which we outlined in a recent blogpost. We are pursuing extensive desk research on this broad range of factors, mining articles, reports, journal issues, conference presentations, and other sources. Once we have concluded our initial draft of this scan, we will share it publicly on this website next month. At that point, we hope you will help us to identify any topics that we may have missed, mischaracterized, or not given sufficient

which will both inform our analytical work and serve as one component of our ultimate final report.

While concluding the environmental scan, we are just beginning our second major research phase for this project, in which we are examining existing models of library networks, consortia, and depository programs in order to identify factors that may be applicable in considering new models for the FDLP. Based on our initial investigation into existing models, we have developed a [framework](#) to categorize different ways in which libraries come together around shared goals and asked for community input. We are currently researching these networks to identify features that may be valuable in contemplating future models of the FDLP. This research will be driven principally by further desk research, although we will supplement publicly available sources with targeted interviews on library networks that we will incorporate as exemplars. We anticipate posting a draft of this report in late November or early December, and again we hope that you will help us to identify important examples we may have missed and contribute to the analysis of how aspects of existing networks could be valuably applied in the FDLP context.

These two steps constitute the major research phases of this project. It is important to note that while Ithaka S+R has conducted a number of relevant projects previously, we do not intend to privilege any of our previous work during these phases. While we will cite our previous projects appropriately, we will attempt to do so equally alongside all the other work that has been conducted in these areas, and we will explicitly ask you to help us ensure that we treat all referenced studies and projects fairly.

Analysis phase

Building on this research, we will develop a set of findings and implications that will be shared on this website during the month of December. The purpose of this exercise will be to corral 50-100 pages of research into digestible and actionable form. We only recently determined that we would conduct this step (it was not defined originally by GPO), but it feels important to share findings and implications for discussion with and review by the community prior to the modeling exercise.

These findings and implications will lay the groundwork for the modeling stage of this project. Some community members have been confused about the modeling stage, which actually has several components. First, we will identify a single direction forward for the FDLP, towards an ultimate objective that is consistent with the existing vision and mission of the Program and that is practical and sustainable. This direction will address the issues and challenges identified in the environmental scan and draw on the lessons learned from the existing models in the library community. Second, we will develop one or more models for setting the Program in this direction. For example, if the ultimate objective were to rely on legislative change (an anticipated possibility in GPO's project development), we would likely develop one model that achieves the objective via new legislation as well as one or more additional models that allow the FDLP to advance in this direction in the absence of legislative action. As we have mentioned previously, we will not be recommending the adoption by GPO or Federal Depository Libraries of any specific brands, products, or services in conjunction with this modeling exercise. Draft recommendations regarding Program directions and a model or models will be shared in later December or January, and again we will welcome community discussion and reactions.

Finally, we will craft value propositions analyzing how the roles and incentives associated with the overall recommended direction, as well as the individual model or models, match with library needs. This exercise will contribute to an assessment of our recommendations and, if they were to be adopted, would help in the articulation

of the benefits associated with participation. A draft value proposition will be posted to this website in January for discussion and reactions.

All of these pieces, integrating further research and analysis driven by your feedback over the course of this project, will together shape our final report and recommendations, which will be released broadly (including to this website) in March.

---

2 Comments

1. **JIM JACOBS** *wrote:*

   Thanks for this outline of your work plan. Your description of how you are interpreting GPO's requirement to produce a "Value Proposition" raises some more questions. You say that you will analyze "how the roles and incentives associated with the overall recommended direction, as well as the individual model or models, match with library needs" and how your recommendations would help in the "articulation of the benefits associated with participation."

   To me, these definitions sound like you will limit the "value proposition" to benefits to libraries and, more specifically, to libraries that "participate" in FDLP (by which, I presume you mean FDLP libraries).

   Do you intend to leave out of your value proposition benefits to information users and the communities (not necessarily geographically-based in the digital age) that FDLP libraries serve?

   I would hope that in identifying the "value" of any recommendations you make, you would take the time to identify value accrued (or lost) to current and future users of government information including citizens in general as well as economists, historians, journalists, political scientists, physicians, geographers, lawyers, students, and others (just to name a few who we know rely on government information).

   I would hope that you would look at the value to GPO and other government agencies of having a network of congressionally-mandated (but non-government libraries) participating in the preservation of government information. I would also hope that you would consider the value to non-FDLP libraries of having, as part of the larger library community, a community of libraries that specialize in government information.

   In an earlier comment, (http://fdlpmodeling.net/?p=1#comment-81597121) I asked if you will be using a traditional commercial/marketing approach to developing a value proposition and how you anticipate specifying or quantifying a value and costs. Have you made decisions about this? To repeat my earlier questions: Will you include costs assumed by FDLP libraries and government information users or only costs assumed by GPO? How will you quantify

government information (including non-current information such as old censuses and old annual reports)? Will you also consider what risks your recommendations create for the loss of free access to government information and the costs associated with any such losses?

