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PROCEDINGS

MR. MATHESON: Good morning. Good morning.

Thank you.

I'd like to welcome everyone and officially call to order the Fall 2016 Depository Library Council Meeting and Federal Depository Library Conference. I'm Scott Matheson. I'm the chair of the Depository Library Council. And with me --

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Thank you.

With me are the other members of Council and some GPO staff. But we're going to go through real quickly and introduce the Council members so that folks on the room as -- who can see the signs, but also folks listening remotely who can't see our -- the signs with everyone's name on them know who people are when we start doing Q&A.

So let's go ahead and start with Rich.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida.

MS. TAYLOR: Teri Taylor, New Jersey State Library.

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:  Can't hear.
Speak up.

MS. HARTNETT:  Cass Hartnett, University of Washington, Seattle.

MR. CORNWALL:  Daniel Cornwall, Alaska State Library.

MS. BERNSTEIN:  Melissa Bernstein, James E. Faust Law Library, University of Utah.

MS. WILLIAMS:  Beth Williams, Stanford University, Robert Crown Law Library.

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

MS. MASON:  Marianne Mason, University of Iowa.

MS. THORNTON:  Lori Thornton, New Mexico State Library.

MR. SHAW:  Jim Shaw, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER:  Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Public Library, Fort Lauderdale.

MS. ROSS:  Karen Ross, University of Arkansas, Little Rock.

MS. KRUMSEE:  Kirstin Krumsee, State Library of Ohio.
MR. MATHESON: Thank you all.

You'll notice that we're 14 this year. Usually, we're 15. Unfortunately, our friend, Erin Guss, took a new job, which is fortunate for her, unfortunate for us. And she had to resign from Council. But we're working on finding a successor, especially somebody with public library experience. If this is you or somebody you know, talk to a Council member, talk to me, let us know. And we'll see what we can do about getting that vacancy filled.

I'd like to start by thanking the GPO staff, who have worked so hard to make this conference a reality. You'll see them with the blue name badges on. You've work with -- you work with them in your depository work. You know how wonderful they are. But they really go above and beyond to make this conference work and happen for all of us both here in Arlington as well as the folks listening remotely. So thanks to them.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: So we are so pleased that more than 275 colleagues are joining us in person and even more pleased that several hundred more are joining via the live stream. We have attendees from every type of depository from service academies and federal agencies
to public, state, and academic libraries.

In addition to the variety of attendees, we have a variety of opportunities to learn and participate over the next three days. In this room, or on this online stream, you'll find Depository Library Council Meetings where Council will be presenting and discussing issues we feel are important to the FDLP.

Each session includes time for Q&A from the audience. So you can participate, including online folks. We'll be capturing all the questions in the chat. So if you're in this room or this stream, we want you to participate. We want your feedback.

In other rooms and on another stream starting tomorrow, you'll have opportunities to learn from federal agencies about their information products, from your colleagues about innovative programs in their libraries, and from GPO staff about new tools to -- and support they're providing to allow us to serve our patrons better.

As you saw this morning during Coffee with Council, we also have many vendors and Agency partners onsite who can demonstrate products and answer your questions or take suggestions.

I know we all love CIS, and here's one of their products. You can go out and pick up some of the
flashcards or the booklets as well if you go out and visit folks in the room right behind us.

One tradition that we have at Council that I am not going to break is a little exercise called Council calisthenics. We use it to get to know each other, to learn who's here with us. We also use it to make sure that people are still awake.

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: So without further ado, everyone who is from west of the Mississippi who came here today from west of the Mississippi, stand up.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. Thanks for your travel.

All right. Now we'll do one that's easy because this is the opposite.

Everyone from east of the Mississippi -- that's me. I'm standing. Great.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: All righty. Now, this one is going to be more exclusive.

Everyone from outside the contiguous United States.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. Hi, Glenn (ph).
All righty. Now, this one we're going to do in stages. So everyone who's stand -- once you stand up, stay standing.

Everyone who has more than 20 years of experience in documents work, on your feet.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Great job. Okay.

More than 10, join them. Anyone with more than 10, join them. All righty.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Good. More than five. More than five?

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: All right. This is great. So look around. See, these are the folks who have been doing this a while and know some of the problems and can answer some of the questions.

Now everybody sit down. And anyone who is a student or who has less than two years of experience doing documents work, stand up.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Everyone who is standing -- no, stay up, stay up, stay up. Everyone who was standing before, look at these people. Find one of them during the conference and introduce yourself so that you can
really network with them.

The other folks you want to find are folks with these ribbons that say First-time Attendee. Some of them are white. Some of them are blue. Find one of these folks and introduce yourself because remember when you were starting out. That networking was really important, and that's how we learn from each other.

Thanks.

You guys can sit down. Thanks everyone. Good job.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Last one. Everyone who is either presenting a session or has presented -- is -- has put up a poster session, stand up.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: Thank you.

So these are the folks who, this year, volunteered to present and make this conference a success. So think about next year. You can volunteer. You can do a presentation or a poster as well.

Thank you to everyone.

This is usually where I would introduce, or the chair would introduce, Director Vance-Cooks, and she would tell you about what's going on at GPO. And I'm going to do that in a bit.
But this year, I was asked to give a bit of an outline of the meeting, the issues we're discussing, and asking for your input on and how everything sort of fits together because a lot of our pieces this year are intertwined and interconnected.

Indeed, together is the key, as you see from our theme, making it happen together. So you'll get sick of hearing me say together, but that's the theme.

I want to briefly tell you about what I did on Saturday, which I promise will be relevant.

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: I went to the Phillips Collection, an art gallery not far from here in Northwest D.C. You should go. It's great.

I went to see an exhibition of a masterwork by an American artist of the Harlem Renaissance, Jacob Lawrence. His Migration series has a long and fascinating history, including title changes and changes to captions. It's really -- it's an interesting work.

But in a nutshell, it consists of 60 fragile, tempera panels created as a set over the course of a year in 1940 and '41. They tell the story of a wave of migration of African Americans from the rural south to the industrial north from about the First World War up
to the second, when he created it in 1940. Lawrence had illustrated other histories before, but none was quite as broad in sweep or, importantly, had so many individual pieces.

The last time I saw this work -- and it's very much one comprehensive work in the FRBR sense if you're a cataloger --

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: -- was 1993. This is because, for reasons both art-historical and socio-historical, the 60 panels are not held by a single museum. The Museum of Modern Art in New York purchased the even-numbered panels, while the Phillips Collection bought the odd-numbered panels. These fragile pieces of this important work are only reunited every few decades when each museum lends its pieces to the other and vice versa. But each of these great museums cares for and preserves the pieces entrusted to its stewardship.

Jacob Lawrence didn't particularly like this arrangement when it was proposed by his dealer in 1941. It's not ideal, but it works. And arguably, the work is better known and more accessible, more widely displayed because of its odd ownership arrangement. Now the full set of images are available in exhibit catalogs, in art store, and on the museum's websites.
So I know I promised this would be relevant.

Here is an example of successful collaboration to steward a collection. Here are two great museums working together to make it happen in furthering their missions, serving their patrons.

So what does that mean for us, for our depository libraries, and for us as government information professionals? I think you can see the parallels. Cooperation, collaboration, and sharing among libraries is not new.

We realized during the creation of the National Union Catalog that we could not do cataloging each on our own. We leveraged standards and technology to ensure that accurate bibliographic description kept pace with the explosive growth of publishing in spite of fixed staffs.

For a century, we've been supplementing locally held collections by borrowing from other libraries on behalf of our patrons. Again, standards and technology have helped expand this process and make it more efficient and more transparent. Inter-library loan is a core function that allows us to serve our patrons in a time when no library can have everything.

Now we need to accept that we cannot preserve the entire corpus of government information each on our
own, nor can GPO preserve everything without 
collaboration, without working together with us.
Remember, we hold the collections.

This cooperation for a new, dual-purpose 
preservation and access is an emerging trend across 
libraries and our consortia. This is good news for two 
reasons. First, government information, our FDLP, is 
the original collaborative preservation and access 
model, right? We know how to work together to 
accomplish these goals. We're leaders here.

And second, we don't have to reinvent the 
wheel. We have some structures specific to government 
information that help us collaborate, work together. 
But we can also take advantage -- really, continue to 
take advantage -- of other structures and tools that 
the broader library community has in place or is 
developing.

So my outline here said, "Give some examples."
And I thought, oh, one or two examples. I came up with 
a ton of examples, and I'm sure I didn't think of 
everything that you can think of.

So I thought of the ASERL's Centers of 
Excellence model. I thought of California's north and 
south repositories. I thought of the joint project 
between the Legal Information Preservation Alliance,
NELLCO and MALLCO called PALMPrint to preserve print copies of legal information. I thought of HathiTrust with their newly started U.S. federal documents program and their emerging shared print retention program.

CRL, CIC, Ivy Plus -- all of these consortia that we work with every day are already doing this work. That means many of us can be part of the solution by doing what we're already doing. We can support our patrons and further our library's mission by supporting our collection.

And please, if you don't already, start thinking of it as our collection. It's always been federal property. That means that it is in fact a collection that belongs to all of us, to our patrons.

We're in a unique position to steward this historic collection of government information to collaboratively manage its acquisition and development, its arrangement and description, its use and preservation.

And GPO is here to help us. No, they're here to collaborate with us, to continue to collaborate with us to make it happen together. GPO has listened to our needs, our concerns, and our criticisms. They've responded and given us the tools that we've asked for.

They've worked with congressional committee to
secure key tools from increased flexibility and
managing individual regional repositories to funding
for better tools to manage our shared collections --
even changing the name of the Agency after 150 years to
ensure that the public knows the mission is not to put
ink on paper, though that will certainly remain one
important tool, but that the mission is, instead, one
that we as government information professionals share -
- keeping American informed.

GPO can't fulfill this mission alone. Our
individual libraries cannot fulfill this mission alone.
Working together with GPO, among ourselves, across
tradition lines, and using new tools, some of which
you'll see demonstrated here in the next few days, we
can fulfill this mission. We can do it better than
we've ever -- than we ever have by making plans work
and working together.

So here's my charge. What I was really told
to do was give you marching orders. Here's my charge
to Council and to each of you for the next two and a
half days. Think about what we need to accomplish our
goals.

Think about what government information
landscape should look like in 10 years, in 20 years, in
100. Think about what small piece you can do in your
library. Think about what you're already doing, things that are an easy sell to your dean, director, or board. What part can your library play in stewarding our collection? What structures can your library fit into? What additional tools do you need? And tell us.

Start getting ready to give us input. We'll be asking for it on lots of topics throughout the next few days. The topics we're addressing are interconnected. They go together. And they support the national plan. It's helpful to think about how each impacts the other and how they fit together.

We'll ask about how we can work together to support our depositories and public libraries. We'll look at how to implement a new policy for our regionals while ensuring that we preserve our collection together. We'll hear about how digital resources can be created and preserved by working together.

We'll see what some libraries, maybe yours, are already doing that can fulfill a stewardship role for all of us. And we'll get updates on programs and see demonstrations of new tools that will help us work together.

In the same way that two museums in different cities of different sizes working together have preserved and expanded access to the 60 panels of
Lawrence's Migration series, our libraries, working together, can preserve and expand access to our government's information and ensure that we continue keeping America informed.

Now for an update on what's been going on at GPO, I introduce to you the director of the Government Publishing Office and 27th public printer of the United States, Davita Vance-Cooks.

(Applause.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MS. VANCE-COOKS: Let's give Scott a round of applause because he actually followed directions.

(Applause.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: I think it's wonderful that he set the tone for this wonderful occasion, and I think that he set apart for us the marching orders. Thank you, Scott. Very well done. Thank you. Welcome. Let me say that again. Welcome.

AUDIENCE: Welcome.

MS. VANCE-COOKS: Thank you.

Welcome to our nation's capital, and welcome to the 2016 Federal Depository Library Conference. Isn't the weather lovely?

AUDIENCE: Yes.
MS. VANCE-COOKS: Thank you for bringing it to us. We appreciate it very much.

(Laughter.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: On behalf of the hard-working men and women of the Government Publishing Office and as the Agency director serving as the CEO of this wonderful Agency, I bring greetings to all of the conference attendees here and virtual across the country.

Before I begin my brief remarks, I would like to give a special welcome to the Council. Can we all give them a round of applause?

(Applause.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: And to our distinguished guests, thank you for attending and spending time with us.

I would also like to thank the GPO employees who worked hard to prepare a polished, professional, and productive conference. Our gratitude extends to the employees of the Library Service & Content Management Department -- it's a mouthful -- and the employees from other departments throughout the Agency who worked hard and worked together to make this happen for you.

Will all of the GPO employees who worked on
This conference in any capacity please stand so that we may recognize you?

(Applause.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: Thank you.

As Scott said, the theme for this conference is making it happen together, demonstrating results. And in support of that theme, I am pleased to provide you with the state of the GPO and how we made it happen in FY-16.

The GPO is in a good place, and I am so very proud of our employees. We ended the fiscal year in a very strong financial position. We are strategically positioned to meet the demands of a digital environment, and we have continued to develop a strong, customer-focused, and employee-driven organization.

Now, as you know, the GPO's budget includes 16 percent appropriation. The balance of the funding, the 84 percent, is derived from reimbursements for products and services, which we provide to federal agencies and the public. In other words, we operate like a business.

We closed FY-16 in a financially strong position with an increase in both revenue and net income after expenses. We accomplished this because of many reasons, but mostly because of GPO's timely
production of information products for Congress, our consultant approach in providing publishing support to federal agencies, our ability to meet the production demands of a digital environment, and the appropriate management of our expenses. And we're investing in resources so that we can continue to improve our operation.

Yes, the GPO is in a good place.

The GPO is strategically positioned to meet the demands of the digital environment. For example, we completed a number of long-term care projects -- or long-term projects, and we set the stage for new ones. We completed long-term projects such as the next generation of FDsys, which is now known as govinfo; the next generation passport; the introduction of the digitized bound record; the development of the composition system replacement for bills; the introduction of the new Ben's Guide; and the introduction of bulk data access to status information on congressional bills, you know, just to name a few.

(Laughter.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: We also set the stage for new projects for the future such as the replacement of decades-old presses traditionally used for the Congressional Record, the expansion of digitized
historical information such as the register and
hearings, and digital print procurement expansion.

Yes, the GPO is in a good place.
The GPO continued to make great strides in its
transformation to become and to be a government
publisher. The GPO launched govinfo, a replacement to
FDsys. Govinfo provides a new and dynamic way for the
public to discover and access government information.
It is a user-friendly, modernized site that provides an
easy-to-use navigation system accessible on
smartphones, tablets, laptops, and personal computers.
The overall response has been very, very
positive, and we're still in the beta stage. And next
year, we will move into the FDsys pre-retirement phase.
The GPO entered into multiple partnerships to
provide additional digital content on the GPO, govinfo.
We partnered with the Library of Congress to make bill
status information in XML format available through
GPO's bulk data repository. We also partnered with the
Library of Congress to release the digital version of
the bound Congressional Record from 1991 through 1998,
covering debates of the 102nd through 105th Congress.
We partnered with the Smathers Library at the
University of Florida to make available the digital
versions of the Panama Canal Commission publications
and its predecessor agencies available.

We're working with the House of Representatives Committee on Rules, the House Parliamentarian, and the Clerk of the House to make Jefferson's Manual and the Rules of the House of Representatives available in XML format using the USLM schema.

We continue to embrace technological innovation by transitioning the integrated library system, known as ILS, to the cloud using Amazon cloud computing services. We launched an updated and redesigned version of the educational website, Ben's Guide to the U.S. Government, and we were so honored that the American Library Association selected Ben's Guide as one of the great websites for kids.

Yes, the GPO is in a good place.

The GPO is customer-driven, and we're proud of the support that we provide to our stakeholders. For example, in FY-16, we produced 20 million passports, 45.4 million pages of the Congressional Record, and 152 million pages of the Federal Register. That's a lot of paper.

(Laughter.)

MS. VANCE-COOKS: We continued to provide support to the federal agencies as they grappled with
the issues of the day. We printed information products on the Zika virus for CDC. We produced print materials for the EPA to communicate with the residents of Flint, Michigan, about the water crisis.

We produced TSA pre-tech materials for the Transportation Security Administration. We printed the Citizen's Almanac for USCIS. We printed the Trafficking in Persons Report for the State Department.

So you get a sense of how involved we are in the issues of the day.

But we also believe in customer outreach, and we worked hard this year to connect with our stakeholders. Customer Services implemented an integrated digital marketing campaign to notify our customers about various products and services that we could offer to them. And that would include products and services such as the ebooks, 508 compliance, GPOExpress, creative design needs.

We conducted road shows across the country with current and prospective clients. We also decided that it was important to visit as many of you as we could. So we sent employees from Library Services, and I sent the executive staff throughout the country to visit you. We visited over 200 libraries to learn more about how you support the program and discuss ways in
which we can help.

So yes, the GPO is in a good place.

The GPO is employee-driven, and our employees have indicated their support for the direction in which the GPO is going. The GPO employees participated in the 2016 OPM employee survey, and the scores from our employees increased across the board. And in most cases, those scores were higher than the government-wide average. In particular, our employees rated the Agency higher than the government average in the areas of creativity, innovation, and our success in accomplishing our mission.

So in conclusion, as I said earlier, the GPO is in a good place. We are financially sound, we are strategically positioned, and we look forward to a bright future with you.

Please enjoy the conference. And thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HALL: Hi, everyone. I'm Laurie Hall.

I'd like to give you a little news update before I start my regular remarks. This past week, we've had quite a few staff reaching out to our libraries in the path of Hurricane Matthew in Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia. And luckily, our data that's come back and our information, we only
had a few libraries that had a little bit of flooding. One or two were still not open. But we thought we'd want to pass on that information to you so -- because we're always concerned about our colleagues and water and damage to materials.

So I wanted to let you know that, as of Friday, we were hearing pretty good things. So I wanted to get that information out to you before I start my remarks.

So thank you, Davita.

And I'm really happy to be here, and I'm glad to see so familiar faces. I've been in the -- at GPO for quite a long time, so I know a lot of you. I know there's a lot of you out there that I don't know, so I'm looking really forward to meeting you, the people that I may have talked to on the phone or emailed.

So I'm looking forward to a really good conference. And please find me and chat with me and my staff. I'm looking really forward to it.

Do you realize that this is the 93rd event of the depositories getting together? We started in 1973, which seems like a long time ago.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: And 43 years later, we're still meeting, still having events in person and virtually.
As a matter of fact, this is the fifth year that we've been doing virtual meetings and sessions. We've added some additional sessions virtually. So -- and as of the five years, we've had over 3,000 virtual registrants. So it's a good thing.

I think today we have over 200. As of Friday, we had over 200 virtual registrations for the conference. So welcome, everybody online. I'm looking forward to chatting with you as well.

So I'd like to talk a little bit about some of the new things at this particular conference. In early October, you all got a news alert about the new conference app. So it's up. It's available. We'll keep it up 'til a few weeks after the conference just to put a few additional things on post conference.

We hope you like the resource. There is a daily schedule. There's outlooks and calendars and hotel maps and all kinds of information, to name a few -- some social media information, too. So we hope you had a chance to download it and are using it. If not, it's on FDLP.gov, so you can do it now. Just …

We also prepared a little pamphlet blue book, just a kind of place for you to jot down some notes about the events if you're interested, just a new feature this time -- want -- might want to share it,
just some little quick reference guides, little
thoughts, to share with us.

We also -- if you haven't noticed outside,
it's the -- our social media photo booth, and there we
all are.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: We have the funny band. We have
the serious band. We decided we needed a little fun at
the conference, so we put that together. We hope you
use it, take some pictures. And we'll be posting some
of those pictures to social media as well.

And don't forget the conference hashtag is
gpodlc16. So we would appreciate you posting your
social medial comments. We're doing that as I speak as
well.

As always, there's a conference evaluation
form. So some of these new things we'd be very happy
if you would give us your comments on the booklet, on
the photo booth, and on the app as well because we
could always improve and we really like your
suggestions. So it -- your conference evaluation is in
your packet. So we look forward to hearing from you on
some of those new features.

As everyone's made comments, my part of this
is to talk to you about demonstrating results. What
we've been doing in LSCM since the last virtual
close, you've been hearing little bits of things
through news alerts, things we post on FDLP.gov. But
my goal here is to give you just a little tidbit about
some of the key things we've been doing in the last
several months.

Now, every one of these things I'm going to
talk about, there is going to be a session at
conference. So check your schedule if you want some
additional information about those things that we're
doing.

There's also in your packet the LSCM update
handout. We always do that because there's lots of
data, lots of statistics. A lot of our folks may be
working on things that are not related to these
projects, but they're still doing a lot of work back at
GPO. So we wanted you to see some of the statistics.
They always wow me when I look at some of the numbers
of how many things we're cataloging and how many
serials we're checking in.

So let me do a little bit briefly about these
results that we were going to show you. We've created
a process for the regional discard policy with
instructions, guidance, webinars, FAQs. And just
within last month, we've invited the regionals to
actually submit their request for discards. It's a very intense process. A lot of work has been going on at GPO to work out the details of the process.

We're also talking about preservation stewards. And I'm really happy to announce that tomorrow morning's session on FIP Net we're going to sign our first preservation steward partner with the University of Colorado, Boulder. So thank you to them. I will be talking a little bit more about that at that FIP Net session.