Finally, I believe that Ithaka S+R's Roger Schonfeld was a contributor to the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access. Will your current work use a similar understanding when your develop a value proposition?

Here is the BRTF definition (page 24 of http://brtf.sdsc.edu/biblio/BRTF_Final_Report.pdf):

"2.1.1 Value and Benefits"

"When speaking about value, economists like to ask "Who benefits?" or "Who cares?" because well-articulated demand starts with a clear and compelling value proposition about the benefits to be gained by having, in our case, access to information at some point in the future. The value of information is not to be confused with its monetary or financial value per se, although it can often be denominated in currency. The value of digital assets is best understood as what digital materials are good for, and that is usually understood as the ways that the materials are used — to advance knowledge, entertain or bring pleasure, help solve problems, or inform public policy."

"Each user community will identify its own set of values and benefits in the digital materials they demand. For example, in scholarly discourse there is a clear community consensus about the value of e-journals over time."

Thanks for your time in considering these issues.

- Jim Jacobs

Tuesday, November 2, 2010 at 6:46 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **JIM JACOBS** *wrote:*

Measuring value.

Here are links to a couple of comments about measuring value and productivity in higher education and libraries that you might find of interest. I think they do a good job of addressing the difficulty of applying traditional commercial metrics to products and services that are public goods.

"Beyond Crazy" by James Kwak
Baseline Scenario, October 27, 2010
http://baselinescenario.com/2010/10/27/beyond-crazy/

"Assessing the (Enduring) Value of Libraries" By Barbara Fister
Inside Higher Ed. September 17, 2010
http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/library_babel_fish/assessing_the_enduring_value_of_libraries

Jim Jacobs

Wednesday, November 3, 2010 at 5:33 pm | Permalink | Edit

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Home   *About*   *Privacy Policy*

Depository Library Council Meeting & Conference

Ross Housewright and Roger Schonfeld from Ithaka S+R will be attending the Federal Depository Library Council and Conference next week, and we look forward to having the opportunity to meet more of the FDLP community as well as to catch up with those of you we've already met. As we're still in the early stages of this project, we won't be ready yet to report on findings or recommendations, but we're eager to learn more about the ongoing developments in the Program. We will be around the conference all three days, please feel free to find us if you'd like to discuss the project, or email us (at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org or our individual addresses, ross.housewright@ithaka.org and roger.schonfeld@ithaka.org) if you'd like to make sure we have a chance to talk. See you in DC!

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Thursday, October 14, 2010, at 8:27 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

One Trackback/Pingback

1. **FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM ›** *on Wednesday, October 27, 2010 at 10:50 pm | Edit*

   […] heard a lot of interest at the recent Depository Library Council meeting in this project and had a number of valuable meetings and conversations while there. We connected […]

‹ *Existing Models of Library Networks*   *Project structure & process* ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Existing Models of Library Networks

First, a brief update: thank you for your initial suggestions in response to our post launching the environmental scan component of our project. We are in the middle of conducting our own research for the scan, and soon we will use this website to highlight some areas where we'd particularly value the assistance of the library community in helping us to better understand certain topics.

In parallel to our work on the environmental scan, we've begun planning for the second deliverable defined by GPO: a report on existing models of library networks, consortia, and depository programs. The goal of this report will be to explore the different ways in which libraries organize themselves to perform projects or provide services and collections, and to think about how these models could be applied in the FDLP. We don't expect that existing models will offer a perfect fit for the FDLP, but we hope that we'll be able to identify strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of approaches that might be applied to various aspects of the FDLP.

We're only beginning our planning for this paper, but we'd like to share the broad structure that we're imagining with the community, and we'll hope for both your general feedback and your help in addressing a few specific questions. Generally, we're imagining categorizing library networks into three broad buckets:

- Affinity groups of librarians: This group will contain professional societies and other organizations that bring together librarians around a common set of interests, ranging from the very broad (such as ALA) to the much narrower (such as the Federal Documents Task Force of GODORT). We will explore the implications of different scales and scopes of focus, and consider the roles played by these various kinds of library groups, including information sharing and the development of the shared values of the library community.
- Member-driven library organizations: This group will consist of formal "library networks" , that is, groups of libraries that have banded together around a shared set of goals or common concerns. In this category, we plan to examine established networks of libraries (rather than the not ad hoc networks formed around a particular problem, which would be considered in the next category). This category would include everything from institution-level collaborations that incorporate a library network (e.g. the UC system, the Five Colleges of Massachusetts) and networks of libraries with varying degree of mutual trust relationships (e.g. ASERL, the Oberlin Group) to government-organized library networks (e.g. the College Center for Library Automation, state library agency roles/networks) and larger networks where members, relationships with one

another is to a great degree mediated through a central body (e.g. OCLC, CRL). We will explore the implications of different ways in which libraries elect (or otherwise come to be) allied with one another, considering the strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of groups of libraries for particular kinds of problems.

- Programmatic library collaborations: This group will contain collaborations that take action to address a common opportunity or concern. Most of the actual programmatic collaborations of the above member-driven library organizations would fall into this category. This category will also contain mission-driven collaborations that don't necessarily arise from the needs of a pre-existing set of libraries but rather identify a common problem and attempt to aggregate libraries around its solution, and ad hoc/one-off projects that bring together a group of libraries to address a single shared problem. Again, we will consider how each of these models offers unique strengths and challenges in addressing certain kinds of problems.

We are still in the process of defining, and refining, these categories as well as relevant sub-categories, so they may yet change in response to feedback we receive. At this point, we believe that many depository library programs contain elements of all three of these categories and therefore will be examining them in the context of all of these models.

Within and across these categories, we will explore a number of questions, including the advantages and disadvantages of each type of library network and its potential relevance to the FDLP. Given key values of the FDLP (values such as preservation, integrity of collections, and broad public access), we believe it will be especially important to investigate the dynamics and components of well-functioning trust networks, including their membership, scope, governance, associated incentives, and so forth.

We would welcome feedback on the broad structure we are developing for this deliverable, and on particular questions we should be exploring in this paper. We'd also appreciate pointers to networks or collaborations you think we should be sure to understand, especially networks of state and/or public libraries, which are such an important part of the FDLP but may not have the same level of collaboration infrastructure to support them as do academic, law, and federal libraries. Thank you for any reactions or suggestions you are able to provide.

---

3 Comments

1. **LORI** *wrote:*

   I think Louisiana's LOUIS network is one you should definitely investigate. ([http://appl006.lsu.edu/ocsweb/louishome.nsf /index](http://appl006.lsu.edu/ocsweb/louishome.nsf/index)) They provide an amazing number of centralized services for both academic and public libraries across the state.

   Tuesday, October 12, 2010 at 3:36 pm | [Permalink]() | [Edit]()

I would recommend you also look at the Internet Archive as a collaborative model because of the focus on preservation and access of digital born and digitized information beyond library walls. Their experience with digital preservation and migration would be really important to consider for a sustainable FDLP model.

Tuesday, October 12, 2010 at 4:52 pm | [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#)

3. **BILL SLEEMAN** *wrote:*

   I applaud your intention to look at existing models for sharing information and resources and how those various models might be applied to the FDLP. While many academic FDL participants have been trying to tinker with the structure, still within the requirements of participation — I think an effort to look at alternative structures for the FDLP is long overdue.

   It may be though that as government information professionals we are trying to maintain a system, not unlike the U.S. Postal Service, that no longer meets customer needs and expectations. As you work through the evaluation of "existing models of library networks" I would urge you to consider a more fundamental question, that is, do we even need a network of participating libraries at all? Could we, should we consider changing in a very fundamental way the relationship (and the mission) of GPO and the library community? — Bill Sleeman, Thurgood Marshall Law Library

   Thursday, October 14, 2010 at 4:18 pm | [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#)

‹ ***Website launch!***   *Depository Library Council Meeting & Conference* ›

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

MODELING FOR THE FUTURE

Website launch!

Today, we're launching FDLPmodeling.net, a venue for us to communicate with the community over the course of our project to develop sustainable models for the Federal Depository Library Program in the 21st century, which is being performed by Ithaka S+R on behalf of the Government Printing Office. This site currently contains a more detailed description of this project in the <u>"About this project" post</u>, and information about our first major deliverable, an environmental scan of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government information, in our <u>"First task" post</u>. We encourage you to participate by posting any questions, comments, or suggestions in the comments field of these posts or, if you prefer, by sending email directly to <u>fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org</u>. Thank you, and welcome to the site!

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Wednesday, September 22, 2010, at 9:20 pm. Filed under <u>Uncategorized</u>. Bookmark the <u>permalink</u>. Follow comments here with the <u>RSS feed</u>. Comments are closed, but you can leave a <u>trackback</u>. <u>Edit this entry.</u>

5 Comments

1. **DANIEL CORNWALL** *wrote:*

   As you're looking for input from non-depository librarians and the public, I think it might be helpful if you did a blog post or two about ITHAKA S+R itself, including your organization's involvement in JSTOR and PORTICO. If there's any chance that your final recommendations will include the use of ITHAKA S+R products, then your involvement in setting up and maintaining digital archives should be disclosed.

   If the LOCKSS Stanford Team were doing this study, I'd ask for the same thing. No matter your intentions, there could be a perception that this project is similar to asking IBM to study whether a state government's data center ought to be outsourced and coming up with the recommendation that IBM should take it over. I'm not saying that this is your intention, but I think you'll need to work at avoiding the appearance of a conflict of interest.