So the next thing on the list is the FDLP eXchange, formerly known as the Needs and Offers list. Many of you have helped in the testing of this, so I want to thank you for volunteering and testing. We're getting really close to a launch, and there'll be a session on that tomorrow. So we look forward to -- for you attending to that and giving us your feedback there.

We also have a session on Federal Information Preservation Network, FIP Net, and that's tomorrow. We're going to be talking about what was started in the national plan and how we're looking at our organizational infrastructure and, you know, creating policies and collection management documentation and preservation guidance to support the national plan and
our new role as preserving our historic content.

And a lot of this came out of our work with
the other part of GPO, the program strategy and
technology group who's working on the trust (ph) to do
a repository audit. So we're starting to look at some
of the results of our investigations, preparing for the
audit, and looking at what we need to do.

So next thing on the list is the FDLP Academy.
Just in this year alone, we did 78 webinars and
webcasts. We've had over 3,500 attendees, and we
recorded archives. And they've been viewed over 8,400
times. So we get a lot of feedback, a lot of really
good programs.

We're also looking for more of you to do
programs. We've had agencies do programs. We do
programs. You do programs. So we're always looking
for new topics, new things of interest for the FDLP
Academy.

Another session this afternoon is at the
request of the Council in the spring 2015 DLC
recommendations for us to do an analysis of the public
libraries that are in the program, public libraries
that have dropped out, and some of the reasons for them
dropping out and come up with some recommendations.

So we have prepared a draft report that we
sent out to the community last week and to the Council last week as well. So we're looking for feedback. We'll do a session tomorrow about the findings in the report and welcome your feedback and then produce a final report at the end of the -- well, the first quarter of the fiscal year.

We've also been doing a lot of things with other tools and services, particularly the CGP. There is a whole new look and feel, some new enhancements. There was a little session this morning about some of the new things on the CGP. I hope you'll be looking at that. It's up and working.

We also did a big push for -- on the PURL system. You guys see the end of the PURL system. We have the inside scoop of trying to create the PURL. So we've got some new technology to help us create the PURLs more effectively, also track them more effectively for you. You can get some additional enhanced metrics on the PURLs system and server.

So those will be -- I think that's Tuesday as well. Or tomorrow morning, there's a session on that whole new enhancements to the PURL tool. We've also added some additional features and services and searching to MetaLib -- the huge, long list of new MetaLib tools.
We also -- as Davita had talked about, we've done a lot of increasing public access to government content online. We've added a lot of material to our FDLP web archive collection via harvesting. There's a session on that as well.

We've also worked with PST to ingest some historic content into govinfo.gov. That's the bound Congressional Record, that project that Davita talked about. We're also doing a project with the federal -- Office of the Federal Register to digitize the Federal Register. We've also been ingesting some of our own content, add notes and some of our other LSCM content into FDsys as well.

It's also been a very big thing of social media this year. We've done over 250 posts related to the FDLP, many of them related to our visits and/or hot topics. New things and important titles that are being published by the U.S. Government come out in social media or in news alerts that we send out on FDLP.gov. And we also launched the FDLP Guide to Social Media this year, so that went out.

I'd also like to talk to you a little bit about technical services. A lot of that -- those data and statistics are in that handout, but I want to give you a few highlights because sometimes the technical
services part of our organization keeps on going. It goes silently, but a lot of things get done.

This year, the Cataloging and Acquisitions group cataloged 17,738 new cataloging records into the CGP this year. And the distribution team, who are here back in the back from Laurel who send your things to you in boxes, distributed 4,502 titles, which comes out to be 989,826 individual copies to you every year. So that's this -- the last fiscal year '16, so just some really good numbers as things continue.

We've also done this with some additional staff. We now had 86 staff at -- on -- in LSCM, and we also had the help of 21 contractors. So they're working -- and the work -- us working with other units of GPO. So we work with our own staff, contractors, and other support units in GPO to get our results and get our job done.

So I'd like to encourage you. I think Davita said meet our staff. You saw most of them stand up. But talk to them here. Ask them questions. If we can't ask -- answer your questions right away, we'll be more than happy to take it back and come up with an answer. They have little blue staff tags. So if you see them, give them your questions.

Okay. Finally, I'd like to talk to you about
the initiative that Davita was talking about, our
visits to visit you. It's called GPO On the Go. And
the staff at GPO both from LSCM and from the executive
team have been visiting libraries pretty rapidly since
the spring. We waited 'til the spring and didn't go
out in the dead of winter.
(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: So we visited 41 states, over 250
libraries. You know, and it really was fun. I really
enjoyed getting out. And I've gone. I didn't go as
much. I stayed in-house because everybody else is
currently traveling. So somebody's got to make sure everything's
working.

But I had really great times. I met some
really interesting people, interesting collections.
People are doing such really interesting things and a
really wide variety of libraries. We've been there to
listen to you to hear your challenges, your needs.
We've celebrated anniversaries and special events.

We have -- on our FDLP.gov site, if you
haven't seen, we have a GPO On the Go initiative, and
it tells you all the libraries that we visited, some of
the ones that we're getting ready to visit. And we
also launched last week a little interactive map so you
can see where we have been and where we are intending
So the next big step is now to gather all that information from all those visits from all of us at GPO and figure out what we're going to do with all that information, try to figure out what we've heard from you, what we can do to help you face some of those challenges.

So with that, I'll give you five seconds on my little trip to Vermont. I don't know if there's anybody from Vermont here. Is anybody from Vermont here?

Well, it was such a contrast -- four different libraries across a large mountain, up and down the state, big libraries, small libraries, libraries that had money, libraries that didn't have so much money. Some of them were very, very historic, had incredible historic collections.

And every step of the way, I was very well received. And half the time, they didn't even know who really I was.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: So that was even better, you know. You just show up, and they're like, oh, you're from the government. And I'm yes.

(Laughter.)
MS. HALL: But I have to relay one really cool fact, and then I'll be quiet and sit down. At Norwich University, which is in Northfields (sic), Vermont -- it's one of the oldest military academies. And it was the first school that had ROTC on their lovely new library and their big, big screen. And everybody is dressed up in their military, you know, uniforms and whatever. Across the screen in the library, not only they're introducing the books that they have, what their services are, how you can use their classrooms, the library was giving meditation seminars.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: And here was the picture of these men in their uniforms like this.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: So it just reminds me that libraries offer so many services to help everybody on their campuses and in their communities.

So with that, I just want to take one more opportunity to thank the staff here who have helped put this conference together for you. And I especially want to call out Ms. Kelly Seifert because if Kelly --

(Applause.)

MS. HALL: Not that the rest of my staff haven't done incredible things, because they have, but
Kelly kept us on target. All these slide decks for all the presentations, all their -- especially for the virtual attendees -- thanks, Kelly.

And also, thanks to all the folks back in the back. You know them -- Lance (ph) and Bridgett (ph) and Debbie (ph) and Shawn Tinasia (ph), who you haven't probably met before. But thanks to all of them for helping to put this conference together.

(Applause.)

MS. HALL: So next on the agenda is a little quick video of our travels, some cute pictures of where we've been, who we've seen. Hopefully, some of you are here to see yourself.

And thanks, and I hope you enjoy the conference.

(Video playback.)

(Applause.)

MR. JACKSON: Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. JACKSON: My name is Herb Jackson. I'm the chief administrative officer for GPO. And I, too, want to just welcome you to D.C. and welcome you to the Federal Depository Library Conference.

As you saw, we have visited many libraries this year, and it's been great to travel the country
and to just interact and see what you're doing in your libraries.

What -- my purpose today is to acknowledge those libraries that had significant anniversaries, if you will. There were several -- as Davita and Laurie mentioned, we went around, the executive team as well as the library services staff. We went around and participated in several library celebrations and anniversaries. In fact, we looked at anniversaries -- or celebrated anniversaries -- 25 years, 50 years, 75 years, 100 years, 125 years, 150 years.

And I don't have all of them. We didn't visit all of them or participate in all of those ceremonies. But we wanted to acknowledge each of you. And there are many that you may not see on my slides in a few moments. But even those that are visiting virtually, we want to just acknowledge those.

If you had a significant anniversary of any number that I just named, won't you just stand so that we can all celebrate you together? If you're here 25, 50, 75, even -- okay. Come on. Let's …

(Applause.)

MR. JACKSON: And we acknowledge those that are virtual as well who celebrated.

What I'd like to do is just show you some of
those libraries that we visited. In celebration of 150 years, we visited the St. Louis Public Library and the St. Louis University Pius, the 12th library.

One hundred twenty-five-year celebrations at Hampton-Sydney College in Bortz Library and the Los Angeles Public Library.

One hundred twenty-five years -- I was privileged to share with Cass on this -- at the University of Washington, Seattle. This is the little library.

One hundred years -- Texas Christian University in the Mary Couts Burnett Library.

Seventy-five years -- Florida State University Robert Manning Strozier Library.

Seventy-five years -- the University of Mary Washington, the Simpson Library.

Fifty years -- the University of Texas at El Paso and the University of Memphis, the McWherter Library.

Fifty years -- University of Northern Colorado, the James A. Michener Library and the Johnson Public Library.

Also celebrating 50 years, the Southeastern Louisiana University, the Sims Library.

Fifty years -- the Eastern Kentucky
University, EKU, libraries.

Twenty-five years -- the University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law Library.

We wanted you to know that we are part of you. The executive and I, we went around at the direction of Director Vance-Cooks, and we traveled the country. I would even venture to say that if this conference weren't -- wasn't going on right now, some of us would be on a plane right now.

(Laughter.)

MR. JACKSON: But we appreciate all of the work that you've done, all the work that you do. And we look forward to partnering with you even more. Thank you.

At this time, Andy Sherman, our chief of staff, is going to come.

(Applause.)

MR. SHERMAN: Good morning, everybody.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. SHERMAN: One of the things that we accomplished this last year in addition to all the projects that Davita told you about this morning was preparing a revised edition, an updated version, of GPO's official history, Keeping America Informed. It first appeared on the occasion of our 150th anniversary
in 2011. We thought 155 years sounded like a good time to update it and, particularly, in view of our new name, the Government Publishing Office.

And in this project, I was very happy to have actually heading it George Barnum, who I think is known to many of you out there, who worked in the depository library program for several years before becoming GPO's historian.

And George has run a very active, a very vigorous history program at the GPO, which has actually uncovered a number of things which previously weren't known -- for example, GPO's very close relationship with President Lincoln during the Civil War years.

George worked directly with Michelle Crowell (ph) at the Library of Congress. She is the curator for the Lincoln manuscripts. She also happened to work with Steven Spielberg on the production of the movie Lincoln.

And what George uncovered was the close relationship in the process of Lincoln's development of his speeches, which were all typeset by GPO, sent back to the president. He would cut them up with a pair of scissors and reassemble the paragraphs --

(Laughter.)

MR. SHERMAN: -- and add information and then
send them back for more typesetting, more cutting and pasting. He was the original cut-and-paste president.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHERMAN: And George was actually able to identify each one of the GPO typesetters by name who worked on that -- on those projects. So -- and that constitutes an original contribution of knowledge.

But there are many other things. There are new photographs in this book. There are many subjects, which George will tell you about in a moment, that we've added to it.

So let me point out that you should already have a copy of this book by virtue of your attendance at this conference here today. If you don't have a copy, please see Lance in the back after this session, and he'll be happy to give you one. If you'd like to have your copy signed, there will be GPO executives -- correct -- at the back who will be more than happy to autograph it and make it more valuable for you. So …

(Laughter.)

MR. SHERMAN: This is all I can -- George. So let me have George say a few words to you.

(Applause.)

MR. BARNUM: Thanks, Andy.

It's always a pleasure and an honor to be
standing in front of you yet again, and I'm grateful
for the invitation to be here.

The book, the reissue, the new edition, has
been very exciting for us. The -- putting the book
together in the first place in 2011 was -- it took
place mid a lot of other stuff. There was a lot going
on in 2011 in preparation for our 150th anniversary.

And so although the book featured prominently
in that, it was nice this year to -- this past year to
be able to sort of take a little more time with it and
finish some things that we hadn't actually really
finished before.

So there's about 20 additional pages of
content in the new edition. There are a lot of new
photographs. We took a few photographs out and
replaced them, and we added some other new ones.

So for example, the photo of Adelaide Hasse is
actually a little bit closer to what she probably
looked like when she worked at GPO instead of that sort
of debutant picture that we all know --

(Laughter.)

MR. BARNUM: -- that was taken fully 20 years
before she came to GPO.

There are some other really great photographs
that we uncovered during the course of this revision,
and new photographs were being slid in down to about a
week before we actually sent it to press.

So I will be talking about the revisions and
the new content at my session on Wednesday. So I'd
invite you all to come by and see that.

And it behooves me at this moment to say a
word of thanks to Davita and to Andy for their
tremendous support for this historical endeavor. It's
my belief that a lot of the reason we have success
today is that Davita and the rest of the executive
staff are very conscious of GPO's history and are very
conscious of building on the strengths that are
uncovered every time that we dig into our history.

GPO is a remarkable place in a lot of ways.
And looking back to 155 years of successes I think is
very, very encouraging for the staff who work there and
I hope for you all as well. So thank you.

And thank you all for being here, for making
your way across the country. And as usual, it's a
pleasure to see familiar faces and to meet new friends.

So we'll see you on Wednesday.

(Applause.)

MR. SHERMAN: I just want to say, also, that
among those who have received a copy of the book was
Dr. Carla Hayden, who visited us last week in her
current role in life, the Librarian of Congress. And she paid a visit to Davita, and we gave her a copy of the book. And so she's very happy with that.

I want to add one thing, that George is working on yet another book, this to be a collection of historical photographs --

(Video playback begins.)

(Video playback ends.)

MR. SHERMAN: -- archive of history photography dating back over a century. And we have wisely not given it up to the archives.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHERMAN: We alone hold on to it. And as a result, George has been able to select about 200 or so photographs, which are being assembled into a volume and to be published shortly before the holiday season. So remember that and all your loved ones --

(Laughter.)

MR. SHERMAN: I'm sure it'll be a great value for you.

I want to point out as we leave the stage that George did one other thing. He created -- worked with our creative services group to come up with a little video about GPO's history. So we'd like to show that to you now.
MR. BRADLEY: Good morning. I'm Jim Bradley. I'm the deputy director of GPO, and I want to also add my thanks to the many libraries I visited. I appreciate your hospitality. Everyone had something interesting to show me. And it is certainly a very viable and well-received program throughout the country. So we hope to keep up the visits, and we appreciate your input.

I have the pleasure of telling you about the library of the year and presenting an award. So I want to start by saying that the library of the year is the James C. Jernigan Library at the Texas A&M University at Kingsville, Texas. Kingsville, if you don't know your Texas geography, is in the south part of Texas down near Corpus Christi.

And it's a fine library. It's selected on their leadership, educational outreach, and commitment to providing free public access to federal government information. They're active in promoting government information to their students and the public through campus events, displays, online chats, and social
The library opened in 1925 and joined the depository library program in 1944. So they've been with us for quite a while. They currently contain over 1 million separate bibliographic items and offer access to over 40,000 periodic titles, which is quite an accomplishment.

So without further ado, I'd like to call up the depository coordinator, Maria de Jesus Ayala-Schueneman, and also David Flores, who's with her.

If you please come up, we will make the presentation.

(Applause.)

MR. BRADLEY: Congratulations.

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: On behalf of FDLP, I'm pleased to give this award to you. Let's give her a round of applause.

(Applause.)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS. DE JESUS AYALA-SCHUENEMAN: Thank you.

First of all, on behalf of all of our colleagues at the Jernigan Library Texas A&M University, Kingsville, I wish to thank the U.S. Government Publishing Office for this award.
Dr. Steven Tallant, President of Texas A&M University, Kingsville, expressed it well when he said, "We are extremely proud to provide our community with access to government information and of the efforts of our library staff. Our staff proactively promotes," the ability -- "the availability of these important documents, and we know that the students and community members are taking advantage of the opportunity to use them in research and other projects."

I am humbled and proud to accept this award on behalf of the Jernigan Library. Many staff members have been working hard in the library's effort to promote and make available government information at our library. But I would like to thank three persons in particular.

Mr. David Flores works very hard every day to catalog and shelf materials, helps with displays, and engages in --

(Applause.)

MS. DE JESUS AYALA-SCHUENEMAN: -- engage in the library's effort to promote government information.

Mr. Milton Clasen, retired cataloger, now part-time worker, who has worked at our library for nearly 50 years, he has spearheaded efforts to catalog all of our government documents in the recent years.
Finally, I would also like to thank the library director, Bruce Schueneman, a former government documents information coordinator himself, for his support of our efforts to make government information as accessible as possible and for the opportunity to come here to receive this great honor.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you very much.

(Laughter.)

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: So you're back with me for another couple of minutes. But I'll be brief, and we'll move on to the book signing, which will be really great.

We want to take a few moments now and acknowledge some of the significant losses our community has suffered over the past year. I know it's not a comprehensive list, but we want to recognize the contributions of our late colleagues and acknowledge how much we miss them.

Past Chair Hallie Pritchett wrote, "Larry Romans was a giant in our profession. Throughout his career, he generously devoted his time and attention to a wide variety of organizations and causes. A long
time and very active government information librarian, his appointment to Council certainly must have been an obvious choice. No one would have faulted Larry for stepping down from Council to focus on his health, yet he attended almost every meeting and conference call and was never afraid to ask the big questions or discuss controversial issues.

"The success of a Council member can be measured by the quality of the contributions they make both to Council and to the community they represent. In that regard, Larry pulled his own weight and then some.

"Dr. Lee Shiflett, a long-time library science faculty member at UNC Greensboro, served as department chair and taught courses, including government documents. He also taught at LSU and the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. His students remembered Dr. Shiflett as 'the greatest mentor' while I was an MLIS student. He was a wonderful professor and librarian, and they remember his wit, kindness, and smile with fondness.

"Dr. Shiflett's colleagues remember him as 'both a respected professor and fine individual' and 'will miss his gentle spirit and quiet sense of humor.'

"Carolyn Kohler was for 30 years the head of
government documents department, the University of Iowa Libraries, from 1971 until her retirement in 2004. A colleague said, 'For many years at University Libraries, I valued Carolyn's deep knowledge of librarianship, helpful nature, and friendly attitude.'

"Gail Kwak was depository coordinator at Northwestern State University's Watson Memorial Library in Natchitoches, Louisiana. Colleagues remember that, 'Gail was such a warm and happy lady. I worked with her at NSU when I was just out of library school, and she was supportive and kind to me,' and, 'I met Gail many years ago as a new government documents librarian as LSU Shreveport. She was generous with her time and advice then and continued to be so for all the years afterwards.'

"Kathy Tesla worked at the University of Minnesota, the Library of Congress, the University of Michigan, Emory, and concluded her 30-year career at Carleton College. She was a leader in ALA. She chaired GODORT, but also served her community in other ways, including serving on the President's Commission on Women during her time at Emory."

Dan O'Mahony wrote about John Shuler, who was chair of DLC in 2009 and '10, when Dan also served on Council, "In addition to his work with DLC, John was a
prolific writer and contributor to the literature and
dialogue concerning government information issues,
serving at various times as the editor of Government
Information Quarterly, Journal of Government
Information and Documents to the People.

"He was an original thinker, initiating such
projects as DOSFAN, the early collaboration between the
Department of State to make electronic files publically
accessible and GIO, Government Information Online, the
crowdsourced online reference service for government
information questions.

"John was also an educator, teaching
government documents course for nearly two decades at
Dominican and at other schools. His students remember
John as 'Generous with his time and talents, especially
with new GovDocs's librarians. His commitment and
passion to his work were unparalleled,' and that, 'His
novel approach to the curriculum, his humor,
personality, and the connection he made with his
students, all of it made the class worth it. All of it
matter.'"

A final comment about John -- but this really
applies to all six of these librarians -- "He was such
a passionate believer in the power of government
information in a democratic society. It was an honor
As Dan put it, "We do well to thank these colleagues for their contributions and learn from their example."

All righty. So some logistic --

(MR. MATHESON: Yes. Absolutely.)

Some logistical announcements -- we're wrapping up. We're about -- in about 10 minutes, your lunch period starts, so you may want to stick around.

(Laughter.)

(MR. MATHESON: Lunch is with regionals. I had a suggestion today. I know there are four or five regionals that have put notes on the board. So look for that. That covers more than four or five states because there was one that had three states on it. If your regional's not here, adopt an adjacent regional librarian.

(Laughter.)

(MR. MATHESON: Or if you don't want to do that, maybe consider taking one of our newer folks. Remember the first-time attendees. Take one of them to lunch with you. Or Cathy Bayer (ph) -- is she in the room?

(MS. BAYER: Right here.)
MR. MATHESON: There she is -- will be organizing a group to go to lunch as well over to the mall. They'll be meeting in the comfy chairs across from Registration in the main lobby.

The amendable Larry Myers (ph) has again organized Law Librarians and Friends Dinner tonight, 6:00 p.m., Sine Irish Pub in Pentagon Row. Sign up on the board by noon, please, so he can give the restaurant an accurate count. Friends includes everyone in this room.