   Monday, September 27, 2010 at 1:52 pm | *Permalink* | *Edit*

2. **ROGER C. SCHONFELD** *wrote:*

Daniel,

Thank you for this question. ITHAKA is a not-for-profit organization, governed by an independent board of trustees. ITHAKA provides three services, the JSTOR research platform, the Portico digital preservation service, and Ithaka S+R, our strategy and research group. Ithaka S+R conducts research that falls into five thematic areas (http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/strategic-consulting) as well as consulting projects for a diverse set of clients (http://www.ithaka.org /ithaka-s-r/strategic-consulting/client-projects/client-projects-1). Much of our work on the role of the library in recent years has involved analyzing and developing collaborative trust models, with an emphasis on models that support preservation, recognizing the varying affordances of different content types (see for example my recent contribution to a CLIR report on the digitization of book collections at http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub147/pub147.pdf).

Ithaka S+R is conducting this project on the FDLP on a consulting basis for GPO, which has defined the purpose and structure of the project. GPO has asked us to recommend a practical and sustainable model or models for the FDLP. As we detailed in other posts on this website, the project plan calls for research steps including an environmental scan and an analysis of library networks. During these steps, we will gather inputs objectively from across all sources that can be used to inform the project.

In subsequent phases, we will be developing recommendations for a model or models incorporating durable FDLP structures and programs. Consequently, our recommendations will not focus on specific brands, services, or products, including those provided by any part of our organization.

I anticipate that the models we develop may include access to and preservation of collections in a variety of formats and services to the general public (as well as specific constituencies) to help with discovery and use. We will not be focusing exclusively on collections, and certainly not exclusively on digital collections or digitization.

Thank you for your question, and also for your tips and suggestions in other blog posts already. I look forward to the continuing dialogue (and to seeing you face to face later this week!).

Best,
Roger

Tuesday, September 28, 2010 at 4:25 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **DANIEL CORNWALL** *wrote:*

Hi Roger, thanks for filling me in on the different parts of your organization.

I'm really looking forward to working with you on discovery and use, which I think are two key aspects of a successful FDLP. I also plan to attend your session on Thursday.

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 4:44 am | Permalink | Edit

4. **TOM ADAMICH** *wrote:*

...Agree with Daniel's comment. If privatizing GPO services is the ultimate goal (and your receipt of the contract to administer such privatization the prize), then I think the FDLP community needs to know that fact early in the discussion (and, ultimately how it might impact both the FDLP collection administration model and free access to government information in general).

Daniel's idea to "spread the wealth around" when it comes to having iterations of government information available and archived (whether the information be in print or electronic form) really is an important one (both from an accessibility perspective and from an archival/governance one).

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 4:42 pm | Permalink | Edit

5. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

Hi Tom,

GPO has retained Ithaka S+R to develop a sustainable model for the future of the FDLP that supports the public's interest in no-fee permanent public access to government information. We share with you the deeply held value that government information must not be, as you say, "privatized." We hope that you will find that our work throughout the course of this project reflects these shared values. To be very clear, our recommendations will *not* suggest "privatizing" the FDLP, nor will they promote any specific brands, services, or products, including those provided by any part of our organization. Please see Roger's earlier response (http://fdlpmodeling.net/?p=19#comment-81592620) for further information on ITHAKA, Ithaka S+R, and our role in the project. Thanks for your interest in this project, and we look forward to engaging with you over the next several months.

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 7:19 pm | Permalink | Edit

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

First task: environmental scan

The first major step in our research process for this project, as defined by GPO, will be to undertake a broad environmental scan of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government information. Our goal will be to identify a wide range of important environmental factors that are reshaping the landscape for government information and that must be taken into account in charting a sustainable path forward for the FDLP in an increasingly electronic environment. As we launch our in-depth literature review and research process, we want to take the opportunity to review our broad strategy for this environmental scan with the FDLP community, along with other interested members of the public, and gather as much of your feedback and guidance as we can. Community involvement in this research can only make it richer, helping us to more completely describe the context in which the FDLP operates.

Our environmental scan research will cover six major thematic areas:

- Changing social/demographic factors. Generally, how are demographics in the United States shifting, with respect to rural/urban differences, primary language, and other factors? More specifically, how are factors relating to access to and use of the internet changing, in daily life and in interacting with the government and with government information?
- Economic factors. How is the current financial crisis impacting libraries of all types, including state, public, and academic libraries? How is the current economic climate affecting government programs and funding? How do both of these connect to long-term structural changes in funding?
- Technological factors. Which trends and new uses of the internet, social media, web 2.0, mobile devices, etc. are reshaping user's online experiences, both in daily life and in finding needed information? What strategies are being applied to make online content more reusable, such as APIs, linked data, or bulk downloads?
- Political factors. How is the "open and transparent government" movement realizing new ways for the public to engage with the government and government information, either through new kinds of government activities or services or through the efforts of the broader community?
- Library-related factors. How is the role of the library in users' processes of information discovery and use changing? How are library roles and services changing in an electronic environment, in all different kinds of libraries? How are libraries working to preserve content for posterity, in print and digital form, and what challenges do they face in doing so?

- Federal Government information publishing and access factors. What challenges to the continued sustainability of the FDLP have been identified, and what solutions have been proposed over the years? What has been the impact of these challenges on FDLP as a preservation and service network? How are the efforts of GPO, the broader government, and a variety of commercial and non-commercial players reshaping the landscape for government information publishing and access?

We are eager to integrate community feedback into the project from this early stage, and so hope that you will share your comments and suggestions with us, which will help to inform our development of this critical context for the changing FDLP. Specifically:

- While this is only a high-level outline, are there major themes that provide important context for understanding the environment in which the FDLP operates that you feel are at risk of being neglected?
- Are there significant aspects to some of these themes that you want to call to our attention, either that you don't see reflected in the above summary or that you want to make sure are addressed?
- Do you have any specific suggestions of citations that we should be sure to look at in building out our environmental scan?

Please feel free to give us any feedback and suggestions via the comments on this post, or via email at fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org. Thank you!

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Wednesday, September 22, 2010, at 5:10 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

10 Comments

1. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

   I'm not sure if this is really an environmental scan sort of issue, but I don't see the concept of assessment reflected in your outline. How do we define success for the FDLP? How do we define success for depository libraries? For non-depository libraries? How about for the public at large? Once we've defined success, how do we determine if the benchmarks are being met? Providing permanent public access to government information is a wonderful thing, but that alone will likely not meet the needs of the public. What sort of help do they require to successfully find and use government information, and are we (government and libraries together) doing a good job of providing that help?

   Thursday, September 23, 2010 at 1:43 pm | *Permalink* | *Edit*

2. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

   Hi Lori, thanks for being the official first commenter on the project! This is a really important set of questions that I think we'll address in a variety of ways over the course of the project. First off, the broad definition of "success" we're using for the FDLP is the

permanent public access to government information.

That said, I think that you're absolutely right to point out that this is not just an issue for depository libraries, but also for non-depositories and for the general public. For the Program to be a success, the needs of all of these constituents for permanent, no-fee public access to government information must be met. We're eager to learn more over the course of this project about, for example, how non-depository libraries satisfy the government information needs of their patrons, either alone or in collaboration with depositories (and if you have any suggestions of examples or articles on this topic, please send them our way!).

Furthermore, exploring the question of the services end users need to effectively discover and make use of government information is definitely a priority for this project. This is certainly important for making sure that government information is not simply theoretically accessible but actually useful, which is in turn critical to the sustainability of the Program. Continued investment in government information by the library community will be greatly encouraged by the demonstration that government information services and collections are vibrant, heavily used parts of the library that contribute concretely to addressing user needs. Looking back over the description above, I think we may have not fully expressed how important to this project it will be to develop a vision for the roles and services all types of libraries, depository and non-depository alike, can play in serving the public's government information needs. Seeking out examples of service innovation, successful or not, will be a priority in the environmental scan process, but if you can point us to any examples of libraries exploring different ways to provide government information services that you're aware of, we'd very much appreciate the advice!

I hope this addresses your questions – please let us know if you have any further questions or suggestions on how we can best address these questions in our research and recommendations!

Friday, September 24, 2010 at 1:49 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

Hi Lori thanks for being the official first commenter on the project! This is a really important set of questions that I think we'll address in a variety of ways over the course of the project. First off, the broad definition of "success" we're using for the FDLP is the sustainable accomplishment of its mission of providing no-fee permanent public access to government information.

That said, I think that you're absolutely right to point out that this is not just an issue for depository libraries, but also for non-depositories and for the general public. For the Program to be a success, the needs of all of these constituents for permanent, no-fee public access to government information must be met. We're eager to learn more over the course of this project about, for example, how non-depository libraries satisfy the government information needs of their patrons, either alone or in collaboration with depositories (and if you have any suggestions of examples or articles on this topic, please send them our way!).

Furthermore, exploring the question of the services end users need to effectively discover and make use of government information is definitely a priority for this project. This is certainly important for making sure that government information is not simply theoretically accessible but actually useful, which is in turn critical to the sustainability of the Program. Continued investment in government information by the library community will be greatly encouraged by the demonstration that government information services and collections are vibrant, heavily used parts of the library that contribute concretely to addressing user needs. Looking back over the description above, I think we may have not fully expressed how important to this project it will be to develop a vision for the roles and services all types of libraries, depository and non-depository alike, can play in serving the public's government information needs. Seeking out examples of service innovation, successful or not, will be a priority in the environmental scan process, but if you can point us to any examples of libraries exploring different ways to provide government information services that you're aware of, we'd very much appreciate the advice!<

I hope this addresses your questions – please let us know if you have any further questions or suggestions on how we can best address these questions in our research and recommendations!