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: You are all our friends. So you're welcome to join us. But please do sign up so we can give the restaurant a count. They'll meet in the main lobby to walk over at 5:45 this evening.

I wanted to promote a couple other things. The photo booth, which we've talked about a little bit, is really fun. And if you search the hashtag, you'll see I actually went over and took a picture with Ben (ph). That's fun. Do that and help promote our -- you know, our goal here of keeping America informed and let people know about us.

Also, the posters in the Van Buren Room, which are just past the South Tower elevators, these are great, great, just quick ways to get great ideas about
depository management, about promotion. And even
there's a poster soliciting some feedback. This is
something I picked up from VCU. It's a little keyring
with cards of all of their GovDocs-related LibGuides
URLs. It's -- and it has -- you know, the other side
has pictures on it. It's a very cool idea. So go to
the poster sessions and look through some of those.

Before we head out to lunch, there'll be a
book signing right back there where David is standing
and now walking away at the table in the back. But for
the logistics, we'd like to have folks line up with
your book. Get your book from your registration
packet. Line up down the middle of -- the middle
aisle. And then if there's -- if we need to curve
around this way towards the windows, please, just so
that we can keep the folks waiting over on this side of
the room. And then once you're finished at the table,
you can go out the main doors there back on my left,
your right.

So Director Vance-Cooks and the senior staff
will be back there to sign. Line up down the main
aisle, and don't forget to bring your books.

We'll be back here online and in the other
three tracks on your schedule at 2:00 o'clock this
afternoon. So have a great lunch, and see you soon.
MR. SHAW: Welcome back, everybody. I'm Jim Shaw from the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and I'm here to welcome you all to this afternoon's session, To Better Serve and Support Public Libraries. Before I introduce our two presenters from GPO, I would like to follow on Scott this morning a little bit by also telling a story that I promise is relevant.

MR. SHAW: But yesterday on my way to the conference, I changed planes in St. Louis. And while I was standing in line to get on the plane from St. Louis to Washington, to my great misfortune, I was standing right underneath a monitor that was tuned to CNN. And the talking heads and pundits and the spin masters and -- you know who they are -- they were just going back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, back and forth. And it was really sort of distressing. But I thought -- you know, later on when I was on the plane, I thought, well, you know, it's actually sort of ironic and even sort of cool that I'm going to the DLC conference having just endured that because this is a place where people get together who go to
work every day to help our fellow country people get along in their lives and in their world and their country, that we are people they go to for help with government information. And we're an institution.

And we were reminded this morning by Director Cooks that GPO is 150 years old. It's an institution that's been around for a while. It's pretty stable. And it's important to remember that institutions are -- I guess you can call it the ballast for the ship of state. They help keep things steady. And we're all going to work every day helping keep things steady.

So if you've studied the electoral history of the United States much at all, you know that from the very beginning it can -- it's been, at times, a very raucous and provocative and annoying and everything affair. But we're all still here, and we probably all will still be here on November 9th, too. So -- well, I'll be back in Omaha. You'll be at your jobs. But we'll be going to work and doing our jobs.

And that's how it's all relevant. GPO, the Federal Depository Library Program, it's one of those institutions probably under-sung, maybe even completely unsung in a lot of respects. But it's one of the institutions that makes the United States the United States. It's one of the things that distinguishes us
in the world.

So thank you all for being here. And I hope that's a little bit of a pep talk during a distressing electoral season.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHAW: Okay. So about a year and a half ago, Council asked our colleagues' PO to take a look at the situation surrounding public libraries and the Federal Depository Library Program. You know, we -- any number of us had noted that in the last decade or so quite a few public libraries had dropped depository status.

And so you get to the point where you wonder, okay, what's going on. What's happening out there? Are there some patterns that are repeating that we could identify that we could help direct some assistance to or some advice and counsel to, something to help public libraries, in particular, find ways to stay with the program and, even better, perhaps encourage some more to join the program? So that's the genesis of this.

About a year and a half ago, a request from Council to GPO, yeah, it's time. I think we need to take a look at the patterns. And our colleagues at GPO agreed, yeah, it's time to do that.
So this afternoon, we have Laurie Hall, the acting superintendent of documents, and Susan Miller, Lead Program and Management Analyst for the Federal Depository Library Program, here to bring to us the draft of this report, To Better Serve and Support Public Libraries.

And those of you who did not have a chance to see it before conference, because links were mailed out -- emailed out last week, was posted to FDLP.gov last week. There are copies of the draft sitting on the chair just to -- it would be my right and -- well, some of your right, some of your left, depending on where you're sitting -- next to the microphone.

In fact, our colleague's just grabbing one. So there you go. That's where you can find them.

And with that, I will turn this over to our presenters. After they are through, I will ask Council for comments and questions. And then after that, we'll turn it over to you, the participants in the room here, for your comments and questions and hope for a nice discussion.

Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Good afternoon. As Jim mentioned back in spring of 2015, the Council asked LSCM to take a look at how to better serve and support public
libraries. In their recommendation were five points that they wanted us to concentrate on, and that's the core of our report.

The recommendations were centered around these five specific points, and they're fully discussed throughout the paper. One correction right from the beginning -- the original recommendation was for 47 public libraries that had relinquished their status between 2007 and spring of 2015. In the course of writing this report, we actually discovered there were 48. So we'll refer to the 48 public libraries that left in that same time period throughout this report.

Between 2007 and 2015, 112 libraries -- sorry I forget to click, sorry -- 112 libraries relinquished their status in the FDLP. Of these 48, 43 percent were total -- were public libraries. And in the FDLP, that 43 percent is comprised of public libraries that are in the city, the county, municipal, city/county law, county parish, multi-jurisdictional, school, and other libraries.

The 2009 Biennial Survey and Needs Assessment stated that public libraries often face challenges on a different scale from libraries serving a more targeted audience. This report attempts to more closely define those challenges as they relate to the FDLPs in public
specifically in public libraries.

The public library report that we prepared more closely examines the reasons public libraries left the FDLP. Let me go back a step. Our objectives in this report are to find out why the -- what the reasons were that the public libraries left -- and that was stated in their official drop letters; the services and the common operational goals of the remaining public libraries; and to take a look at the current LSCM programs and initiatives that may serve as incentives for public libraries to stay in the FDLP.

We are also proposing a couple of new programs that can assist public libraries as well as other libraries within the FDLP. And towards the end of the program, we're hoping that you can give us some more ideas on some of those things that we can take care of.

So how did we write and address those objectives? The first thing we did is we examined some of the current industry trends in public libraries. We looked at articles and research papers from experts in the industries, and we looked at internal LSCM data. And that includes an analysis of all of the 48 drop letters from the public library. When a library relinquishes status, they're -- they have to submit an official drop letter.
So we examined those. We looked at the 2009 and 2015 Biennial Survey and Needs Assessment. We looked at documents and official correspondence and other related subject matter material and anecdotal information that we gleaned from interactions with public libraries that our LSCM staff has heard in speaking to public libraries and/or participating in conferences.

Currently, the Federal Depository Library Program supports a network of 1,148 libraries. The types of libraries within the FDLP are six primary categories, the largest being academic, which is 72 percent of the program. Public is 15 percent. State government is 7 percent; federal government, 4 percent; local government, 1 percent; and 1 percent special. As of September 2016, there are 177 public libraries in the FDLP.

This chart looks at the library drops during the 2007-spring 2015 time period covered in this report. Of the 112 libraries relinquished -- that relinquished their status during that time, 48 were public libraries, 43 percent, and 50 were academic libraries. California led the public library drops with 10. Colorado, Florida, Michigan, New York, and Wisconsin all had three drops each.
So what happened? During this time period, 2007 through 2015, the following events took place. If you remember, we had the Great Recession, including banking failures, subprime mortgage crisis, big industry failures such as automotive. The federal government had sequestration, which was huge federal spending cuts. We had a shutdown in there -- I think a 12- or 13-day shutdown -- and state and local government funding cuts that resulted in permanent cuts and staffing and other resources for libraries. So in some sense, it was the perfect storm.

If we begin to look at some of the characteristics of public libraries, in the summer of 2012, the digital supplement cited an important point on public library closures from Chief Officers of State Libraries Agencies Report. And the number of libraries that had closed -- this is libraries in general, not just FDLP libraries -- that had closed as a result of funding cuts, fewer states, 12 as compared to 17, reported public library closures in their states within the past 12 months.

Most states reported that fewer than five public library outlets have closed except New Jersey and Michigan, and the majority of states, 82 percent, that reported that public library hours had been cut in
the past 12 months due to funding cuts. That's an increase from 4 percent of the previous year.

At our spring 2012 conference -- no, I take that back. Sorry. I went to the wrong slide.

In the -- in -- to better understand the public library audience and services needed to serve the audience, LSCM took a look at the funding, growth trends, and characteristics of public libraries in today's world. One of the biggest obstacles facing public libraries today is providing public access technology services and resources.

Sufficiency. Sixty-five point four percent of libraries reported fewer public access computers to meet the growing demand.

Staff. Public libraries reported challenges with providing E-Government, employment support, and access to library technology staff. Twenty-three point two percent of public libraries reported a decrease in staff over the last three years. Seventy-one point nine percent reported permanent staff reductions.

Three, reduced hours. Twenty-one point five percent of the public libraries reported a reduction in hours over the last three years due to budget cuts. Urban public libraries reported the largest reduction in hours over the last three years with an average
reduction of 65.8 hours per year.

Four, cost. Cost factors were a continuing challenge in maintaining, sustaining, and enhancing public access technology infrastructure.

Budgets. While 53.2 percent of the libraries surveyed have seen budget increases, up to 2 percent over the budget decreases as the prior three years, 12.5 percent reported operating budgets stayed the same as previous years.

The fastest-growing spending priorities are technology and electronic materials. Small-town libraries, in particular, 37 percent, view technology as a crucial line item. Suburban libraries saw the greatest need for e-books and tied with urban libraries, electronic resources, and digital collections.

When asked what they would do to improve service if they received extra funding, top -- the top response was to add or restore staff.

The hours of operation have increased as well. While over the past five years, libraries' average weekly hours have fluctuated -- down from a high of 59.8 in pre-recession 2008, but up from 2011's 49 -- this year's results show an overall increase in 3.4 weekly hours per system. The largest libraries
increased hours for the second year in a row.

Sources of funding -- the exact same article we just referred to says -- asked the question, "Where does the money come from?" The sources of funding included on a federal level. The Library Services and Technology Act funding was $180.9 million, generally steady over the previous year's funding. Thirteen percent of public libraries surveyed had public referenda primarily to fund operating budgets. California -- in June 2014 elections, six library parcel tax measures passed for $19.1 million in revenue.

Appropriated money from town and county budgets increased overall by 2 percent, with smaller libraries serving populations of 10,000 to 24,000 showed a 4.5 percent growth. Large libraries showed a 1.4 percent growth. And libraries serving 500 to 999,000 showed a 4.2 percent growth. Small-town libraries saw a .3 percent growth. State funding bought -- brought us 3.6 percent increase. And rural and town -- and small-town libraries saw the most decreases.

So what are some of the services -- common services that patrons are requesting of public libraries? In September 2015, the Pew Research Center
issued a report focused on the state of public libraries. The report conducted a survey that asked the community what services they wanted from a public library. The following table reports on the responses.

The top answers included offer free early literacy programs to young children; coordinate more closely with local schools in providing resources to kids -- as a side note, we have Ben's Guide; offer programs to teach all patrons how to use digital tools, including computers, smartphones, apps; offer programs to teach patrons about privacy protection and online security; create services or programs for active military personnel and veterans.

These themes of education, digital literacy, programs and services, and library space were prominent among the responses offered.

In a 2014 digital inclusion survey done by the ALA and University of Maryland's Information Policy and Access Center, they focused on the internet and public libraries. Virtually all libraries, 98 percent, offer free public Wi-Fi. This is compared to only 21 percent offered public Wi-Fi in 1994.

Close to 90 percent of the libraries offer basic digital literacy training, and a significant majority support training related to new technology.
Social media use is up 56 percent.

Seventy-six percent of libraries assist patrons in using online government programs and services. The vast majority of libraries provide programs that support people in applying for jobs, accessing and using online job opportunities, and using online business. More than 90 percent of public libraries offer e-books, online homework assistance, and online language learning. The survey results showed a consistent trends in the increase of public technology services offered in U.S. public libraries.

In the 2015 Biennial Survey and Needs Assessments, libraries were asked to identify what services and content management activities they provided. The top five services offered by Federal Depository public libraries included reference desk, help desk, physical, quick answers; managing the physical library and prints collections; providing electronic access to documents; virtual reference assistance comparable to usage in academic and local government libraries; and providing training on searching and effective use of information.

When asked to identify the tools, methods, or applications used in the library to deliver information, the -- in the 2015 Biennial Survey, the
answers were shown in the chart that's in the public library report. One of the key points of this question found that public libraries were more likely to use social networking and mobile devices as the primary tool for delivery information.

The 2015 survey found that since the 2009 Biennial Survey, the importance of user access tools has increased from 40 to 56 percent. And webinars and webcasts have increased from 3 percent to 33 percent. The complete list as well as the comparison to other library types, again, is included in the full report.

The 2015 survey noted these trends in public libraries. The key subject categories of both academic and public libraries are health and safety, education, people and culture, computers and internet. The tools for managing are delivering information, website postings, social network tools, emails, some scanning and demand -- on demand, and of course mobile devices, which has increased greatly.

So with that information, we go on to the five specific points that Council requested us to address. Point 1 is to identify the reasons why public libraries -- library depositories relinquished their status. Once again, LSCM took a look at the 48 public libraries that relinquished status. In the five points raised by
Council, a thorough examination of the official drop letters listed some of the following reasons.

I also want to note that in the public library report, there is a complete listing of every one of the 48 libraries and why they dropped.

Top reasons for leaving the FDLP -- 52 percent cited the availability of online resources. It's important to note they could also specify more than one reason. Forty-six percent attributed reduced budgets. Twenty-seven percent, staff shortages -- not necessarily through staff cuts or losses, but by reallocating the governments documents resource are making them take on additional task.

Twenty-five percent, availability of nearby depositories -- on that note, it's important to notice -- note that out of the 48 libraries that dropped, the County of Los Angeles Public Library system saw a total of seven libraries relinquish their depository status between March 2009 and July 2010. Each branch library had an FDLP designation. The main Los Angeles Public Central Library continued as the member of the FDLP. Mid-Manhattan Library consolidated three branches into two.

We also saw 23 percent cite low use by patrons; 21 percent, space reallocation, noted change
in library; and 17 percent, branch consolidations. Again, a complete list of this is available in the report.

Of the 48 public libraries leaving the FDLP between 2007 and spring of 2015, the majority were city, county, or municipal libraries.

There's a couple of additional points to be made about libraries during this same time period. Twelve public libraries decided to stay in the program after their initial decision to leave the program. The reasons for the reversal included a change in director, additional funding, switching to all digital, consultation with our outreach and support librarians on creating operating efficiencies, overcoming some of their operational problems, and enhanced program applications after instructional direction from LSCM.

Since October 2015, 2 libraries have joined the FDLP while 12 more have relinquished status. Four of those 12 are public libraries. This includes Columbus Metropolitan Library; the Brooklyn Public Library; Henderson, Nevada's public library; and the Natrona public in Casper, Wyoming.

Point 2, Council asked us to survey or pull current FDLP public library directors, depository staff on important challenges they face as depository
libraries. In -- again, in our 2015 Biennial Survey, Question 4 asked, "To what extent do you consider the following factors to be problems or challenges to providing information and services?"

Public libraries were significantly more likely to cite marketing, user training, and lack of training on how to use and search resources as major or minor problems; increased workload, 72 percent; staff reduction shortage, 71 percent; keeping up with technology, 69 percent; and budget constraints, 67 percent.

Point 3, "Survey or poll the library directors and depository staff of remaining public depositories to identify both the positive advantages they achieve by being depositories and what additional enhancements or benefits would help them to provide government information service to their patrons."

The 2015 Biennial Survey noted in the key findings that all FDL surveyed responded that services that allow users to serve themselves are considered most important. This includes access to depository materials, user access tools, free access to fee-based government databases, the FDLP.gov site, webinars, webcasts, et cetera. The two most-often cited resources included -- 78 percent named access to
depository materials as the most important service, and user access tools have increased in importance from 40 percent in 2009 to 56 percent in 2015.

At the spring 2006 (sic) virtual conference, the -- there was a discussion entitled At the Crossroads: Continuing the Discussion of Public Depository Libraries. This quote started that discussion, and I thought it was important to -- at this point to make sure we had remembered it.

"Participation in the depository library system connects our institution to the world outside our community. Both our staff and our users benefit from this connection to the ideas that come to us from statewide and national sources," Former Director Frederick Kirby, one of the Benton Harbor Public Library.

At the same discussion, Erin Guss, formerly at the St. Louis Public Library, shared these usage statistics. 2015 averaged 23 requests per month for holds on SuDoc items. Approximately 70 percent of reference questions in business, government, law department relate in some way to government information.

Guss goes on to point out the dichotomy government documents are one unique aspect of the
research and collections of St. Louis Public Library, and government documents infiltrate all departments. In contrast, the biennial survey asked, "What are the least important services provided by the FDLP to your library?" For public libraries, 49 of the percent of the respondents found conferences to be a service of lesser importance. Authentication of government publications on FDsys was considered less important with 38 percent of the respondents, as were the legal requirements and program regulations and marketing promotional materials.

The survey went on to ask, "What services and/or resources do you need from FDLP that are currently not being provided?" The response -- more digitized historical collections of government publications, including historical coverage of titles in FDsys, and item selection flexibility based on subject, item selection flexibility based on geography and on recommendations for size of library.

Thirty-four percent of the public libraries would like to see government publications classified using the Dewey Decimal System.

The libraries were also asked about their level of satisfaction with existing FDLP services and tools. A number of resources ranked high in
satisfaction -- FDLP.gov, FDsys, CGP, training in webinars, web tools for collection development and maintenance, and free access to government fee-based databases.

So the fourth point was to compile this information into a report. The draft report is currently available not only on that chair --

(Laughter.)

MS. MILLER: -- but on FDLP.gov. We would like to have your comments on the report once you read it and ingest it back to us November 18th close of business. You can send those to me at skmiller@gpo.gov. Once we receive those, this report is expected to be finalized in January of 2017.

Point 5, I turn over to Laurie.

MS. HALL: Do we want to stop here for questions on Susan's section? Or do you want to go -- continue? It's really up to you guys because that's a lot of data that she just went through. So it's really up to you guys.

MR. SHAW: So let's do some questions now, and then make sure we leave 15 minutes.

MS. HALL: Yeah, that's fine.

MR. SHAW: Okay.

MS. HALL: So Susan doesn't have to get up and
MR. SHAW: So no more than seven or eight minutes of questions.

So there is questions from Council first?

Okay. According to our tradition, comments and questions from Council?

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. I'm Beth Williams.

MR. SHAW: Hello, Beth.

MS. WILLIAMS: I had a quick question. Thank you so much for that report. That was really rich. I look forward to reading it in more detail.

I wonder. It sounds like the bulk of your information came from published sources and also from surveying current FDLPs. Did you consider, or would you consider, in the future surveying those libraries that are leaving the program to try and get direct information about their reasons? Because, as we know, not everyone ends up falling within the standard deviation.

MS. MILLER: We actually tried to survey the 48 libraries that had left. We sent them emails to the contacts that we had. Obviously, some of them had left in 2007, 2008. So it was hard to find them. We got maybe a handful of responses. And basically, they said exactly what they had already said to us in their drop
letters.

If you look through the chart that's included in the appendix that lists the individuals, it does give you the specific reasons that they left. Of course, we summarized them, but it does give you the specific. And there is a chart within the library that gives you more of the reasons. So …

MS. WILLIAMS: Just real quick to follow up, so you used just the information that they outlined in their --

MS. MILLER: Yes --

MS. WILLIAMS: -- letters.

MS. MILLER: because, again, we did try to contact them, but we had zero luck on that.

MS. WILLIAMS: Right. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Mm-hmm.

MS. KRUMSEE: Kirstin Krumsee, State Library of Ohio. I was wondering if you talked to the libraries -- the public libraries that have stayed in the program to get a sense of what they're doing well that maybe could be recommended to some of those public libraries considering dropping.

MS. HALL: Yes. Laurie Hall. We've -- some of that's going to come up. But that's one of the things we're doing, is while we go out and start
traveling, we're making sure we hit public libraries.

One of the recommendations we'll talk -- or the -- yeah, recommendations, we'll talk a little about that.

But we are going out and talking to public libraries in our trips. So yeah.

MS. THORNTON: Lori Thornton. I know in my travels in public library land, so to speak, that one of the services that -- or challenges on a different scale that public libraries are facing is providing E-Government service. In any of your discussions or looking at the data and documents, did that come up?

I mean, 7 -- in the 2014 survey, you cited 76 percent of public libraries assist patrons in using online government programs and services. And the top reason for leaving is availability of online resources. So I'm wondering if the FDLP couldn't do something as sort of a value-added membership type of thing to help them somehow with providing E-Government assistance.