Friday, September 24, 2010 at 1:51 pm | *Permalink* | *Edit*

---

4. **ANONYMOUS** *wrote:*

Hi. I wanted to comment on both Lori's keen observations and the comment to her input. I think Lori is right that the benchmarks for assessment need to be established (with respect to what materials/information we need to provide and how we can efficiently provide it). I also think there needs to be a better mechanism for enabling depository libraries to serve populations (both within their institutional boundaries as well as within the non-depository institutions they serve). As a depository librarian, I would love to establish formal agreements with institutions in my region to act as their "guide" to government information access (particularly to the K-12 education community). Right now, I voluntarily give of my time/efforts to serve — via my work with the Gov Doc Kids Group – http://govdocs4children.pbworks.com/ , http://wikis.ala.org/godort /index.php/Gov_Doc_Kids, http://community.fdlp.gov /govdockidsgroup , http://community.fdlp.gov/weblinks/community-groups/gov-doc-kids-group.html . However, this model of service is not supported financially (which is understandable in light of these unusual economic times. However, in defense of the GPO, their efforts to provide a forum and space for groups like mine – via the FDLP Community – is to be examined as a model for the future dissemination of government information. Take a look at Rebecca Blakeley's Digital Deposit Documents to the People area for an example of FDLP Community utilization). Again, to return to Lori's initial observation to identify what is expected of the depository community and what resources will be provided by the GPO (above and beyond what is supported at the local level) to enable those expectations to be fulfilled. As you noted in your project outline, libraries are facing difficult budget times, often having to go to extraordinary lengths to establish why they

community infrastructure to FDLP members (that is supported with human, technological, and financial resources like the FDLP Community), the GPO can be recognized as a primary information source in libraries for the future, ranking in tandem with the fee-based databases, other resources, and human assistance we will continue to provide to users.

Friday, September 24, 2010 at 4:05 pm | Permalink | Edit

---

5. **DANIEL CORNWALL** *wrote:*

Hi Ross – Although it relates mostly to e-government (i.e. provision of services), you might want to look at "Florida Public Libraries and E-Government: Services, Issues, and Recommendations" at http://www.ii.fsu.edu/Research/Initiatives/E-Government/E-Government-Final-Report. This 2008 report was a snapshot of how public libraries in Florida were handling the provision of government information and providing assistance with government resources.

Going back to Lori's point, I'm not sure that you've addressed assessment. Saying "the broad definition of "success" we're using for the FDLP is the sustainable accomplishment of its mission of providing no-fee permanent public access to government information" sounds to me like a restatement of your charge. This project will need to define what "sustainable accomplishment" means.

In some respects, the goal of "sustainable accomplishment of its mission of providing no-fee permanent public access to government information" is something that can only be recognized in hindsight. If you and I could hope into a time machine (perhaps the TARDIS of Dr. Who), jump ahead to 2150 and were able to access of a free copy of "In Katrina's wake : the National Guard on the Gulf Coast, 2005" we could jump back to 2010 and report "mission accomplished."

Since that option isn't available to us, what criteria can we look to that if met, hold potential for no-fee permanent public access to public information? I would suggest that one would be having a certain number of copies of government publications and data sets in the hands of multiple institutions.

I realize this project is in the beginning stages, so I won't look for a full assessment plan next week. 😃

Thanks to you and the other staff at ITHAKA S+R for setting up this site. I'm looking forward to following your progress here and will do my part to encourage librarians and members of the general public to contribute.

Monday, September 27, 2010 at 1:16 pm | Permalink | Edit

---

6. **SHARI LASTER** *wrote:*

One issue that I think could be explored and addressed in significant detail are the differing strengths and challenges at academic institutions of different size. Academic libraries serving as FDLs range in size from serving a few thousand FTE to serving tens of

drastically from institution to institution, the variance seems to be greater based on the size of the institution. I would love to see some kind of fantastic breakdown of the library-related factors based on a finer distinction between libraries than simply whether they are academic, public, or some other broad category.

Monday, September 27, 2010 at 7:42 pm | Permalink | Edit

7. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

Hi Daniel,

Thanks for the citation, this is exactly the sort of thing we're looking to ensure we include! Yes, a lot of the literature around public library government information services seem to focus around e-government activities, but this is a good thing for our scan to document, and points to the fuzziness of the boundaries of "government information." Although, government publications, may be a sensible category for librarians, the impression we've gotten from the literature and from conversations with the community is that that it may not be for most members of the general public (and even researchers), who may often know (at best) that they want help in dealing with some government-related issue. So it's good to see how the category of "government information services" is expanding in the public library sector.

Thanks also for your suggestion about one criteria for how the success of the FDLP could be assessed. At this point, it seems that more criteria have been suggested for collections and preservation than they have for services, so we'd also be most interested to hear ideas that might support an assessment of the access, discovery, and support services that the FDLP provides.