MS. HALL: Can you explain a little bit more? Because like in this conference, we have a lot of participants from other agencies who come and talk to us, talk to the community about their individual services. So the IRS sometimes comes and I don't -- whoever is out there, too. So they're here to avail themselves of what services they have.
There's also -- within the federal government, there is a lot of programs and, most of you know, that historically have been very similar to the depository -- the census depository program and the patent and trademark. So they are going out. So we do that kind of facilitation of trying to get that community to also be aware of this community and here. So that's one thing that's already going on.

Are you suggesting some additional type of -- because there's -- across the entire government, there is every type of service -- so immigration, filling forms out, you know. So and I know each individual public library does a lot of that work with the office -- the federal office in that area, local area.

So I -- so if you have some suggestions on how we can improve the -- that kind of outreach, then just let us know. We can try.

Did I get what you were asking?

MS. THORNTON: Yes. And I don't know that I have anything specific. I just think maybe that's a discussion that we ought to be having with public libraries, perhaps. How can the FDLP help you? Maybe training, maybe facilitating more discussion with agencies, perhaps. I'm not sure.

MS. HALL: Right. This is Laurie Hall again.
Back on the -- I mean, historically, we've always sent the tax documents to you. We've sent the documents and allowed the libraries to then take the documents. We do have training on the Office of Federal Register. You know, we have training available, and we've had that historically on specific groups of materials.

We've also had the agencies come and give training. And a lot of those agencies are now also doing webinars. So that's one way that we've reached out to try to get that information about what the federal government produces to the libraries.

So yeah, any other additional thoughts on how to do that would be helpful. But that's kind of our history, what we've done so far.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University of Iowa. I've listened to some webinars that are archived on FDLP Academy from Social Security, Medicare. And they are recorded, so they are available. And I think there is a hesitation from the Agency's point of view. They are happy to describe services, navigating the website.

But it's for the individual to provide that private and personal information. It would be (inaudible) of a librarian or documents coordinator or
library staff to know where to go, understand the
arrangement of the website and what forms are
available. So I think that may be the limit of what a
library could do for privacy purposes.

But if you do go to FDLP Academy, you'll find
some of those recordings, and they're really quite
valuable. I'm an academic. I'm not going to fill out
anybody's Medicare for them. But it's important to
know about it. So -- and public libraries are right on
the front lines.

We've had floods in Iowa more than once. And
FEMA -- knowing how to get to FEMA, how to fill out the
documents -- it's a very important function. But it's
ultimately up to the individual affected to complete
the forms -- but my thoughts.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central
Florida.

I don't know how you would easily measure
this, but the -- some libraries will say they're
dropping because there's other depositories in the area
so they'll take up the load. Anecdotally, I could say
that when there's librarian there at -- I'm the large
academic in my area. So I get referrals from other
smaller depositories. When there's not somebody at
that depository that's responsible for the duties, I
don't feel like I get those referrals anymore once
they've dropped status.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. HALL: Yeah, thank you.

I think that's actually what it says in the report.

MS. MILLER: I just read -- did I read it wrong?

MS. HALL: Yeah.

MS. MILLER: Sorry.

MS. HALL: I think you left out a piece of the part. Yeah, no big deal.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: This is Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Public Library. One of the things -- I have looked at this a bit differently because in my institution we have not only a federal depository library. We also have a patent and trademark depository library.

And over the past several years, they have shifted focus. They are now actually -- they had -- to the point where they've actually formally renamed their program the Patent and Trademark Resource Centers. And there's been a bit of discussion I know bubbling up about moving the FDLP from a more collection-centered
to a more service-centered program.

Some years back, if my memory serves -- and it may well not -- when I was attending this conference, the -- there was some question about, well, why should we stay in the program. And one of the big things was, yes, the collections are great, but it is the expertise of the librarians who are now -- I hate to use the word gatekeepers. One could use the word facilitators.

But in any way you slice it, you're looking at people who the general members of the public who are not research specialists who do not necessarily even have a specific focus as they would in many of the major academic institutions come in, and they have no clue where to begin looking, how to begin looking. And they look to us to help them get into this labyrinth that is the federal government both in terms of its physical agency structures, where are the information sources, and what have you.

The Patent and Trademark Office realized this a while back. The advantage they have is, first of all, they've only got about 82 or 84 institutions, not 1,150. And as -- I believe that their governing United States code, which I think is either 35 or 37, is written a bit more vaguely than Title 44, which in that instance is a good thing because it gives them a lot
more elbow room to move around.

But when it comes to doing things like E-
Government services and assisting the public, it is
very easy to say, yes, we should be doing that. But it
is not always so simple when you're confronted with
either administration, budget, or other logistical
factors that, essentially -- I don't want to say
prohibit, but at least make it more difficult for some
staff to become proficient enough in government
information and the inner workings of how to navigate
through all this to make it useful enough to the public
where the administration can say, yes, that's a
worthwhile program. Let's continue doing that, or
let's join in on doing that.

It almost seems like we're seeing the opposite
trend here. If -- of the 12 libraries that decided to
reverse course and remain in the program, as was
alluded to here, some of those were due to simply a
change in director. Some of this could be simply an
emotional decision on the part of administration, or
they may have some kind of agenda with they want to
move forward with some other program and the depository
takes a back seat to it.

There is so much that's happening on the
ground at any given institution that it can be
difficult. But I think it's something we're going to have to look at to move to this more service-centered model. How we're going to do that I truly do not know, but certainly the PTRC might be a good place to start looking.

MR. SHAW: I'll jump in. On Page 10 of the report, a focus on service, the bar graph there, the public wants libraries to advance education, improve digital literacy, and serve key groups, when you read down through that, that's really not just public libraries. That's most of us.

And honestly, the term mission creed comes to mind, that we want our libraries to do more and more and more. And you know, it may become harder to, you know, balance everything out. And maybe one thing for FDLP is how do we get the depository program, government information infused in all these different things because it can relate. How I'm not sure.

But when I look at this page, in particular, and see all the different things the libraries are -- their own publics are telling them this would be a real good idea for you to be doing this, okay, that's great. Now, how are we going to in an era of stagnant or falling staffing, budgets, and everything else? It's a very, very challenging environment.
That's one thing, Susan, your report does very, very well, is that it really gets at the challenges of just running a library and the kind of economic and staffing environment we've had this last decade.

Laurie?

MS. HALL: Ready?

MR. SHAW: Yeah, let's go back to the -- we'll do audience questions, then everything ...

MS. HALL: Okay. So the Point 5 was to put this all together and come up with some policies, procedural changes, or enhancements that would encourage public libraries to remain in the program and that would provide an incentive for the public libraries to apply for empty spots or designations.

So let's take a quick look at some of the actions -- oh, I have to do the advance slides, okay -- and key initiatives that we came -- thought about and we're currently working on or we're thinking about investigating. I wanted to make it clear that we were just talking about self-service and a service-centric approach. We're using that term here. We're using that term as we investigate new tools and services. So I didn't want it to get mixed up with Lori's notion of changing the entire program.
So we're looking and using a new approach to look at the tools that we create for the depository. So when I'm using those terms, that's what I'm meaning here. So we're looking at things that would help the depositories and the development of our tools for you.

So the key -- let me -- the key five top challenges that we melded together from 2009-2015 were the budget constraints, the increased workload, the same ones that we've just talked about with almost every library in Appendix 1 -- staff reductions, budget constraints, cost containment, physical space, keeping up with the technology. So those are the five things that we put together.

So over the next fiscal year -- that's 2017, which has already started, by the way -- we are in the process of looking at several of our existing services and tools, applying that user-centric model. And we started that by doing that ethnographic study, which some of you participated in. We're getting a lot of information and feedback from that report that helps us look at, actually, some of the services that are in place, processes that are in place in your depositories.

So you know, that helps us decide, A, our priority of tools and services that we're going to work
on in this fiscal year or budget for the next fiscal year.

So here is some of the actions that we're planning to address as recommendations for this report. Like I said, some are already under -- or being implemented, and some are in the process.

Okay. So the first one is improvements to the library services system. That's the -- we found -- oh, sorry - through the ethnographic study, through some of the information coming back from our library visits. These are the key areas of -- in our library services systems that we're going to be looking at.

And remember, when we do things at FDLP, we try to do things that have the biggest impact for all libraries in the program. A lot of times, we'll develop something small. And actually, it -- if we were doing something for the public library, it often can be used by other different categories of the library. So our goal sometimes is to develop things that will have an impact for all libraries in the program.

So the key things on our agenda are working on FDLP.gov, the Catalog of U.S. Government Pubs. You've seen this morning we have some new enhancements to that based on user feedback. And also, the Depository
Selection Information System, or DSIMS -- that's one of the key tools that the libraries use to manage their item selections.

Secondly, we're also looking at a new customer relation management tool. That's the next generation of askGPO. But we're going to take it a little bit further than that because we're going to develop a platform so we can do better outreach to you -- your libraries, your staff.

Majority of the material that we have about you, the libraries, is in manual form. It's not digital in any shape or form. So we're trying to create a new part of askGPO to help us better serve the libraries in general, which would hopefully help us also increase response time to questions, make sure we track your questions.

The third one -- and those two, by the way, impact the public libraries as well as all of you. I just wanted to make those clear.

Number 3 actually does target specific programs in the new public libraries. We have identified 314 congressional vacancies and 39 senatorial vacancies. And the outreach and support staff are currently formulating a plan on how to go out and try to target public libraries in those areas and
see if they will join the program. And they're going
to be testing that. In the next couple of weeks,
they're going out to Texas to do a trip and see if they
can, you know, get some more public libraries
interested in filling some of those vacancies.

One of the key things we've been talking about
all along is that -- our visits, the GPO On the Go
initiatives. And 23 of those visits of the 250 were to
actual public libraries. We've dedicated some outreach
to those libraries, public libraries, and to any other
libraries to help them with their selection profiles,
shortcuts to streamline, their weeding. We've been
giving them govinfo.gov training. We've bene just, you
know, educating library staff as we go, training.

So some of those actions have actually helped
some of the smaller and public libraries stay in the
program or, you know, understand what we provide --
what services we do provide.

We've also reached out to the public library
community. We sent a fairly big contingent of staff to
the Public Library Association. In April, we also had
a booth as well there, a GPO booth. So our staff got
to attend a wide variety of, you know, sessions,
brought back a lot of intelligence from the -- that
meeting. And we plan to continue that.
We also plan to outreach to some other organizations that include and address the issues that public libraries are facing. So there's a couple others I have on my list, and I can't remember what they all are, but not just the PLA. So we plan to continue to do that if funding is available.

We also are compiling some briefing and informational materials, highlighting the values and the benefits of the FDLP. Some of the, you know, benefits of being in the program, like, a quick guide, quick informational sheets -- we did get some feedback from the ethnographic study and from our library visits that a lot of the libraries who are -- librarians who are wearing multiple hats would really like some kind of quick guides so that if they don't DSIMS once a month, they don't remember how to open it up. And it was over -- kind of come up with some quick guides to allow people to utilize some of those services who are not full-time document librarians anymore.

We're also looking at some briefing information about what it really means to be an electronic depository or mostly electronic depository so that it'll help, you know, sell that aspect to the program to administrators and for better understanding of what that really means.
Number 7, we've been on the stump looking for more webinars and more training that has to deal specifically with public libraries. We're looking for public librarians and people and staff and public libraries to do some of these webinars and training. We've been doing some of our own and outreaching to find some webinars that relate specifically to public libraries.

We're also undertaking in the technical services area. We're looking at some kind of subject guides. We can't quite figure out what it is at this point, but our staff is working on it, trying to assist smaller libraries, public libraries, smaller libraries that don't have that much time for collection development activities to actually -- our staff would kind of select resources on a certain subject or topic as they're going through their day-to-day routine in cataloging and acquisitions and identify some of these documents, kind of to be a bibliographer for some of these smaller collect -- libraries and help them identify key government information resources based on the topics of interest.

We're getting ready to do a little pilot project on that shortly. So we'll keep you posted on that one. That's just under investigation at this
point.

One of the things that we've done because we did hear in the survey that the public libraries really want Dewey -- and I heard that in Vermont for some reason because I think Dewey was in Vermont. All of those libraries have Dewey. So the staff now -- as a matter of fact, we were investing it -- Fang just posted it past week -- that we used to strip the Dewey classification records from our bib records. But now if it's PCC and it's authenticated record, we're leaving the Dewey numbers in so they're in all of our bib records that we do send out and put in the CGP. And we're also investigating staff training to have them start assigning Dewey.

Right now in the cataloging and publications program, the Library of Congress is assigning Dewey numbers for us for the -- that purpose. But Fang will tell you a little bit more about that at the tech services session, which I believe is --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Right now.

MS. HALL: -- right now. Oh, okay.

Okay. And number --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: It's being recorded.

MS. HALL: It's being recorded. So we'll find
Further analysis -- obviously, there is data that we probably didn't get around to analyzing some of the other biennial survey data from 2007 and 2013. We did not analyze at this point in time because we didn't have time to analyze it in order for this report. When we first put it out, we didn't have anybody on staff to analyze it.

We do now have a new staff member who is in government speak and operations research analyst who does just that kind of thing. So we're planning on getting -- he's only been here a month. I don't want to overburden him with -- but that's one of the things I would like, to have him take a look at that data to -- for the public library information and trends there. And then we'll just continue to moderating -- monitoring the trends in public library from either our additional libraries that we add or drop -- or drops.

So that's kind of the 10. I think that's enough, right -- 10 things we're thinking about.

MR. SHAW: Okay. We'll continue our questions and comments period. Before we go to the audience in the room or online, any further comments, questions from Council?

MS. TAYLOR: Hi. Teri Taylor from New Jersey
I had a question about the possible of the subject guides. Would that be an area where maybe you might address the E-Government, like, best practices or anything that -- and also, would this be something that would be accessible from FDLP.gov that would …

MS. HALL: Yeah. This is Laurie Hall again. It's still kind of in the introductory phase. But yes, it would be off FDLP.gov. Yeah, it could address any topic that you potentially wanted. So I think it could address some of those E-Gov concerns. We're -- I think we're looking at key topics. What was it? Education -- I think for our trial period it's education, health, employment. Yeah, I think some of those are the topics that we were looking at, at this point.

MS. THORNTON: Lori Thornton with a comment for number 5, the other Laurie, which was engaging community. Was one of the organization's COSLA? Because that would be a good one since so many state libraries are -- and other COSLA members -- are involved quite extensively with the public libraries and their concerns and needs.

MS. HALL: Yeah. GPO has always reached out to COSLA. I do believe there's a COSLA representative
here, or was trying to come to the conference. And we
-- I had a phone conversation. There's a new
representative, too -- this is October -- probably in
early summer. So yeah, we continue to reach out to
them and work with them. So …

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central
Florida.

Some of the regional depositories actually do
this in terms of working and establishing relationships
for here's another library you can work with that may
have some of your same concerns. I'm wondering about
more of a -- maybe a more formal buddy system that it's
established and not leaving it just to the regionals to
do that with other states of trying to partner up
librarians at other public libraries with some of the
existing ones that may be struggling and also maybe
some of the other libraries in their area that may not
be public libraries, but trying to not just leave it to
the regionals to try and coordinate that.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson from Yale Law
Library. It seems like that might be a good way to get
a jump start on the -- you know, if LSCM staff --
outreach staff can go in and, you know, help people's
processes to the point where they choose not to drop
out after they thought they were going to, that maybe
having that sort of a support network would be helpful. Maybe that's something that we could suggest to Regal (ph) and/or find out from them what -- from the -- from our regional folks what help would be -- they would like from GPO for that.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: This is Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Main Library. I'll take a stab into the dark here. Per Scott's marching orders, what will our program look like in 10 years or even 100 years, I would posit a much more uncomfortable question. Will we have a program in 100 years?

And so many things have popped up in -- just my personal experience, in the last few months. I mean, there was an article on CNN, 9 Ways, or whatever it was, in which Star Trek Predicted the Future (sic). Well, if you have your little personal access device and you have all human knowledge in front of you, which of course is a day we all look forward to, right, at that point, the old saw about everything's on the internet will actually be true.

And if, as it says here on Page 18 that 52 percent of the libraries that dropped out of the program rate online access as a major reason for doing so, I am at the same time reminded of the -- was it --
GODORT, I believe. There was a roundtable discussion of the librarians' farewells, the retiring librarians. One of them was David Cismowski. And while many of the librarians were putting in some valuable comments, David in his usual understated way was saying, you know, becoming obsolete is the biggest threat to the FDLP. Are we becoming obsolete to many public libraries?

It seems to be the case that that might be, in fact, the perception. If we have put out so much that is now on the internet, if we at the same time have reductions in staff, I can see where the priorities for a lot of administrators and smaller libraries are going to say there's not really a lot of reason to say.

And GPO has experienced a lot of this themselves, perhaps. In the heat of battle, they forget. But I was going through some of my notes taken at former conferences. And one of the first ones I came to, Bruce James was then the public printer, and he was going on and on about stuff. I had no idea what he was talking about.

It turned out, of course, what he was really going on was that the Federal Register, the initiative from Congress that stated that GPO will give away the Federal Register, the CFR, and others forced a major
change in GPO's business model. It's not something they wanted, certainly, and it happened practically overnight. Boom. This is the way you're going to do it. And GPO came through by reconstructing fundamentally what they did and how they did it, and they've done a remarkably good job at doing that.

Are we doing the same thing with the FDLP? I'm not suggesting that I have an answer, but it seems to me that we're giving away more and more material -- we meaning GPO, in particular. But if you've given away the store, why are you disappointed when somebody doesn't show up to buy anything?

MS. BERNSTEIN: Melissa Bernstein, University of Utah.

And something that I've been thinking of -- and your comment, I think, just brought it to the floor; and please don't hate me -- is maybe the contraction is not necessarily bad. You know, like, that it -- I -- and I'm not going to express this well either, so forgive me.

But it could possibly just be a natural outgrowth of, yes, some of these smaller libraries are realizing, you know what, this is not my primary thing. It's just not -- you know, I've got 16 balls in the air, and this is one I can drop, you know, pretty
easily because it's not being used much, whatever. 

I think as long as we maintain critical mass and the information is out there and we're making sure that it's not some sort of systematic thing why public libraries are being forced to drop out, I mean, it's just kind of -- I don't know. I feel like it goes along with your comment that it may not -- it may just be sort of the reality of where we are and not necessarily --

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: I get these --

MS. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- flashes of memories from past conferences. And I don't know if it's some kind of dementia setting in. I hope not.

But at some point, there was a discussion around this very table. And I never thought I'd be sitting up here to say this. But -- and I totally do not remember who it was, but it was something along the lines of, you know, it would be a shame if we thought of our positions as documents librarians was more important than getting the access to the information to the people who need it.

In other words, if the whole idea is to keep America informed, it's much more important that they stay informed than that we stay docs librarians. At
least that was the sentiment expressed by someone up
here at this table. I don't know who.

On the other hand, of course, we -- you know, we like to do what we do, and we think we're doing a
good job at it. And we know that what we're doing is
important. But by the same token, what we're doing is
in a transition. There will come a time at some point
when much of this becomes irrelevant from the
standpoint that the access will be so overwhelming in
whatever format it will be that the idea of
distributing print documents will be so archaic.
They'll say, well, how did we ever do that.

Well, how many of you all have got 3-D
printers in your library? When I first started coming
to these meetings, that technology hadn't even been
invented yet. It's the hottest thing we have going
right now at our institution. So who knows where we're
going?

It may be that this contraction is part of a
natural process. I don't know. We would, of course,
like to reverse that process. And certainly, I think
that the model that is enshrined in Title 44 is giving
us some trouble inasmuch as it is written. They print
it. We collect it. We make it available.

Certainly, given the trends that I've been
seeing, the electronic access, the all-electronic
libraries are where a lot of the action's going on.
And I have to say I have personal experience with this
because I was called into my director's office, my then
director at the time, who was given a mandate by our
county administration to look at reorganizing our main
library. And one of his first questions was how fast
can you shut down the depository. We need the space.

Well, needless to say, I was kind of like --
my heart was in my throat. What do I do here? And I
said, well, okay, you have to understand. First of
all, there's implications to getting out of the
program. But if space is the problem, tell me how much
space I can have.

And I began shifting radically toward a more
electronic collection, which has gone over apparently
very well with my users because now they can go into my
catalog, get the PURLs to get what they need.

By the same token, in a much smaller
institution -- fortunately, I'm at a rather large
county library system. But I can see where in a
smaller library system a few well-chosen mark (ph)
records with PURLs and a few well-chosen links on the
webpage might give them most of what they need --
might. But we don't know that.
MR. SHAW: Okay. We're going to have to --

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: But how do we find out?

MR. SHAW: -- leave some time for the
audience. I'll just make one comment. The technology
is changing fast.

How many -- are there any other folks in the
room right now, because I'm about to turn it over to
the room, who are OCLC WMS libraries? Okay. That's
pretty close to a next-generation catalog system now.

What we did at our -- with OCLC WMS, we went
into their knowledge base, threw a little software
switch on a file that is U.S. document electronic
records. And a few hours later, several hundred
thousand e-doc records floated right into our search
results. Every six or eight weeks, OCLC corrals up a
bunch of new ones, adds them to the file. Set and
forget. Haven't touched it. We don't have to do
anything.

Now, down the line, we'll probably discover
some maintenance issues that we haven't run across yet.
But the technology is indeed changing, and there may be
opportunities in the offing for GPO to partner with or
work with, vendors, particularly catalog vendors, as
new next-gen systems come online to make that kind of
thing more prevalent.
But in any event, I need to try to advance a slide here.

Yes. Those of you in the audience or streaming online, we have two questions online. Actually, we're going to go to those right now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. HALL: It's Laurie Hall.

I think we have one scenario where that happened where they -- one scenario where a library dropped out and came back in. But as Susan said earlier, reaching out to the libraries that dropped out, we didn't have much luck with that because people are not there anymore. How many -- only a few responded because once they're out of the program, they're pretty much out of the program and their whole priorities have changed. So we did try to reach out to some of those that have dropped in the past.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. HALL: This is Laurie Hall again.

I think we've partially been thinking about some of that. But I have that person -- we need to have the whole comment sent, actually, so that we can get some things.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MR. SHAW: We have a microphone -- this is Jim Shaw again -- microphones set out in the middle aisle. And we have colleagues moving towards it. So please go ahead.

MS. QUINN: Amy Quinn, Central Washington University.

A couple of comments and a question. First of all, I'd like to thank Laurie Hall for sending me the data about the FDLP drops. I'm -- I've created a -- well, first of all, I've done some questions and answers from the FDL -- the people who have dropped. There are 126 libraries on that data you sent me.

And from the questions I've asked these directors and some of the depository librarians that I could get a hold of, it came up to me that I'm going to have to do a survey. And some of the report that you've just talked about, some of the comments here conclude what I have found out as well. But I'm going -- a survey is going out, actually, next week because I just got IRB clearance on Thursday to actually do the survey because mine's going to be much more detailed on some of the questions. And some are very personal.

But some of the things I'm going to be finding
out is how they use space and place. And if you come
to my talk this afternoon, I'm going to talk about
that.

But a question for you all is with your public
library data, did you look at all and haven't yet
analyzed the data related to depository space and in
more detail than what you've reported and it's just
some of the stuff you're going to analyze.

Do you understand my question? Like, how much
space is being -- did the -- a lot of the directors
look at space and how much they are looking to get rid
of space in order to utilize?

MS. HALL:  Laurie Hall. Aimee -- thanks,
Aimee.

No, we -- that is not -- we did not get that
specific --

MS. QUINN:  Okay.

MS. HALL:  -- into the detail of the reasons.

So --

MS. QUINN:  Then my -- because my --

MS. HALL:  -- we haven't at this time. So …

MS. QUINN:  Okay. Because that's what I'm
going to be getting into, the really nitty gritty.

MS. HALL:  Yeah, we'd appreciate the data --

MS. QUINN:  I just --
MS. HALL: -- when you've -- have -- are done.

MS. QUINN: Yeah.

MR. EATS: David Eats (ph), Free Library of Philadelphia.

I want to thank my colleague and counsel, my fellow public librarian, for saying almost everything I thought I needed to say. And I agree with all of it, especially about looking -- moving more to a service model such as the one that USPTO has embraced.

I read this entire report, and I was really pleased to see it -- that it hit pretty much all of the bases, including the one about how even large public libraries like my own, which are hiring new staff to initiate new 21st century initiatives, that the fact that they -- the report has taken into consideration the fact that priorities are changing.

I did want to say one thing about E-Government, which I think really caused me to choke. I do E-Government reference work every day. I answer questions. I really don't need the FDLP to do E-Government. What I do need are the websites of federal, state, and local government agencies and my knowledge of those things in order to help patrons find what they need to do.

I do hope the FDLP at least will maintain its
electronic access to important resources even if they otherwise eventually sunset. I mean, thank you very much.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Hi. This is Jeffrey Schwartz from the Brooklyn Public Library.

And I wanted to know how many public libraries opted out of their physical GPO subscriptions and opted into electronic-only subscriptions during the last year or during the period this study was undertaken.

MS. MILLER: I don't have that information. We'd have to get it from our outreach department. I don't think, if I understand it correctly -- Ashley (ph), you can correct me -- we don't have any all-electronic libraries. They're all a portion of electronic and tangibles.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: This is Tom Fischlschweiger again.

Just as a note on that, over the years, due to staff issues, space issues, et cetera, I began -- and GPO was also giving us the mandate to go to the zero-based review of the selection items. I just slowly started moving toward more and more electronic selection.
And it came home to me without realizing what had happened. We did our public access assessment last year, and I got the numbers. And it turns out that we are now in excess of 90 percent of our selection is all electronic now. And it wasn't even conscious in the sense of I want to be at this target. But -- I'll talk that way. But it's just something that grew out of the normal process of how we had been changing.

It's a very good question. I'm not sure that there's going to be a specific answer. But I'm -- how many are moving toward predominantly electronic libraries? That's going to be a very important question in the future certainly.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.

MS. BURKE: Hello. My name is Helen Burke. I'm lucky enough to have served as a past member of DLC, and I'm currently at Hennepin County Library in Minnesota.

We are one of the two libraries in Minnesota that dropped status. One of our smaller branches -- but it was substantial -- dropped status just simply because we merged the Minneapolis Public Library with the county library.

We also at the central library, like Tom, are lucky enough to be a PTRC. So I wonder if I might
suggest a kind of pragmatic solution that draws upon the FDL community, especially the public libraries, to come up with an updated version of the essential titles.

When the whole community did that exercise of the essential titles to keep and print -- I think that was the title -- if we could do a renewed exercise within the public library community with the idea of keeping status and going more electronic, if you keep status and you remain what paper titles do you want with the idea of civic engagement, and I think that would invigorate the community, perhaps, as well as update our idea of when that essential title survey was done. It was kind of like, oh, my God, the internet and the electronic access, is it secure, whatever.

GPO has gone a long way to give us security and authenticity. Let the community draw from within its own professional opinions of what a depository should keep, you know. Thanks.

MS. BEHRENS-HUFFSTETTER: Connie Behrens-Huffstetter, Milwaukee Public Library.

Listening to Tom is just great. Also, when they're talking about E-Government, our problem is we can find the things for patrons. But as we all know, most of that is law -- oh, sorry. Thank you.
And we aren't lawyers. And that is brought home real well with the Milwaukee private downtown law librarians telling me this, the Milwaukee County Law Library telling me that, you know, call -- ask us.

But also, the other problem that we have with E-Government and helping people with forms -- we're librarians; we like to help people. And we have to say no, and that's not a -- you know, we can find them for them. But as we've said before, it has to be the patron who works on them.

But also, we have to remember that many of the things that we have -- statutes, public law -- we have to give the books to the patron because, legally and ethically, as the public librarian, because I am not a law lawyer, I cannot help them because it's all a part of interpretation.

So when -- you know, it's a whole different -- sometimes, you know, I read these things, and I talk -- I look at them. And it's a very different public law library -- public librarians are so different from academic librarians.

I work on -- I'm a regional. We're a regional. I have 10 hours a month to work on FDLP, GPO. I push myself through more using it for other -- you know, what do you give up at that time? But just
that I would love to do E-Government and help the
people because Milwaukee is one place that they really
do need that help, but it's what comes afterwards.

We've had people from wanting their
immigration papers filled out and was told -- and they
come over to us and say, well, we were told you would
help us. Just like with patents, it's going to end up
being them calling a law -- a patent lawyer by a
certain time. And people don't want -- like that.

I mean, we don't tell them. We show them what
we have for the patents, USPTO, and that you can call
them all you want. And they love it. They have all
their numbers down there. But you can only go so far
in serving them.

And I would love to do a lot of the things
that we talk about, except time is not of my -- one of
my things. I'm desk most of the time.

So that's what I have to tell you about the E-
Government and the difference between. Thank you.

MR. SHAW: This is Jim Shaw again.

The issue with helping the public with legal
reference and things, that's common to everybody. I
have that happen several times a month where I hit the
limit of what I can reasonably and appropriately do.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. This is Melissa
Bernstein.

And speaking as a law librarian -- and we happen to all be clustered here on this side --

(Laughter.)

MS. BERNSTEIN: -- of the table. And I think we all have law degrees as well. But we are in the same position. Just so you know, we cannot provide legal advice to our patrons when they come in.

So we have the exact same restrictions. We may have a little bit more knowledge just from our end and our training and whatnot, but we can't do it either. And they do get quite frustrated.

MR. SHAW: We're very near the end of the appointed time. If there's any one last comment or question, we can try to address quickly. People are voting with their feet, I see. That's fine.

Ashley?

ASHLEY: (inaudible - off mic).

MR. SHAW: And thank you very much for that comment.

And thank you to our colleagues from GPO for presenting the draft report.

Remember, everybody, if you have an additional comment or thought you'd like to share, please email them to skmiller@gpo.gov -- skmiller@gpo.gov -- close
of business December 18th.

MS. MILLER: November --

MR. SHAW: November 18th. Sorry. Close of business November 18th. Thank you very much.

Thank you, everybody. We'll reconvene for another session in half an hour.

(Applause.)

(Break.)

MS. MASON: We'll get started in just a moment or two.

Good afternoon. I'm Marianne Mason, and I'm a member of the Regional Issues Working Group. The topic that the group felt was most pressing to address is the recently approved regional discard policy and how it could change practices in libraries that choose to participate.

The session will be divided into three parts. In Part 1, I'll review a very brief history of the request to discard to JCP, the current discard policy, and the optional request to discard by regionals. I'll also describe the interconnectedness of the resulting need to determine holdings information throughout the FDLP community and the need to develop and expand a tool to accommodate the regional discard lists.

In Part 2, Lisa Russell will present and
demonstrate the FDLP eXchange, the application that will replace and expand the national Needs and Offers.

In Part 3, Dan O'Mahony -- I'm sorry -- will outline the practices that affect selectives and regional libraries.

More than 800 libraries responded to the FDLP Forecast Study Questionnaire in 2012. This was the first survey with open-ended questions sent to FDLP libraries by GPO that gave respondents the opportunity to say what they really meant. This is also the first opportunity that the depository community had to document past hallway conversations, brainstorming sessions at conferences and blog posts asking for change.

Two questions, in particular, begged for detailed comments. Question 31, "What would an idea FDLP look like that," meant all -- "met all of your current and anticipated needs for federal government information?" And Question 32, "Thinking about the next five years, what specific things would you like GPO to do to help you and your library improve public access to federal government information?"

We spoke, and GPO listened. Fill out those surveys, folks.

After digesting and analyzing the responses,
GPO released the forecast findings document in 2013. And four requests in relation to the regional discard policies stand out -- increased digital access -- some regionals asked for digital substitution in place of tangible publications and permission to discard due to space concerns; provide improved and easy-to-use tools and services; allow more flexibility and collaboration among FDLP libraries for collection management such as regional consortia and cross-state border partnerships; and finally, preserve tangible and digital collections for future generations. That means a reliable, authenticated repository and expanded FDsys, now coming into govinfo.gov.

In 2014, regional libraries were surveyed to determine their intent to discard publications within a limited group of titles. Although the survey was for analysis only, it had the potential to inform a draft policy proposal to be sent to the Joint Committee on Printing for approval.

And I think I may not have -- there we go.

In July 2015, Davita Vance-Cooks sent a letter requesting JCP to approve the option of regional libraries to withdraw specified tangible publications. The specified conditions to withdraw print, CD-ROMs, and microfiche included that the be retained for a
minimum -- that they had been retained for a minimum of seven years and that they are available in FDsys in authentic, digitally signed formats.

In record time, just a month later, JCP responded with approval in August 2015 with the additional condition that a minimum of four tangible copies exist in the FDLP distributed geographically. Both the process for discarding publications and the retention requirements for regional libraries outlined in the legal requirements document no longer seem adequate or accurate without the process of regional libraries to withdraw publications.

So what came next? One, the Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statements 2016-3, dated May 31st, 2016, on the subject Government Publications Authorize for Discard by Regional Depository Libraries, states the purpose, provides the background, the policy, definition of terms, the responsibilities of the Superintendent of Documents, and a bibliography.

So official authorization has been granted through this policy statement for regionals to discard.

Second, establish a preservation steward network of partners for the four geographically distributed tangible copies of publications. Outreach and conversations with libraries has begun. A template
for a memorandum of agreement has been created stating the responsibilities of preservation stewards. And I will list those responsibilities. I think there's a little uncertainty in that point. Verify the physical existence of the item in their -- on their list. Ensure the items are cataloged. Determine the condition is good with a minimum level of preservation for the copy of record. Store the items in controlled access environment. Choose between non-circulating, or not circulating, through interlibrary loan. Or house the items in closed or open stacks, allowing for circulation, with guarantees in place to replace if they're damaged or lost.

Mark items with Do Not Withdraw in the item itself and the online record. Include in the library's conservation program. And finally, notify GPO of changes in condition, location, and conduct a condition assessment at least every three years using a random sampling of titles.

So some questions. How do we know who the preservation stewards are? How do we share and see the discard lists from regional libraries? Don't we need to see lists from selective libraries in a more uniform way than we do now? There must be an easy way to manage these lists, right?
And I think this would be a good time to have Lisa Russell begin her description and demonstration of FDLP eXchange.

MS. RUSSELL: Thanks, Marianne.

I'm going to start with a couple slides just to give you -- let's see. Here we go. I'm going to start with a couple slides to give you a little bit of background, and then we'll jump into a demonstration.

First, on the goals for the FDLP eXchange -- to create an application that automates the Needs and Offers process, allowing libraries to digitally review, list, request, and process Needs and Offers. And the application will be user-friendly, utilize automatic -- automated workflow, and match one library's needs to another library's offers and include a communication tool to help libraries make the connection to eXchange materials.

The current project timeline is that we completed the discovery process last December. For those of you who don't know or haven't heard this before, what we normally do when we do a contract for this kind of development is that we have a -- the contractor come in. They big on what we put out as our requirements, and then they come in and spend a couple months with us discussing them to make sure that they
really understand what it is that we want.

So we finished that in December 2015. The initial site design was completed in April 2016. And if you attended the virtual conference, you may have seen the demonstration a bit there. The initial development was completed in July of 2016, and GPO did our internal testing in July 2016 as well.

The we did a beta test with 29 depository libraries in September 2016. So we're just taking a look at all the feedback we got from that. Most of the feedback's been pretty good. We're also taking a look at if there's anything that we can do in fairly short order to add to the development before we release it.

Next, we're planning to do some additional development. There's some backend changes that we want to make before we go live with it. And we're planning to go live -- we're targeting spring 2017.

I think -- oh, one more slide.

I know you're not going to be able to see this very well. But I wanted to just give people an idea the difference -- there are some slight differences between the regional interface and the selective interface. I'm primarily going to be showing the regional interface today, and I'll kind of point at the -- some of the differences. In order -- in the
interest of time, there are going to be some cases where we kind of just wave at something and say, well, this is a lot like what we just showed. So we won't go into everything.

But the main differences between the regional interface and the selective interface are that the regional interface has the ability to review lists. And there's no significance between the orange spaces on the two screenshots. That just is a matter of where I happened to have my mouse at the time. So don't let that confuse you.

You'll also see there are four buttons across the top for the regionals, where there is three across the top for the selectives. That, again, is to allow for the list review.

And with that, we will jump over to the demo. So -- and the way we're set up today, we've got the -- the actual demo is being run on the side, and I'm doing the voiceover. So if you hear me say anything to Deborah (ph), I'm not just talking to my imaginary friend. I'm talking to Deborah --

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: -- pretty much, who is actually running the demo over there. So okay.

This is the dashboard for the FDLP eXchange
for the regional repositories. You can see across the
top we've got the different -- you've got the
dashboard. Then you've got Input and then List Review,
which is the thing that's not on the selectives
interface. Then you've got My Offers, My Needs, My
Matches, and Needs and Offers Repository.

Above that, you've got the Library Account,
Help, Notifications, and the in-site communication
tool. And above that, you can also see who you logged
in as. So in case you forgot who you are or if you're
not sure if you're logged in or not, that's how you
find out.

We will start by going to the Library Account.
And this is the place where you can go. We're allowing
the regionals to set the review periods for their
region both for the regional review and for the
selectives to review within their region.

And so this is something -- if you happen to
be an ASERL library where you're using the ASERL tool,
you can still go ahead and use this to offer (ph)
nationally or to do your needs. And to do that, you
would want to change the regional review period and the
selective review period for -- to zero.

You want to go ahead and change one of those?
There we go.
So we're changing that to 30, and she clicked the checkmarks to save it. Again, those are two things that the regional only can do.

If you scroll down below that, you'll see Offer Nationally, and that's a Yes or No. So if you're in a selective depository, you're not required to offer things nationally. We do like it if you do. So that's a Yes or No. If you don't feel like you can, you can choose No. If you can, you can set it for Yes, and then you can set a time period that you want to release -- offer your own things.

So if you want to release -- offer things nationally but don't have a lot of time -- you know, you're under some pressure to clear some space or something -- you can set that to say 10 days, or something like that. So that's entirely up to you.

Below that, we're not going to show this, but you can see where we can add additional library -- additional users for your library account. And every library can have up to five.

Next, we're going to go ahead and add some items. Okay. So to manually add an item, there's two ways you can add. Right now, she's showing how to manually add an item, which gives you a form. And you can type everything in and then submit it. And we'll
get to -- next there's a place you can upload a spreadsheet.

Sorry. It's taking a minute to type things in. We thought about copying and pasting but thought that might get too confusing.

And you can see anything that is a required field has an asterisk by it. If it's a -- this is actually a need that we're putting in. So for needs, you can choose what conditions you'll accept. So if you'll only accept something in good condition or good and fine, you can mark those. If you'll accept anything, you can mark the Any Condition, and that checks all the boxes.

So once that's done, she's clicking Add to List and Add Another Entry. Oops, and we have an error. So one of the things that this tells you is if you forget to put something in -- we forgot the -- it looks like the classification in here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: You want a colon. Sorry.
One question -- while she's doing this, one question that we often get is if it matters what -- how about the spacing. It should be able to match whether you've spaced it, you know, with the space between the GP and the 1 or without the space. So the spacing won't matter. If you, of course, make a typo, that will matter -- this is -- because this is the field it matches on.

And the other thing that you won't get a match is if two libraries are entering something that one library has kept up with the web tech notes and the other library hasn't so they've actually entered different SuDoc numbers, those aren't going to match, although we do have a secondary match on key -- I believe it's keyword and title and year of publication. So you still might get a match through that.

You can see in the publication date there's a start date and an end date. So if you want to enter something that is arranged, you can enter, you know, the date of the first issue and the date of the last issue. You're not going to get as good a match on that.

The other thing that we have is there's an Add to List and Duplicate button down at the bottom when she gets to it.
Are you ready?

I'm not sure if she's ready for that. Okay.

She's ready.

So you can see right now she's hovered over the Add to List and Duplicate. So that adds what you just entered. And then you can go back and change -- you know, if you need to tweak the SuDoc number, change the year for the second one that you're offering, you can do it that way. And that will allow you to get a little bit of -- a little better match. It is still more time-consuming, but it does help with the matching process.

And when you're done adding things, you can click Finish List and Submit. We've set it up so that there's an administrator for each site who's probably going to be your depository coordinator. And the others can enter something and submit it to that person so that person can submit it once they've reviewed it. The idea was that if you have student workers or volunteers or someone who's not as experienced, you might want them to enter it. And then you check it over before you submit it.

So you want to do an upload now? Okay.

Uploading a list is pretty much the same. If you've uploaded lists on other websites, you kind of
navigate to the site, find your list, and select it and tell it to upload. Once it's uploaded, she's showing now that you can double-check and make sure all the fields are matched correctly. So if you had -- say, the title didn't match, the -- your title field. If you called it Document Title instead of Title or something like that and want to make sure it's matching correctly, you can go through what she's doing right now to make sure everything's matching.

It also highlights errors so that you can go in and correct errors on whichever one has an error. This one doesn't have a format. And it will tell you at the top. I don't think -- I'm not able to see it right now, but you can -- yeah, up there at the top, it shows zero errors present. So as you fix the errors, that number should go down if you have several errors when you first go in. And then can click Submit for Review.

This tells you it's completed your upload. And then if you go -- I don't know if you can see. But that little bell where it has the notifications, that number goes up because you have a notification saying that you've got a list that's been submitted. You can go to that and access the list there in order to go ahead and review it.
And you can see both of the lists that we just added are there. She can pick one and go ahead and submit it.

So once you've selected the list, just go through -- scroll through and review it to make sure everything's okay. You can view individual items.

And here you can see you can edit or delete. So if you made a mistake and just completed wanted to delete it, you could delete it here. Or you can go in and edit it.

So do you want to edit one of them, Deborah?

Okay.

So we're going to say this was my -- we'll take either paper or microfiche on this one. And you submit it again. And you submit to the library admin and go back to approve lists for submission. And now everything's good. So we approve it.

And at that point, it goes to your regional for review. This is a little bit different since we're using a regional interface to demonstrate it. But regionals actually could go ahead and still use it if they have secondary copies of things to offer.

So let's see. What's next?

Okay. This is just to give you an idea. This is a new offers form. Just so you can see, there's a
few differences in what's -- what the information on it is. In the offers, the condition statement is required. It also -- you obviously are going to be specific and say, you know, this piece that I have in my hand is in good condition, or fair condition, whereas opposed with a need you're saying I'll accept any of these conditions. So that's a little bit different.

There's also a date because we ask for a date when something was received. And that is in the offers, which is not in the needs because, obviously, you don't have a date when you received a need.