Thanks for your help and for your interest in the project!

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 2:29 pm | Permalink | Edit

8. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

Hi Shari,

That's definitely a complicated issue, have you seen GPO's segmentation project (http://www.fdlp.gov/home/about/723-crp-segmentation-needsassessment)? Breakdowns there included doctoral, 4-year, community college, law school, etc. Categorizing academic institutions more generally is always a tricky topic, as the evolution of the Carnegie Classification suggests.

As you say, I think there's a lot of individual variance between academic libraries based on their unique constituencies, histories, etc. I don't know that I have the data at this point to say whether or not this variation is principally along the lines of institution size, or if it is informed by other characteristics such as disciplinary focus, research intensity, or location relative to other Federal Depository Libraries. I definitely agree with you, though, that there's a lot of variation in interests between different libraries that often get lumped together into the same category. This is definitely an issue we're looking forward to

resources that we should know of, I'd very much appreciate any advice you can offer!

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 2:29 pm | Permalink | Edit

9. **TOM ADAMICH** *wrote:*

Yes, it's a big project, so, like Daniel and Lori, I don't expect you to have all of the answers tomorrow. However, there needs to be some measurable guidelines (which might form the foundation for future assessment). Also, if the ultimate goal is to reduce costs and increase accessibility, then involving the "community" (whether it be FDLP libraries, public libraries, state agencies, local governments, etc.) needs to be considered as being an important part of that assessment equation (not only to have involvement in the administration of activities but to determine how to best maintain and, again in hindsite as Daniel discussed, measure the effectiveness of those activities).

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 4:50 pm | Permalink | Edit

10. **LORI SMITH** *wrote:*

I think this article may offer a good summary of the issues I'm concerned about:
Assessing the Value and Impact of Digital Content.
Authors:Franklin, Brinley (brinley.franklin@uconn.edu)
Plum, Terry (terry.plum@simmons.edu)
Source:Journal of Library Administration; 2008, Vol. 48 Issue 1, p41-57, 17p

GPO has, in essence, become a "vendor" of digital information. To determine if the public is satisfied with the "product" they're offering, statistics will need to be kept on usage and on users. What is the public using? Are they finding it successfully on their own? Did they go directly to FDSys or did they get referred from another site? Did they get help from a library? If so, what kind? Are people generally more satisfied with the help they got from a depository library or from a non-depository library? What are people looking for that they failed to find?

If we define success for the FDLP as, for instance, 90% of the people who search for government information find what they need no matter what year that information was published, then we need to know if that's really happening. If it isn't happening, we need to know what we can do to improve FDLP's performance. And, if depository libraries continue to be part of the overall solution, they'll need to have some measure of their local success and impact in order to justify the money they're spending on staff, and so on, in support of the program.

Friday, October 15, 2010 at 7:02 pm | Permalink | Edit

One Trackback/Pingback

STRUCTURE & PROCESS *on Wednesday, October 27, 2010 at 10:51 pm | Edit*

[...] outline of important environmental factors to be investigated, which we outlined in a recent blogpost. We are pursuing extensive desk research on this broad range of factors, mining articles, reports, [...]

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

About this project

The Government Printing Office has retained Ithaka S+R to lead a project that will develop a model for the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) to more efficiently accomplish its mission in a rapidly changing digital environment. Ithaka S+R is deeply honored to be selected for this role, and look forward to contributing to ensuring the continued availability of government information to the American people, which is vital to the success of our democracy. This site is intended to provide regular project updates as well as a mechanism for vigorous community engagement.

Project Description

GPO has defined the objectives and structure of this project. There will be no reassessment of the fundamental mission of the FDLP, which is to ensure that the American public receives no-fee ready and permanent public access to federal government information. In this project, Ithaka S+R will conduct an environmental scan, examine other library networks, identify a practical and sustainable model (or models) for the FDLP going forward, analyze the value proposition for the FDLP in the 21st Century, and provide regulatory and legislative recommendations to guide possible implementation.

With these ambitious goals, broad community engagement will be critical to the success of this project. We are therefore establishing a variety of mechanisms to incorporate into this project the expertise and perspective of federal depository libraries, other libraries with an interest in government information, the non-library government information field, and other interested parties. We will rely on community input and advice throughout the course of the project, both in guiding our research efforts and defining our recommendations for the future of the FDLP. We therefore encourage you engage as regularly and indeed vigorously as possible, via this website and other venues.

Project Plan

Throughout the course of the project, this website will provide regular updates on project progress, often accompanied by calls for input or advice on specific issues. We will welcome your contributions via blog comments or email. We also anticipate posting several surveys or focused questions, in order to gather specific attitudinal or operational data that that will inform our project planning and recommendations. Perhaps most importantly, we will share several interim papers that will serve as building blocks towards our final report, seeking community feedback on these draft

publicly on this site in order to gather community input:

- An environmental scan of the issues and trends impacting libraries and government publishing;
- A report that identifies and describes existing library networks, consortia, and depository programs;
- A white paper on new models for the structure of the FDLP and for depository libraries to provide access to government information; and
- A value proposition for a 21st century FDLP.