So there's a couple of things like that.

There's an OCLC number and a CGP system number if you want to use those as well.

So with that, I think we can move on. We approved the list.

Do you want to show the regional review process now? Okay.

So this shows all the lists that the regional has for review.

If you want to select one, take a look at it.

So you can review it here. You can also accept an offer and pass on an offer or just allow an offer. The disallow offer is there for something that
really shouldn't be offered. We had to -- we were trying to differentiate that between passing and disallowing. We were talking about rejecting, and then people -- the -- you know, it started sounding a little bit too much like match.com. It was like, no, we don't --

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: -- want to reject anybody. So we decided to disallow it instead.

So and you can go through and select the items that you want to look at. And you can go through and select the items that you want to look at. You can expand them to see more information.

And you can see up at the top it says View Matched Need, the very first entry. You can do that to look at the need that it matches, and you can see them side by side so that you can see if it really matches what you -- what you're looking for if you have something that matches.

And this is the place where I think it really is going to help streamline the process down the road, is that when people start getting their -- I know a lot of people don't have needs lists in the system right now. But when people do start getting needs in the system and it can match, it can help streamline because
you don't have to look as closely at some of the other stuff then.

And then there is a place down at the bottom to request the need, request the offer, request the match, however you want to say it. You can also send a message to the library. We won't go through that today, just in the interest of time.

If you do want to see some of the features that we're skipping over right now, we are also doing – – I'm doing a shorter -- a longer version tomorrow that going to show a little bit of both interfaces. And it's going to get more into the nuts and bolts. It's at 8:30 in the Wilson Harding Room. You can --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Wilson Harrison.

MS. RUSSELL: Wilson Harrison. I was close. It starts with an H.

So we will be getting into a little bit more detail if you want to come and take a look there as well.

So let's see. That's List Review. You can also -- right next to List Review on this interface, it says Review My Offers. And you can look at that to see what you have in the system. And this allows you to view by item or view by list, if the little button up at the top.
So you can -- you know, if there's too many items that you don't want to look at -- we only have one list in here, so it doesn't make a whole lot of difference in this case. But that could -- if you have several lists and you just want to kind of combine them all together, you can do the list by item and take a look at them that way. Or if there's a list that you really need to deal with right away, you can pick that one and tackle that.

There is also a sort. It sorts by what -- when it was created, title, classification, when it was published, format, when it was posted, and status. So those are the options there.

And you can also filter. We don't need to go into that. It's not all that different from the filtering that you've seen before. But it does allow you to filter by format, or whatever -- if you're only looking for paper, if you're only looking for CD-ROMs, or whatever. I don't think probably there are too many people looking for CD-ROMs at this point. But if you are …

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: I know it's not a terribly popular format at this point. So that is the Review My Offers.
Review My Needs is right next to it, which is pretty similar. So we won't go to that.

Review My Matches is next. And this -- you saw before we would see a match on a particular list. This is everything that matches, and you can pull it up just by the things that match. So if you wanted to, instead of going to your list first, you could go here first and pick off all the things that are matched and deal with those. And then that takes them out of your list when you go back to the list to review it. So that could help streamline the process a little bit.

And the last thing to look at is the Needs and Offers repository. This shows you everything that's there. It shows you both your needs and your offers -- I'm sorry -- your needs and everybody else's needs, your offers and everybody else's offers.

There is also a place where you can do a keyword search. And this could be useful if you need to do -- if you're looking for something on a particular title, if you're looking for something on your state. We're going to do health. This shows you everything that's in -- has the keyword health.

You need to remember here we're not searching full mark (ph) records. We're searching what's in the system, which is going to be the title. So if it has
health in the title, it'll find it. If it's something that doesn't say health in the title but has -- would have had a subject term health, it's not going to show up. But it does help you do a little bit of subject searching.

I think the one last thing we wanted to show you was that we also have a mobile version. And you can see that on a browser by just shrinking the browser. You can see as it gets smaller you start to see the hamburger minion up at the top. And this you can use either for a tablet or a cell phone. I don't think a lot of -- unless you've got one of the larger cell phones, you're probably not going to want to review a whole lot of this on your cell phone. But that is an option. If you need to take it out to the stacks and actually see what's on your shelves, that could be useful.

So that's a quick overview. And with that, I will turn it over to Dan.

Oh, okay. We'll go ahead and take questions now if anybody's got any.

Sorry. The first one's a camera. So ...

MS. SELBY: All right. Hi. I'm Barbie Selby, UVA.

Is regional review required for all the offers
from selectives?

MS. RUSSELL: Currently, yes, although if you had -- if you weren't going to review anything from your selectives, you could set the time periods to zero. If there were only certain things you want to review -- like, I know some regionals don't review hearings because they're getting a lot of the same things, or they don't review microfiche, those kinds of things. We don't really have that kind of granularity to turn that kind of thing off at this point. It might be something we could think about for the next release.

MS. SELBY: So are the offers able to be known to other people before the regional reviews it?

MS. RUSSELL: No. It goes first to your regional. And then once your regional time period has elapsed, then it goes to everybody in your region.

MS. SELBY: So it's based on time period.

MS. RUSSELL: Right. And then --

MS. SELBY: So if a regional --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MS. SELBY: Not me, of course. But if a regional didn't review --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

(Laughter.)

MS. SELBY: -- it would flip over to everybody
else.

MS. MASON: Right. And if you set your time period for, say, 15 days, it's available then to everybody in your region that -- on the 16th day. But you still have access to it.

MS. SELBY: Sure.

MS. RUSSELL: So if you didn't get it -- get the review done by that -- by the end of that time period, you do still have access to that request.

MS. SELBY: So I'm thinking about the ASERL process we already have and --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MS. SELBY: -- how to dovetail this. So --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MS. SELBY: -- thank you.


UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, I'm sorry. I forgot to ask if Council has any questions first.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Hi. Melissa Bernstein, University of Utah.

So one question I had was if you pass on an offer.

MS. RUSSELL: Mm-hmm.
MS. BERNSTEIN: Is there any way -- let's say for some reason you pass on it because -- and you took another -- somehow it didn't work out. Is there any way to go back and see those offers that you passed on? Does that make sense --

MS. RUSSELL: I --

MS. BERNSTEIN: -- to kind of undo that?

MS. RUSSELL: -- think that this might be something I need to ask Deborah about.

DEBORAH: So it will be in the repository. So --

MS. RUSSELL: That's what I thought.

DEBORAH: -- unless somebody else has nabbed it already, you should be able to continue to access it until the offering library has deleted it from the system.


MS. RUSSELL: Thanks.

MS. KRUMSEE: Kirstin Krumsee, State Library of Ohio.

I'm guessing this might be a far-in-the-future idea. But would it be possible to, like, lock institutions out of offering items that aren't, like, yet eligible for discard, things like the five-year rule or like the one-year with online --
MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MS. KRUMSEE: -- equivalent.

MS. RUSSELL: That was one of the things that we tried to build in with the -- require -- requesting the date when something was received. It's not foolproof. When we do have -- in some cases, you may not have a date on your -- and you may not be able to find it easily.

So we do have a -- I think Deborah's going to it right now. There's a box that you can check. Basically, it has a disclaimer that says -- that -- you know, I've either had this for five years or I'm substituting. I'm offering this because I'm allowed to by the rules.

And you have to check that box and accept the disclaimer if you're going to offer something without a date or that might be more recent.

Anything else from Council?

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington.

I'm just -- it's a comment and not a question.

It's --

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MS. HARTNETT: -- such a delight to see the ability to do federated searches for what everyone is
offering. We've been waiting for this for years. And it will be a real benefit to the community.

MS. RUSSELL: Great. That's good to hear.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University of Iowa.

I was just prompted. How much maintenance is there from the offering library to take down the lists after they've been posted? If -- there are some libraries that are listing many, many lists. So how much maintenance is there? I guess I'll leave it there.

MS. RUSSELL: Right. You actually don't have to take down a list. If -- you have to take down something that's been accepted by another library. But you don't have to -- if you've had something that's gone through the whole time period, it's going to expire.

You'll still be able to view it. And I don't think we really showed that, but there's My Past Offers and My Past Needs. You'll still be able to view it there, but you're the only one who's going to be able to see that.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Wait. So you have to -- sorry. This is Melissa Bernstein.

So if someone has accepted it, you have to
take it down. It doesn't automatically, like, match --

MS. RUSSELL: You have to change --

MS. BERNSTEIN: -- sort of thing?

MS. RUSSELL: It matches, and you change the status to say that it's been accepted because you might have a match that maybe once you look at it it's not in the condition that you want or there might be some other reason that you can't accept it. So for that reason that you have to actually change the status on it to --

MS. BERNSTEIN: So it's possible to have, like, two people claim --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah, it is.

MS. BERNSTEIN: -- you know, the same thing.

Okay. So that has to be managed --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MS. BERNSTEIN: -- somehow, which is why I thought pass on the offer. You might want to go back if you passed on some --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MS. BERNSTEIN: -- you know. Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Anyone else?

Sandee?

MS. MCANINCH: Okay. Sandee McAninch, University of Kentucky, another ASERL library.
Do the regionals get notified when an offer has been submitted by one of their selectives?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. And we didn't really show that there are -- both get offers through the -- there's a notification tool within the tool -- within the application. Sorry. And there's also a communication tool. So you would get notification if you got communication. You would also get a notification.

But also, when you go in and set up your library, there's a place where you could check which ones you want because you might not want every single time somebody's offering, if they're offering, like, one-offs, you might want a daily notification that you got something yesterday, or something like that. So it allows you to select what you -- which notifications you want and whether you want them by email or through the notification tool.

MS. MCANINCH: So you're literally getting a notification for every item they offer.

MS. RUSSELL: You have a -- you have the ability to select that. It would either be by the list when a list is submitted. Or you would -- you -- so if somebody submitted a list of 100 items, you wouldn't get 100 notifications. You'd get one notification.
You also have the ability to say I just want to be notified daily. So if you have three libraries who submitted that day, say, you know, I -- you had five lists from three libraries in your notification.

    MS. MCANINCH: So it's something you tailor --
    MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.
    MS. MCANINCH: -- that it can be -- okay.
    MS. RUSSELL: Anyone? Got an online question?
    UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).
    MS. RUSSELL: Okay. That's a good comment.
    UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).
    MS. RUSSELL: Yes, there are definitions for those. We actually started with the -- I think there were six or seven different statuses that are -- not statuses -- conditions that are used sort of for the used book vendors. We started with those, and we decided that was a little bit too complicated to have quite so many. So we condensed it down a little bit.
    So we took that, and we do have definitions. I don't remember if we've updated them in the help tool here, but it will be in the help tool when we go live. And I believe we posted them online as well for the regional.
Cindy kind of is nodding her head vigorously. So I'm going to take that as a yes.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** What if the date the item is received isn't on the item? I'm not convinced that I really want to see the past 100 years listings.

(Laughter.)

**MS. RUSSELL:** Right. That's why we have that disclaimer that allows you to check in and say I don't have a date. But you know, I know if -- I've had this for at least five years. So you know, it's got too thick a layer of dust to not -- to be less than five years old, or whatever.

(Laughter.)

**MS. RUSSELL:** Did you have another one?

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Okay. Last question. If our state is currently using ASERL, are we all continue to do so? Or was this supposed to replace it?

**MS. RUSSELL:** That's up to your regional. That decision has to be made at the regional level. If your regional wants to continue using the ASERL tool, they can use this for -- just for the needs and for anything to offer nationally. But -- and they can do that by setting the time periods for the region and the
-- everything within the region at zero.

So then when something is entered, when an offer is entered, it would go automatically to the offer it nationally phase of the offering cycle.

But it's something for your regional to decide whether they want to use the tool or not.

That's it?

MS. WEIMER: Yeah, hi. Kathy Weimer, Rice University.

I saw in the filtering by format. I would like to just suggest the map might be useful for those of us who like to interact with maps. Otherwise, it's like defaulting to Other or Print or something that might be confusing.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Thanks.

Yeah, I think we currently consider maps -- in the list of classes, we consider maps and Braille both to be paper. And we did add Braille because we know that some people might not want something that was in Braille with the -- and didn't want them to -- so but I think maps is a good add. So we'll take that into consideration.

Anyone else?

MS. KRUMSEE: Kirstin Krumsee, State Library of Ohio.
Is there any way to, like, mark whether not
if, like, something's been rebound or ...

MS. RUSSELL: There is actually a Notes field
in there that's way down at the bottom of the form. We
didn't look at it very closely, but it's in there. And
actually, there is a Notes field for the whole record.
But there is also a Condition Notes field, so you could
put it there as well. It's probably the Condition
Notes field would be a better place for it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off
mic).

MS. RUSSELL: We had -- that's actually a
policy question that we probably need to think about
and make a decision. Or I don't know if that's
something that would -- I don't know if Cindy's
scratching her head or if she's got -- okay. I think
she's scratching her head.

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: She's -- I hope she's not
pulling her hair out.

That might be a regional decision. Yeah,
well, if it -- yeah, if it's a regional on a selective,
of course, it's -- your regional is going to get it.
If it's two selectives or two people outside your
region, I don't think we have any guidelines for that.
But that might be something we should develop.

MR. SHAW: This is Jim Shaw, University of Nebraska at Omaha. That would -- you know, a link to eBay, so, you know --

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MR. SHAW: -- use it for fundraising in that way.

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MR. SHAW: No, you're not supposed to sell them.

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MR. SHAW: This -- I'm joking. This is really wonderful.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. SHAW: This is really -- and --

MS. MASON: Yeah.

MR. SHAW: -- it will get refined over time.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, absolutely.

MR. SHAW: You know, they always do. So this is amazingly good work.

MS. RUSSELL: Great. Thank you.

Another online question?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Can we use this to offer current duplicate items or items to be
received that are not part of our selection profile?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, you can. And any time you get a duplicate, you can offer it. It's considered a secondary copy, and you could offer those through this. You would just want to make sure you mark the Disclaimer box to indicate that you are eligible to offer it.

Was there another part of that question I missed? I think I answered it. Okay. Cindy?

MS. ATKIN: Cindy Atkin, GPO.

Is that on?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MS. ATKIN: Okay. Cindy Atkin, GPO.

I just want to go back to that question about priorities. And Lisa's right. We have been talking about it. It's a policy issue, but it's going to come up more and more.

There are instances like just -- what was just described in the question. There are instances and ASERL folks know that the Centers of Excellence and for the folks using their tool get priority.

We have some questions internally to GPO about priority for preservation stewards for partners.

Excuse me. And we've also asked ourselves where do we
fall, GPO as an Agency, needing materials for
cataloging, or what have you? Where do we fall into
those priorities as well? So it's something we've
thought about, and we will have decisions made before
this is launched. How's that?

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: We didn't really discuss that
much. But this is something that we did -- around the
time that we were getting ready to start working on
this was when we got this decision that we -- it was
okay to start letting regionals offer things.

And so the question came up that, you know,
can we build this in. And it's like let's do it as
Phase 2. Let's go ahead and get something -- you know,
we already have the requirements for this. So that's
one of the things that we're talking about. What is
that process, and what are the requirements for the
tool in order to be able to use it for the regional
discard process?

And I -- Dan might be covering some of that on
his comments, so I won't go too much -- into that too
much. But that is something we're talking about as a
Phase 2.

MR. MATHESON: So since you have the Input
form up, I -- just like a hypothetical, we recently
weeded, say, a couple shelves' worth of GAO reports. And we said here's the SuDoc number, GAO reports from this year through this year, mostly complete. And we'll -- call us, and we'll look and see if the title you want is here. Is that …

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah, you can enter that. What you would do in this case is -- I'm assuming that they all have the same stem. You would put the stem in, and then you would put the start date and the end date.

And there you would want it to differentiate between, you know, this isn't a full bib record. So it wouldn't be -- like, the Federal Register started in 1938, or whatever. You don't want to say 1938 if you're offering 1972 to 1974. You're going to want to enter the dates that you're actually offering. And then you can put that note, like, you know, mostly complete in the -- once you put that range in, there's a -- I think we called it a Multiple Items Note that appears that you can fill in that information there.

MS. RODGERS: Stephanie Rodgers, Virginia Commonwealth University.

So where you were searching before, is that your search in keyword? You're only searching in title? So there's no way to search in the classification yet. If I wanted to put in HS because I
want --

MS. RUSSELL: That's --

MS. RODGERS: -- anything that's --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MS. RODGERS: -- Homeland Security, how would I do that? Because those titles aren't always --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.


MS. RUSSELL: That's --

MS. RODGERS: Is that --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah, we don't have --

MS. RODGERS: -- possible?

MS. RUSSELL: -- an Agency because the Agency field isn't in there. So the main field where you're going to get the -- anything that would be subject-based would be in the title currently. Maybe that's something we want to consider for a later release --

MS. RODGERS: Is --

MS. RUSSELL: -- is to add the --

MS. RODGERS: -- classification.

MS. RUSSELL: -- a bureau or, you know, Agency and Bureau in there.

MS. RODGERS: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: So --
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Sort by SuDoc?

MS. RUSSELL: You can sort by SuDoc. But if -
- you know, like, the -- I think you mentioned -- like,
FEMA used to be FEM, and now it's under HS. So
something like that you're not going to -- yeah.

MS. RODGERS: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: You're welcome.

Kelly?

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger,
Broward County Public.

It just kind of bubbles up to a question that
I've been kind of -- are we going to get a user guide
on how to do this? Because when ASERL came out, I
mean, we had --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- you know, it was a
brief cheat sheet on how to do this. And then it kept
spitting my lists back until I realized I had to put in
blank columns as placeholders into my Excel
spreadsheets. I didn't -- nobody explained that to me.
So I see, for example, this publication is
available electronically. Are we going to have to go
and hunt down everything to see --

MS. RUSSELL: No.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- whether there's an
MS. RUSSELL: That's only if you have it. The idea there was that if you know that something's available electronically and the person who's reviewing it might not want to -- you know, they might not want to take up the space on the shelf if it's available electronically. Or they might want it if it's not -- the idea is that it would give them the opportunity to compare it.

So if you have that, you can enter it. But it's not required.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Okay.


What kind of evaluation and assessment stuff are you hoping to grab out of this database? In other words, are people going to be watching, hmm, what kinds of stuff are people withdrawing and ...

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah, that's a good question. And we actually discussed whether we wanted to have sort of a stats module or a reports module in it. And when we were discussing that, we realized we don't know the requirements for those reports. So we decided to put the reports module or a statistics module off for later.
We do have the ability to sort of pull everything into a spreadsheet on the GPO and if we want to do that and start slicing and dicing it. But we're thinking that once people start using it, then we'll get some better ideas of what people are going to want reports on.

Kelly, have an online question?

MS. SEIFERT: Yes. Can we enter a name that we don't have selected on our (inaudible)? That's a good question. I would think you could. But I guess that might be something we'd have to run past our policy folks and get back to you on.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University of Iowa.

I have two questions, actually. The current -- currently, there are lots of lists posted on listservs -- gov.gal, in particular, as opposed to the Needs and Offers list. What kind of encouragement can there be to use eXchange rather than circumventing --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MS. MASON: -- that? Anyway, that's one question.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MS. MASON: And I don't know if we -- there's an answer to it right now, but I think it is an issue.
The questions just went whew.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MS. MASON: So I'll have to get back to you on that. Sorry.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. I think as far as -- I guess my hope is that it's enough easier to use than posting on a listserv that it's going to -- that's going to help encourage them.

Also, if regions start using this, if it's already in the system, then they're having to reenter it if they're offering it on gov.gal unless they -- I guess they could -- if they have a spreadsheet, they could always offer that again on gov.gal. And there's no reason they couldn't use both if they wanted to.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: This is Tom, Broward County again.

I just want to state, I guess, as a matter of principle, you're going to have to allow people some sort of ability to select if it's not even on their selection policy because, for example, if anybody's weeding anything from the war department --

MS. RUSSELL: That's true.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- nobody has anything from the war department --

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.
MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- in their selection profile --

(Laughter.)

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- at this point or stat abstract, you know --

MS. RUSSELL: That makes sense.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- you say. So -- but again, you might end up with priorities. And I think where that's going to get real hairy is when you start having preservation stewards.

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Somebody claims it. And then a week later, the preservation steward says, oh, I see this on this library -- on this list. Now what do you do?

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: They've already claimed it.

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: They should have the priority.

MS. RUSSELL: And that's --

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Where do we go with this?
MS. RUSSELL: That's one of the things we need to talk through. We are -- it is still legally required by Title 44 to offer it first to your regional and then to your selective. So the best we can do as far as making sure that preservation stewards have, you know, a high-ranking shot at it is give them the third crack at it. That may mean building in another layer into the workflow.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: They built that into the ASERL --

MS. RUSSELL: Right.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: -- back and forth about -- a bit who was able to see what when. And maybe that might be something that might have to get built into it later. But …

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah. And I think another thing that we need to think about is those cases where there's a regional where they've split up their collection. You know, who do those lists go to? Do you -- right now, we've got it set up so that sort of for the traditional model, we -- they have one regional or two regionals.

And then if you've got two regionals, you can say, okay, these libraries go to this regional, and these libraries go to that regional. Or both regionals
can get everything. But we don't have any more
granularity. You know, we can't break it up by SuDoc
number or anything like that at this point.

MS. MASON: My second question suddenly came
back to me. I had hoped that the preservation stewards
would be identified in eXchange. And maybe you're
going to talk about that tomorrow in more detail. But
I think it'd be nice for us to know what the plans are
for that.

MS. RUSSELL: Right. At this point, that's
still something we need to work out. I think we do
definitely want to identify them in some way to make
sure that they are kind of getting the third shot at it
because -- and there are some other things, you know,
like what if your regional wants it but they're not a
preservation steward and there's a preservation steward
who needs it. How do you make sure that you end up
getting your four copies around the country with it
still going to the tradition -- first to your regional,
and then to the selectives in your region.

So there's some -- definitely some things
we're going to have to work out with that.

Anybody else?

Dan, do you want to go ahead?

MR. O'MAHONY: So as Marianne mentioned in the
outset, this has been a longstanding desire on the part of selectives and regionals to have a practical, functional, reliable tool that could magically bring all this stuff together and make our lives a little more efficient and easier to do what can be a very tedious process.

And it certainly wasn't raised in the forecast study as a key priority, again, for regionals and selectives alike.

So to see such great work on this first round of a tool that gets us so much further down the road is great progress.

As you all are sitting there and looking at this tool, you're probably thinking of all the ways in which this is going to impact you directly in terms of how you create your lists and submit them to your regions. And each of the different regions may have their own nuances as to how they handle that process.

But what we thought we might do here is sort of look a little more generally at the practical impact on regionals and selectives and more specifically as it relates to the regional discard policy.

So first off, how does it relate to regionals? How will it impact regionals? Well, the ability to discard materials, the policy has a fundamental change
in the program in that regard in that regionals now will have the option to consider discarding materials. And this, of course, is a voluntary option. There is no requirement on the part of anyone, of any regional, to discard. But if they so choose, this is now an option that they can consider.

Now that we're into the implementation phase, all regionals have been invited to participate in this initial implementation phase of the discard policy. As we've seen in the tool, the overall process, the tool being a key part of that, will help streamline this process for depositories to offer discards and also fill gaps in their collections, those locations, be they regional or selectives, for that matter. But to make those matches and to connect those dots so that those collections can become more comprehensive will be a great advantage here.

And all this relates to building that infrastructure for preservation stewards. And we've talked already about, you know, literally building in that layer within the tool as that becomes necessary to identify who those preservation stewards are so that this tool can feed that process very efficiently.

Okay. I tried that one. Did somebody move it over there? Thank you.
Only two slides, and I couldn't get from 1 to 2.

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: So you know, how will this affect selectives on a practical level? Well, first and foremost, it's going to be a single place to go for all the information that you need in terms of submitting discards and all the actions related to that. And I think even the glimpse that we saw in this initial round, you can see some of the efficiencies built into that process already.

Similarly, as we talked about for the regionals, it streamlines the process overall. And for those selectives that are interested in building collections, albeit smaller collections than your regional colleagues, but this will give you an opportunity to see much more efficiently nationwide what those offers are.

And potentially, as regionals begin to discard some of their materials, there may be some tradeoffs there as well in terms of building those local collections -- again, the opportunity for libraries to participate in -- as a preservation steward, because that's open to all depository libraries, not just regionals. And in order for that network to be
widespread and robust, it's going to require all
different kinds of depositories to be participating.
And at least in this initial phase, there is a
potential opportunity for where a preservation steward
has been identified and where that preservation steward
needs to build that collection, potentially
transferring materials from selectives to that
preservation steward's collection at GPO's expense.
That's something that they are trying to fund on a
case-by-case basis going forward.

So those are some of the general practical
effects at both the regional and the selective library
experiences. We're -- we've got lots more times for
more questions or comments or sharing of your own sort
of insight into how this might impact your own -- oops,
excuse me -- your own state's operations or other
questions.

Questions first from Council?

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of
Washington.

It really is becoming clear to me as you sort
of wrap this up for us that this will also dovetail
with things like people's awareness of super session
rules and so on. And so I think as we're moving
forward as a whole community using one platform, people
will perhaps be talking more about, oh, yes, this was always something you kept the latest only of or regionals chose to retain.

I'm excited about the dialogue I see coming -- again, not a question but a comment.

MR. O'MAHONY: Anybody else from Council?

Barb?

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

Also a comment, I think it's terrific. I think -- I know everybody who's not in ASERL is really sick of us saying these things. But I think when people see how easy it is to add with a form or to add with a .csv file or something, that this will be really used a lot.

And the story I always tell in Virginia is the first time that one of my select -- one of the selectives in Virginia got -- somebody claimed something from her, she had tears in her eyes --

(Laughter.)

MS. SELBY: -- because no one goes through those Word files. It's just -- this is going to make it so people will actually get materials they want and doing it at the national level is just going to be, you know, so much even better.
MR. ABERCROMBIE: Hello. Brent Abercrombie, Indiana State Library.

I guess I have a question. I don't know how every state does their Needs and Offers database. I'm unfamiliar with the ASERL that has been mentioned a few times.

But I know, my state, we have -- we just created a new Needs and Offers database earlier in the year that looks a little bit different than what is currently shown right now.

So I guess I would value a little bit more contextual information about what other states are doing for Needs and Offers because, right now, if my selectives from Indiana wanted to, you know, participate in this, they would end up looking in two different places and not one because, just in looking at it, I can tell our Excel spreadsheet formats are a little bit different.

Ours have extra quirks compared to yours, but I just don't know how easy of a sell it would be for me to go to my powers that be and go you know all that hard work you did on your Needs and Offers, well, there's this, you know, brand new toy that, you know, we can hop on and, you know, ignore the previous year's work.
So I don't know if that's a question, more just a concern coming from my end.


I mean, just from my own experience, we have -- or in Ohio, we have just a listserv right now where people email off their Needs and Offers every month, or every so often. And I think this would be -- for us at least, I think this would be a pretty simple sell to go a different direction from just an email list.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University of Iowa.

The lists that Iowa libraries compile could be an Excel sheet, in -- a Word-processed document. Another library has a website where they post all of their lists, their own. So it's a real potpourri of how Iowa libraries submit their lists. And it's the inconsistency that has caused some frustration, I think.

So I think with very little effort in selling this, I think Iowa will benefit from the eXchange. But that's the current situation for Iowa.

MR. MATHESON: Okay. Lisa, this is Scott Matheson from Yale Law School.

It looked to me like the spreadsheet importer
could be set so that if you had a set of spreadsheet-type data that had the required fields, now, that might be an issue with the Indians -- what they're currently doing, that you could also import it. You could just tell it the fields are in a different order.

MS. RUSSELL: Yeah, we tried to -- can you hear me? We tried to develop the spreadsheet so that you could -- you know, if you were using ASERL and had uploaded a spreadsheet, you could go ahead. And once it's gone through the ASERL tool, upload it into eXchange in the same format.

Or we also tried to do it so that you could download -- if you had -- probably -- I don't know if it would work better for Needs and Offers. But anyway, if you had catalog records from your own OPAC that you had identified as things you wanted to offer, things you needed, you know, maybe they're things that have been missing for three years, or whatever, maybe those are things you want to upload as needs, that you would be able to download into a spreadsheet and then upload it into the tool.

MR. MATHESON: Thank you.

MR. O'MAHONY: Whether it's, you know, your state or any other state -- Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library -- I think, ultimately, it's going
to come down to what are the advantages and disadvantages. You know, whatever local systems or processes we may be undertaking now, one this national system comes up and is fully functional, if the advantages to playing in the national arena outweigh whatever hard work went into a local system, then we'll all make those decisions. Yeah.

Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Two questions. First is are preservation stewards synonymous to ASERL's Centers of Excellence.

MS. RUSSELL: Cindy Atkin over there is shaking her head no. No, it really -- I'm seeing both of the people who are working most on the regional discard process that say -- shaking their heads no. They're actually people who are choosing particular areas of the collection that they're saying we're going to keep this forever.

And I don't know if either, Cindy or Heidi (ph), you want to -- I'm probably jumbling this pretty much -- if you want to respond to that. Or Suzanne -- I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Sorry. I forgot this was regionally -- recently assigned to Suzanne. So I overlooked her.

MS. EBANUES: Suzanne Ebanues, GPO.
Preservation stewards are library either regional or selectives who are saying that we're going to keep this portion of our collection permanently and we're going to take steps to preserve it to ensure that there's -- if the material needs to be boxed, then we'll get some boxes. And that's one of the things GPO's investigating, is what kind of help we can provide on that in addition to we are going to cover expenses, shipping expenses, to fill gaps in a preservation or its collection or to get them better copy.

So it's similar to the ASERL Centers of Excellence, but there are some differences.

MR. MATHESON: This is Scott from Yale Law School.

The memorandum of agreement, just for everyone's reference, the sample draft form Memorandum of Agreement for Preservation Stewards is on the FDLP website now. You can read it. It's only five pages long, four and a half pages long, including the signature block. So it's a light read, and it's interesting. So I would suggest that folks look at that and that they consider coming or tuning in remotely to tomorrow morning at 10:30's Could you Already Be a FIP Net Partner session --
(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: -- where we'll talk in more depth about this.

MS. WILLIAMS: Beth Williams from Stanford Law School.

I just want to echo a previous comment about the utility of being able to query this database. I think I can see a real powerful need for me to be able to query to see what other people are collecting and to get a general idea about my own future -- so just to put in a plug.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you. That's a good comment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: One more as well. Have you considered having a category from (inaudible) to replace collections due to natural disasters that might have more weight (ph) than selectives, et cetera?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes, we actually don't have -- we didn't go over it. But we do have -- when you put in your needs, there's a place where you can check if it's something that you're looking for to replace something for the -- that's been damaged or lost in a natural disaster.

There's also a place that you can check if
it's something that you need for a digitization project. So if you're working on digitization and there's, you know, a missing issue of something that you're digitizing, you can put that in as a need and mark it as something that's needed for digitization. You know, and maybe when it gets to that -- if it's someone outside your region, maybe when it gets to that offer nationally, they'll give you dibs over someone else.

MR. O'MAHONY: I'm envisioning all the nifty little icons that might be up there for the various different --

(Laughter.)

MR. O'MAHONY: -- disasters.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida.

To that, there may be a need to override someone not offering it nationally because as it would have to be offered nationally for it to show up in the needs at that point, right, unless we moved earlier with the regional. So we have to have some way to override. So I would say I'm not offering it nationally, but we tried to fill these gaps or preservation steward. There has to be some way that it will filter into their needs list.
MS. RUSSELL: Right. I think in order to -- for the need and the offer to match, the needs and the offers match at sort of the same -- in the same phases. So if you have a need -- if your regional has a need and you have an offer, it's going to match your regional first. And your offer's also going to match a need for another selective in your region first.

And then if we could build in that third level for the preservation stewards, then they would get the fourth -- it would -- it still matches in the same sequence. But I think I see what you're saying.

MR. GAUSE: Just that if they were saying we're not going to offer it nationally --

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, yeah.

MR. GAUSE: -- that's after it goes to preservation steward matching, that they're not offering that beyond the preservation steward. But it still matches the preservation steward.

MS. RUSSELL: Ah, okay. Yeah, so you're saying build in three so that it has to go through all three. And then the offer nationally comes as the fourth, and that's where it becomes optional.

MR. GAUSE: Right.

MS. RUSSELL: Gotcha.

MR. O'MAHONY: So if there are no more
question, I think we want to thank Lisa and all the
good folks at GPO for the wonderful work done to get us
to this point.

(Applause.)

MS. MASON: And one final note, I think we can
all look forward to an FDLP Academy webinar --
(Laughter.)

MS. MASON: -- on how to use this. And there
may be a whole series of webinars.

But thank you, everyone, for your -- for
attending and your good questions. Thanks a lot.

(Applause.)

(Off the record.)
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MR. WALLS: All righty. Good morning, everyone. It is a little after 8:30, so we will go ahead and get started.

I have just one or two quick announcements for the group, and you can pass these along to other folks you see who I know were in our other great sessions this morning.

For the online folks, I want to remind everyone, if you're watching the stream, if you're in the stream, great. You're welcome. But there's a second stream today that covers the events in the Washington Ballroom, which you'll also be able to do.

Those will also be recorded if you're torn between participating here and participating there. But I wanted to let people that there are options for, if you're a virtual attendee, to see some of the other sessions as well.

A quick announcement for those in the room -- and please pass this around to your colleagues -- this afternoon, the -- one of the local restaurants that we often go to for lunch, California Pizza Kitchen, is doing a fundraiser event, which is great. There's details on the
board. But it means there's a very limited menu from 11:00 o'clock to 12:30. So either plan to go a little later in the break time for lunch if that was your destination, or read the details of the fundraiser which I've put on the board, which is a great idea as well.

So those are sort of my announcements for this morning, and I will turn it over to our folks who are going to talk about digital stewardship. Thanks.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. I'm Beth Williams from the Stanford Law Library, and I'm very pleased to be talking to you this morning about digital stewardship.

Anyone who's undergone a digitization project, large or small, is quickly confronted with technical considerations that, in a world of multiple standards, seems more than a little daunting.

I'm extremely pleased to introduce such a large group of LSCM experts who will speak to us about their progress in creating a preservation plan for GPO along with some practical considerations about implementation of the FIPNet Program, which we'll hear more about
later today.

In this morning's program, we'll explore an important piece in the puzzle of GPO's future. Developing partnerships with us for digitizing government information in a way that provides not just ready access to government documents, but long-term preservation of this critical information.

Put another way, for depository libraries like us to succeed in reducing the footprint of our physical collections while making and sharing ever-larger digital collections, we need practical guidance. Thankfully, our panel members are here to help.

Please join me in welcoming Cindy Etkin, Senior Program Planning Specialist; Fang Gao, Chief of LSCM's Library Technical Services; David Walls, LSCM Preservation Library and FIPNet Coordinator; Jessica Tieman, Strategy and Technology Expert Consultant; and Lisa LaPlant, FDsys Program Manager. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. ETKIN: Thanks, Beth.

And thanks to Council for having a session on digital stewardship.
We're pleased to be here to share a whole bunch of information with you. And thank you, too, for the audience for coming to this session when we know that there are other good sessions going on at the same time.

So we're going to go through with some different panelists, and then we're going to hold questions to the end. Okay. Then we'll move on, for those of you who are watching online. And this is me, Cindy Etkin, and I'm going to go first.

I was on vacation in September and I got this email confirming that I was going to speak on this panel.

(Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: Thank you.

It was a great vacation. And I thought I'm not on this panel, but okay. So (inaudible), sure, I'll talk. I'll do anything. So what do you want me to talk about?

So I'm here to talk about how digital stewardship and the digital preservation fits in with our national plan and how we're moving towards our vision of making government information available when and where it's needed.
So we released the national plan earlier in the year, and I've point out on this slide the outcomes that relate to digitization. So of course, we're going to have more online official government content accessible to depository libraries, to you all, and to your users, to the public at large.

And we want federal agencies to have more awareness and to contribute their content to the Federal Depository Library Program and to FIPNet, the Federal Information Preservation Network, which David will talk about in just a bit.

We want the Catalog of Government Publications to be the most comprehensive index of federal government information, the corpus of federal government information. And we want our users to be able to be confident that the content they're using is official, digital, and secure, that it's authentic and it's complete. And Jessica will be talking about the Trustworthy Digital Repository Audit and how we're going to be achieving that. And in the end, this national collection of U.S. Government information is going to be accessible to future generations.
And some of you may recall that we had three strategies for success, three strategic priorities. And there are two of them that related to what we're talking about this morning. The first one is life cycle management of government information. We're looking to build a whole life cycle management process at Library Services and Content Management that GPO -- and Fang is going to be talking a little bit about that.

The third strategic priority is services. And it was mentioned a little bit yesterday that we needed to have more of a service environment. And this is one of our strategic priorities -- to become more service-oriented, user-oriented, and to provide the users with what they need.

So while people have been out talking about FIPNet at conferences and in different kinds of settings and we have been encouraging people to consider being FIPNet partners, we've been doing some things internally that aren't necessarily visible to you all. And that is we're starting to build that administrative structure so that we can administer the FIPNet
And so what we have in the way of new documentation that supports that, we have the Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statements. These are available on FDLP.gov.

2016-2 defines the content of scope for GPO's system of online access, FDsys govinfo. And we have a policy, 2016-4, that defines permanent public access through preservation.

So we now have documented in Superintendent of Documents Policy that the content that will be available in our system and that preservation is, indeed, a way that we can provide permanent public access to future generations.

And just this last week, we made available a collection development plan for GPO's system of online access. We haven't done an announcement yet on that — no news alert yet. We will do that.

But for those of you who are here and who are listening through our live stream, it is available on FDLP.gov, and you can find it under Project Resources for the TDR, the Trustworthy Digital Repository Project page. This is
supporting documentation for our efforts in the
TDR certification.

These are some of the actions that are
in the national plan that relate, and this is
probably pretty small for you read. But it's
developing a preservation program within the LSCM
business unit.

It is digitization of information the
national collection. It's about continuing to
participate in the development of standards and
guidelines. And David will share a little bit of
that with you. It's about the authentic and
digital content in FDsys govinfo, and Lisa will
share a bit of that with you as well as Jessica.

And of course, what's very important to
us -- and you all have told us it's important to
you -- is that we do have that TDR certification.

We're going to be working with agencies
to identify their content, their corpus of
content, digital as well as tangible. And part
of this whole life cycle management, we're
transforming LSCM from a print-centric to a
content-centric organization.

So our ultimate goal is achieving our
vision, which I said earlier is to provide
government information when and where it's needed. So if we take a look at our strategies, we take a look at our actions, and we are moving on all of those that we really achieve our goal. And for those of you know me, I really, really, really like hockey. (Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: And for those of you from St. Louis, I'm really sorry, but here's a really nice picture that I captured of Burakovsky getting a winning goal against St. Louis. (Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: But we, too, can have a winning goal. Our ultimate goal is achieving our vision, and I think that what we have laid forward in our plan and the actions that we're working on, everybody in LSCM and with the folks in programs, technology and systems, we're going to do well for you, I think.

So that's my pulling it all together and how it relates to what we're doing and where we're going.

And I'm going to turn it over to David.

MR. WALLS: Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.
MR. WALLS: Thanks for coming up, 
joining us so early on a Tuesday morning. 
So Cindy kind of went through the 
national plan. What I want to do is to call out 
some very specific things in the national plan 
that are within the national plan for access, are 
important outcomes that support digital 
stewardship -- access to more complete authentic 
content, of course, is something we all want and 
the community has been asking for, for some time; 
access to content shared by federal agencies as 
well as content provided by FIPNet partners 
through collaborative partnerships made by the 
FIPNet initiative; and content that is accessible 
for future generations because we know that there 
is no such thing as long-term access without 
digital stewardship.

Within the national plan for an access 
are specific obligations that we recognize 
through the federal government that we have an 
obligation to preserve our information.

And specifically, that means implement 
the FIPNet program and expand the partnerships, 
develop and strengthen the preservation program 
within Library Services and Content Management,
raise the preservation of government information
to a very high level in the national priority,
and to digitize as much as possible through
partnerships the tangible collection of
government publications, and, of course, maintain
an inventory of the preservation copies of record
that we do have and continue to participate in
guidelines and standards.

So what actually is digital life cycle
management? It's the progressive technology and
workflow, workflow processes, needed to ensure
long-term sustainability of and access to digital
objects and metadata. It's about the active
stewardship of digital assets over time through
policies, staffing, resources and technology,
preservation with strategic initiatives and
programs like FIPNet, and processes designed to
maintain useful access to information assets so
that the information needs of both present and
future generations.

I like to talk about publications and
digital content as assets because that's a word
in our culture that immediately triggers a sense
of value. We value assets. We manage them
carefully.
Sometimes -- you know, working in a large library, sometimes the publications just become so much stuff. But if we think of them as assets, that's something that we will develop policies and processes and things to preserve and to guard against.

So within the Preservation Federal Network, just to remind people of what it is, it's a collaborative strategy of information professionals working in various partner roles. We don't have the content. The libraries do.

We want to work and partner with FDIPs and other stakeholders to ensure access to the national collection of government information.

The various partner roles that we conceived of that people have responded to and said they want to participate in are on the right -- digital imaging, content hosting, cataloging of metadata, web harvesting, tangible preservation stewardship, the preservation steward partners, collection care, and conservation.

Within GPO and the FIPNet community and the preservation program we're developing, what I've called out in this slide is the things on
the left are things that we're doing to build our own in-house infrastructure within Library Services and Content Management. The things on the right are things that we are specifically doing to also support the FIPNet program and the partners and the outside community of stakeholders.

And that is to continue to support the partner roles for the community; to simplify the participation documentation; develop guidance for specific partner roles -- we're going talk a little bit about that this morning; and to provide opportunities for partners to discuss and advise LSCM through future webinars and forums; and to engage the community better in stakeholder participation and problem solving.

We are also hiring some positions within LSCM to support digital preservation and finishing plans for not only collection and development of digital, but also for life cycle management, for improving processes, for metadata extraction, and requirements for developing digital quality assessments. So when content comes in to the program, that we can appropriately assess it.
We're working toward improved stewardship of web-harvested content. And of course, our large task is -- when Jessica talks about the Trusted Digital Repository assessment, is to be able to respond to those things where some improvements are needed and, of course, to maintain FDsys as the digital repository and system of record for digital stewardship of our digital assets.