We will welcome vigorous discussion on the project blog as well as private comments and suggestions via email on these interim deliverables.

Finally, we will release our final report including recommendations via this site by March 2011.

In addition to these online mechanisms, we also look forward to discussing these issues with the government information community face-to-face. We are already planning to attend the October Depository Library Council meeting and the ALA midwinter meeting, which will give us opportunities to discuss this project in person with the library community. Recognizing budgetary limitations, we also would welcome additional suggestions for other venues we should attend during the course of this project.

By providing your comments and suggestions over the course of this project, we can create recommendations that will best meet the needs of the community. We look forward to working together with you to define a sustainable future for the FDLP in the 21st century.

You can reach the Ithaka S+R project team at FDLP-modeling@ithaka.org, or via our individual addresses.

Ross Housewright, Research Analyst, Ithaka S+R // ross.housewright@ithaka.org

Roger C. Schonfeld, Manager of Research, Ithaka S+R // roger.schonfeld@ithaka.org

---

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Wednesday, September 22, 2010, at 5:00 pm. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Comments are closed, but you can leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

5 Comments

1. **MR WORDPRESS** *wrote:*

   Hi, this is a comment.
   To delete a comment, just log in and view the post's
   comments. There you will have the option to edit or delete them.

   Friday, September 17, 2010 at 8:57 pm | Permalink | Edit

2. **ANONYMOUS** *wrote:*

   testing 1 2 3

   Friday, September 17, 2010 at 8:59 pm | Permalink | Edit

3. **ROSS** *wrote:*

Test

Friday, September 17, 2010 at 9:15 pm | *Permalink* | *Edit*

4. **JIM JACOBS** *wrote:*

I would like to hear how you are interpreting the requirement to produce a "Value Proposition." Are you using a traditional commercial/marketing approach to this? Has GPO defined for you what they want? Assuming that GPO wants you to specify, or even quantify, a value based on costs and benefits, how will you quantify those? Will you include costs assumed by FDLP libraries and government information users or only costs assumed by GPO? How will you quantify the value and benefits of permanent, free public access to all government information (including non-current information such as old censuses and old annual reports)?

Jim Jacobs

Tuesday, September 28, 2010 at 4:42 pm | *Permalink* | *Edit*

5. **ROSS HOUSEWRIGHT** *wrote:*

Hi Jim,

Thanks for this question. Given that each phase builds on previous phases of the project, we have a great deal more definition of the earlier phases than we do of later phases such as the value proposition at this point. I appreciate these suggestions about some of the ways to think about this phase, and as we have a greater sense of definition for this phase we'll be posting a request for additional input on it, but if you have any other suggestions in advance of this, we definitely welcome them. Thanks again for your interest in the project!

Wednesday, September 29, 2010 at 2:31 pm | *Permalink* | *Edit*

One Trackback/Pingback

1. **FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM › WEBSITE LAUNCH!** *on Wednesday, September 22, 2010 at 9:20 pm* | *Edit*

[…] Printing Office. This site currently contains a more detailed description of this project in the "About this project" post, and information about our first major deliverable, an environmental scan of the issues and trends […]

FEDERAL DEPOSITORY LIBRARY PROGRAM

Reaching us – project email problems

Apologies for any confusion this may have caused, but we've been informed that the project email address we have set up (and announced in posts below) is currently bouncing back emails. We've determined that due to a misconfiguration in the email account we set up for this project, emails from outside our domain are being returned to sender (because emails from within our domain are allowed through, we didn't notice this problem in our setup tests!). We're working to address this situation as soon as possible, but if you've sent us a note and had it bounce back, please contact us directly – we're eager to hear from you:
Ross Housewright, Research Analyst, Ithaka S+R // ross.housewright@ithaka.org

Roger Schonfeld, Manager of Research, Ithaka S+R // roger.schonfeld@ithaka.org

We hope to have the project email address up and running again within the next day, and apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. Thanks very much for your patience, and please let us know if you encounter any other technical difficulties in working with this site.

:EDIT: The problem has been resolved – you can now contact us at the fdlp-modeling@ithaka.org address. In order to clean up the navigation of the front page, I've changed the date on this posting to effectively "archive" it.

This was written by rhousewright. Posted on Wednesday, September 22, 2010, at 3:46 am. Filed under Uncategorized. Bookmark the permalink. Follow comments here with the RSS feed. Post a comment or leave a trackback. Edit this entry.

Post a Comment

Logged in as KSIEGER. *Log out?*

COMMENT

Submit comment

About this project >