So as far as guidance goes, there was a link on the conference publication page for the new guidance document for digitization partners. And that document basically recognizes these three principles that digital imaging partners provide to us in that they increase public access to legacy and historic federal government information in digital formats, they're providing authentic digital service of federal government publications that preserves the life of tangible copies for use, and they're preserving authentic digital copies within the Trusted Digital Repository framework of FDsys for future generations.

Within the guidance document -- we'll just take questions about that, if people have
looked at it, later.

The guidance document itself specifically discusses sort of the principles of digital imaging -- what you're trying to achieve in a digital imaging process; what our preferred and acceptable master imaging formats are -- we decided to give some options; and a process for content, either already digitized or resulting from a current digitization effort.

Part of the basis of FIPNet is to recognize that libraries are digitizing this content not necessarily for us but for their own collection development requirements, their own preservation needs, things like that.

We're providing an opportunity for the libraries to give that content to us to store it within FDsys so it can be part of the national collection of digital government information and receive the security and access that it needs.

We want to talk to people about following (ph) conventions and things like this. There's minimal technical metadata specifications in the document. And we can talk about content packages if the digitization imaging partner can provide them.
So I will turn it over to Jessica.

MS. TIEMAN: Hello. My name is Jessica.

Part of my participation on this panel is to provide some context as to how internal units within GPO sort of work together for achieving digital stewardship, best practices, and prescribing to certain standards.

And also, I'm going to talk about -- or try to sort of bridge together the bits and pieces of this a little bit. And I think that by this point in time, a lot of people have heard about the TDR standard, have heard that we're starting full digital (inaudible). There's studying preservation program. There's FIPNet. There's the Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statements.

So a lot of new stuff going on. And it might not appear to be completely related, but all of these bits and pieces are definitely related. And a lot of them are sort of running tangentially to a lot of the developments and recommendations that have come out of the internal Trustworthy Digital Repository assessment that I performed.

In November 2014 is when GPO first
announced that they really wanted to certify the repository FDsys, which is now govinfo, against an international standard. And that international standard is ISO 16363.

So I'm going to refer to it as ISO 16363 or just the ISO standard throughout the rest of the day. And I have a session at 2:45 today that I will really delve in deeply into my actual internal assessment and what the next steps for GPO will be to achieve external certification within the audit process.

But sort of -- in November 2014 is when GPO announced that they wanted to sort of go through with this direction, and then I came to GPO in June of 2015 as part of the National Digital Stewardship Residency Program. This is a program that is administrated through the Library of Congress but funded through IMLS. And essentially, I went to GPO and was there to dedicate my full time and attention to an internal assessment against this standard.

So just as an overview of what I did as this resident doing -- performing, this assessment, I worked very closely with the ISO 16363 standard, which is a list -- it's a
standard and a list of 109 criteria. And those
109 criteria are grouped across these three main
areas. So there is an area of criteria that are
organizational infrastructure. There's digital
object management, and there's infrastructure and
security risk management.

These 109 criteria are not -- they're
not proportionally equitable throughout these
main areas. For example, digital object
management is one of the bulk of the ISO
standards. There's about 60 or so within that
109 that are solely about digital object
management.

So that's really a large core of that
assessment process. But then organizational
infrastructure and security risk management have
about 25 to 30 criteria each.

And part of my role on this panel is to
make sure that everyone understands that GPO, as
an institution, will be going -- will be
undergoing this assessment process because there
are many, many groups and parties involved in the
success of the data repository.

So while Library Services and Content
Management is playing a very predominant role in
preservation of policies and preservation
guidelines and establishing some work flows,
particularly for reformatted content, for
digitization of content and ingest from FIPNet
partners and so forth because they serve that
role as the administrative party over the FDLP
and so forth.

Even though they play such a prominent
role, there's also many other groups in GPO that
really contribute to the repository. So when it
comes to who I'm evaluating -- I realize this
text is kind of small. But when it comes to
organizational infrastructure, the parties that
are really involved include LSCM. It also
includes the business unit Programs, Strategy and
Technology, which is actually where I spend a
large majority of my time and where I -- and
that's also where I was situated during my
residency program.

It also includes plant operations. It
includes acquisitions. RIT and security
departments are also -- provide a lot of services
in support for our repository systems. And we
also have a lot of vendors and contractor
development staff that really support all areas
of the repository.

When it comes to digital object management, the large majority of those activities and responsibilities falls upon Programs, Strategy and Technology. PST sort of leads the daily operations and the development of the repository itself.

And so all of the way that we handle our digital objects, a lot of our infrastructure systems that support that, and a lot of our automated processing and parsing of the content, all of those responsibilities fall on PST. And Lisa LaPlant will go in more depth as to how that content is ingested and preserved and so forth from a technology point of view.

Specifically, PST includes staff that are dedicated specifically to our search technologies, our repository, our content management system. And even the govinfo website is managed by PST.

When it comes to security and risk, PST also plays a predominant role. PST governs a lot of the risk registry for our repository.

So for example, if our file formats are at risk of not being lendable (ph) 5, 10 years
from now, this would have, you know, have those
communications about should we be transforming or
what would we do. So they manage things like
that. They also sort of do the planning for --
the financial planning for our storage costs and
things like this that support our infrastructure
systems.

And obviously, because PST serves such a
predominant role in infrastructure for the
repository preservation services, they also have
to interface a lot with IT and security.

And what that looks like in terms of
very specific responsibilities, in terms of
evaluating organizational infrastructure, the
types of things that are in the ISO 16363
standard that I evaluate are things like policy
documents.

So that would include -- let's see --
our public policy statements. It includes
operating procedures, collection development. It
includes analysis of our statutory authority, our
design documentation, contingency planning, our
financial security, our configuration management
documentation, and also documentation of things
like service level agreements.
And this is not an extensive list but just an example of what types of things I assess and look at when I'm assessing organizational infrastructure to support preservation.

When it comes to digital object management, the types of things that I assess are metadata policies -- how authentic or how we're measuring the integrity of our digital objects, what our file naming and digital object identification processes are.

I'll be checking fixity. I'll be checking for file type. How discoverable is our content? Is our digital repository conforming to standards such as the Open Archival Information System?

And then when it comes to infrastructure and security risk management, the types of things I assess are how well do we monitor our systems, do we have redundant backup, you know, of weighed (ph) double parity storage and so forth.

Are our service level agreements comprehensive? Are we properly modeling our storage costs by monitoring backup and restore processes, disaster planning and mitigation?

Things like this are what I assess for
infrastructure and security risk management.

And in terms of determining if the processes that GPO does are successful or not, in compliance with the ISO 16363 standard, the way that I assess if something is good, essentially, is how well it meets the needs of the designated community. The designated community is a concept that is defined in the OAIS standard, also in preceding documentation that sort of chartered or led the way for the OAIS standard.

It's also spoken about in depth throughout the ISO 16363 standard and states that a designated community is an identified group of potential consumers. They should be able to understand a particular set of information. These consumers might consist of multiple communities and are designated by the archive and might change over time.

So earlier, I know in this conference it was brought up that, basically, the success of preservation is not just that you can access the content but that it's actually understandable and reusable and relevant. And so everything that I assess is within this context of does it meet the needs of our designated community.
And for GPO, the designated community includes the American public, which is very broad, but it more specifically includes the FDLP. It includes our federal partners and stakeholders. It includes our content originators -- so constantly making sure that our metadata, our collections, that these things are actually renderable and usable and that our processes are understandable as well.

So there has been an increased effort to provide, you know, more documentation of a system on the govinfo website to have more open conversation about what our services are and sort of forms like this.

And very briefly, I've been asked to just reiterate why it is that ISO 16363 is sort of the best or why GPO is choosing this sort of assessment process.

So just brief history. In the spring, I gave a similar conversation and went in more depth into the history. So you can go and look at that in the FDLP website recordings.

But just as history, the repository is modeled off of the OAIS framework and Lisa will go in more detail about that, but this is a
standard that the repository is built off of. It was released in 2003.

About the same time that OIS was being written, a document was released called Trusted Digital Repositories: Attributes and Responsibilities. This is still a very key document, despite it being over 10 years old, almost 15 years old.

And ultimately, this document defined all the things that digital repositories need to be doing and also claimed that there needs to be a way to certify digital repositories to be able to know that when they claim they are doing preservation, are they really and how do you confirm that.

Ultimately, that grew into the TRAC standard, and CRL performed several audits of repositories under TRAC. And at that time, TRAC was a checklist of responsibilities and things that repositories need to be doing.

But it was not necessarily an international recognized standard. It was more of a just a -- it was a very strong, useful document. And CRL performed these audits and those repositories really paved the way. Those
six repositories that underwent that certification process of CRL really paved the way for what repository audits could look like or should look like.

And ultimately, TRAC evolved into the ISO standard that is now a standardized process. And if you listened to my previous discussion in the spring, you'll know that no repository has been audited underneath ISO 16363 yet because the standard to certify auditing bodies to perform these audits wasn't released until 2014.

So it's not -- at this time, it's assumed there are probably auditing bodies that are being certified to perform these audits, but none of them have publicly stated that. But this is an opportunity for GPO to potentially be the first repository to undergo the certification process.

And I know that this slide says 2:30, but I'm pretty sure my presentation is actually at 2:45. So if you come to that presentation, I'll be going more in depth about my internal assessment specifically.

And now I'll turn it over to Lisa.

MS. LAPLANT: All right, folks. Good
morning. So my name is Lisa LaPlant, and I'm the FDsys govinfo Program Manager. I've been involved with the FDsys program since around 2004, so it's a pleasure to speak to Council again. I know it's been a couple years since I've been able to speak with you all.

So I'm going to give you a brief technical overview of the FDsys system in relation to digital object management under the OAIS model.

So for some of you, this will be a refresher. We're going to talk about packages. We're going to talk about ingest, the model. For some of you it will be a new exposure to some of this terminology.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. LAPLANT: Aha, that would help. But first, some background. So GPO's Federal Digital System was launched in 2009, and it was a replacement for the old GPO Access system. So some of you probably remember the old GPO Access (inaudible) system. It provides access to over one million titles from legislative, executive, and judicial
organizations. And we get around 40 million retrievals or document downloads per month.

So another big piece of information and news related to our site was the launch of govinfo. We launched it as a public beta on February 3rd, 2016, and it will eventually replace FDsys.

So I encourage you to come to the session this afternoon. I want to say it's at 4:00 o'clock. It's right after Jessica's session. We give an update on the content and some of the developments related to govinfo.

All righty. So I know you all have probably seen this slide before, but we'll go into it. And the system can be thought of as three distinct components. So it's a content management system that securely controls digital content throughout the life cycle to ensure authenticity and integrity. It's a preservation repository that follows archival system standards to ensure long-term preservation of and access to digital content. And it's a public access website that combines extensive metadata with modern search technology.

All right. How about a slight deep dive
into the OAIS model? So FDsys was built on the Open Archival Information System model. It is an ISO standard, ISO 14712. And the reference model addresses functional activities for ingest, archival storage, data management, administration, preservation planning, and access to digital content throughout its life cycle. In addition, the reference model provides a set of functional requirements for preservation systems.

So I'm going to go through each one of these because I think it's going to help frame our discussion, especially in terms of digital stewardship and life cycle management.

So the first requirement is to negotiate for and accept appropriate information from information producers; second, to obtain sufficient control of the information provided to the level needed to ensure long-term preservation.

Third, determine by either itself or in conjunction with other parties which community should become the designated community and, therefore, should be able to understand the information provided.

Fourth, ensure that the information to
be preserved is independently understandable to
the designated community. In other words, the
community should be able to understand the
information without needing the assistance of the
experts who produced it.

Fifth, it should follow documented
policies and procedures which ensure that the
information is preserved against all reasonable
contingencies and which enable the information to
be disseminated as authenticated copies of the
original or traceable back to the original.

Sixth, make the preserved information
available to the designated community.

So it really captures that entire life
cycle from production to management to being made
available out to the designated communities.

The reference model also provides a
unique vocabulary for how information is
packaged, described, and presented. The model
uses the concept of an information package. The
package includes digital objects, metadata
required to described the objects, and packaging
information that associates the content and the
metadata together.

So in terms of content life cycle, the
preservation process within FDsys begins at ingest when an archival information package is created from a Submission Information Package.

And now I'll go into a little more detail about packages in FDsys govinfo.

All right. Our first package is a Submission Information Package. It contains files to be submitted to the system, and it may optionally contain metadata. A SIP can be collection specific, or it can meet a minimal set of submission guidelines.

And here's an example of a Submission Information Package in our content management system. So when I log in to the internal interface of FDsys govinfo and I go to, say, for example, the Federal Register collection and I go to the SIP area, this is what I would see.

So you'll see that -- actually, I'm sorry. It's a little bit small. There are different file folders. There is a graphic submitted. There is a PDF submitted. There's SGML submitted. There's text submitted. So this is what I would see right before I submit a Federal Register package to the system. So it includes all required file formats or renditions,
and it also includes optional file formats for a valid SIP in the Federal Register collection.

Our next step in the process is the creation of an Archival Information Package. An archival information package contains all submitted formats or renditions plus a MODS XML file which contains descriptive metadata, a PREMIS XML file which contains our authenticity and preservation metadata, and an AIP.XML file which is our METZ file, so it binds the entire package together. So METZ tells us everything, all the parts and pieces that makes this package self-describing.

So if I log in to the preservation repository, what am I going to see for the same package? So I see all of our submitted renditions. I see locator, PDF, postscript, graphics, text, SGML. I see a MODS file, our PREMIS file, and our AIP METZ file.

Okay. So an access content package is specific to our system. It is not defined in the OAIS model, but it's something that we use in order to be able to manage the content and metadata internally within the system.

So it contains both a copy of the
submitted preservation files and any access
derivatives. So, for example, a digitally-signed
PDF is in an access content package. The PDF
that's unsigned is in our AIP in the preservation
area.

Another example for the Federal Register
collection is the XML that we create from
submitted SGML files is in the ACP, but it's not
in the preservation area in the AIP.

And we do this in order to be able to
continually update and create different types of
access derivatives. We can run an AIP through
our processing steps in order to create new
access derivatives as technologies change and as
the needs of our designated community changes.

You'll also notice that there's a file
kind of near the bottom called an FDsys.XML file.
This is an internal schema that we use to manage
metadata as we move it back and forth from
component to component within the system.

So this is what our ACP looks like in
our content management system. So you will see
that we have all of the folders, all of the
renditions, with the dash (ph) submitted. So
those are the files, the renditions, that came in
through submission. And then we also have the access derivative.

So I have an HTML that's created from the text. We have a PDF, digitally-signed PDF, that's created from the submitted PDF. We have an XML rendition that's created from the SGML and our FDsys.XML metadata.

All right. And finally, our dissemination information package. So this is what's available on the public website. It has all public access renditions, plus MODS, PREMIS and METZ.

So while you can get all of these pieces individually on the public site -- you could download a PDF, you could download a MODS file, you could download the PREMIS file -- we also make it available as a ZIP file. So you can download the entire content package, if you'd like. So for example, if I click on the ZIP file on our public site, I'll see that ZIP file has HTML, PDF, XML. And then it also has our METZ file, it has MODS, and it has PREMIS.

All right. So slightly shifting gears, as many of you know, there are two separate instances of our system. One is our production
instance, and the other is our continuity of operations instance. So when I say instance, it means two separate copies of the entire system. So let's get into that a little bit more.

So at each instance, we have a set of servers and filers. So we have storage filers, which I'll come to that in a second. We have database servers. We have content management system servers, processor servers, search servers, search admin servers, application servers, web services, and visualization servers.

So just to kind of give you an idea of the scope just for search servers, we have 14 of them at each instance. So we're not talking just a single box or a single server. This is a very large system, and that's duplicated at each instance.

So I'd said I'd come back to the storage filers. You'll notice a little purple thing next to it. That's a brain.

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. LAPLANT: Why not? Brains are purple.
(Laughter.)

MS. LAPLANT: So filers can be thought of as a storage brain that manages storage, performance, synchronization, failures, parity, growth without impacting the individual availability of storage volumes, files, or bits.

So when you hear filers, think about it as the big brain that manages your storage. And we have two of them in case one of the brains kind of feels a little flaky that day.

But so just to kind of slightly touch on storage, you know, we do have quite a bit of storage that is -- that manages -- that's the base layer for where all of the content resides.

So if you have specific questions about storage. I'd be happy to address those or come see me after the session, and we can do a really, really deep dive on storage. My original slides had that super deep dive, but we'll hold off on that for now.

All right. So also, at each instance we have a multi-tiered virtual local area network. We have a web tier and application tier and database tier. So think about that as layers of separation.
So items that are in the web tier can really talk to items in the web tier. Items in the application talk to application tier. And items in the database tier talk to database. We also have a set of routers and switchers, firewalls, and a load balancer.

So that's really the snapshot of what we have at each instance. So everything that I just went through we have it at production, and we also have it at our continuity of operations instance.

And this is how we keep it in sync. So I'm not going to go into every single box and dotted line on here, but we have a set of software and hardware solutions where we are able to keep those instances in sync. And it supports both our disaster recovery and our failover processes.

So I've gotten this question recently about the number of copies of files in our system. And I wanted to just kind of run through how many. So we talked about the instances. We talked about the different packages.

So for copies of files in a package, we have -- remember we had both of our production
and coop (ph) instances. So we have production
AIP in the preservation repository, production
ACP on the content management system, production
ASEP in the public site. So that's one instance.

We have the same thing at coop, and then
we also have our weekly backup. So at any point
in time, you could see that within the whole
FDsys govinfo eco system there are seven copies
of a file.

All right. And to just kind of wrap up
on authenticity and integrity, so we record the
SHA-256 hash value for all content files in our
PREMIS metadata. So I would encourage you to go
the public site, whether it be FDsys or govinfo,
and take a look at what's in one of those PREMIS
files. You'll be able to see the hash value for
all content files that are in the system.

And there are a number of open-source
tools, even desktop tools, that you can check
that hash value against a value that's in our
PREMIS.

We also record the significant events in
the life cycle of content in our PREMIS metadata
files. So check out what's in the PREMIS. And
finally, we do put digital signatures on all PDF
documents.

So I just wanted to make sure that I, you know, talked a little bit about authenticity and integrity of our content.

All righty. I'll introduce Fang Gao, and she'll talk about making it happen with metadata.

MS. GAO: Thank you.

MS. LAPLANT: Thanks.

MS. GAO: Thank you, Lisa. This is Fang Gao, Chief Library Technical Services.

So, so far, we've heard about national plan. We've heard about the strategies for success and also FDsys being a system of records. It's -- FDsys is our content management system and preservation repository. And also, it has a user-friendly interface.

So all this, we have to make it work with metadata. So how is this going to affect our work?

So my unit, Library Technical Services, is a unit within LSCM, Library Services and Content Management.

Content management system. So we are involved in the whole life cycle management of --
all the life cycle management of end functions within for government information. We acquire, identify government information. We classify and cataloging, preserving government publications. We also make them available to our public and FDLP, especially.

So a lot of our work you already know. My staff creates records in CGP, the catalog. But probably you haven't heard -- the things that you haven't heard about is creating public -- creating metadata for FDsys.

So a lot of -- some of my Congressional catalogers have been creating the graphic records for our Congressional publications, which live in FDsys. And apart from those, we are also creating metadata for historic content in FDsys.

So for example, with our Treasury Department publications, one of the title is Official Register of the United States by Civil Service Commission and also any reports from the GPO publication.

We not only creating e-records for serious (ph) publications and monograms (ph), we also sometimes create collection-level record. An example for that is the CZ (ph) collection.
So we have a (inaudible) information center collection. That's ingested in FDsys, and it's available from 1951 to 1999.

So some of these projects we've learned a lot. So let me just give you an example from the most recent ingest from the Panama Canal Commission Publications.

So the process is not an easy one. We have staff, the catalogers, and systems librarians, and project and program staff involved in the whole process. So when we have a title, we create -- we make sure the records is in CGP. If it's not, then we will create a preliminary record.

And then our system librarian will crosswalk it into MARC XML. And then we'll have the project and program staff getting the ingest process started with the record.

So there's quite a few back-and-forths and -- until we get the ingest process completed. Then we go back and complete updating the metadata record and having the PURL going directly to the publication. So that's basically the whole process.

So let me give you an example. So which
URL we'll use in our record? So if you look at this search, which I know is a little bit small - if you do, for example, are creating a record for Canal record, so when my staff do a search for this title and wanting to find a URL for the PURL to direct to, after the search, just for Panama records, we have thousands of hits. So obviously, that will not be a good URL to use.

However, the next screen you can see here, when we do a search now, nine records come up, and it's all for this collection. So it has precise results for this search. So how did that happen?

It looks like this will be, you know, the useful and perfect URL for our PURL to direct to. So how did that happen? So the trick here is to have the system number embedded in the MODS record. So through these ingest project, we've learned quite a bit.

So moving forward, what we will need to look into is designate a single and authoritative source of metadata for which metadata are extracted and transformed for multiple purposes. And also, we need to explore automated ways to extract metadata between different systems, CGP,
and FDsys.govinfo.

So we all know sometimes if you search in CGP, of course, when we have the big records and you have PURLs, you click on it, it goes directly to FDsys.

And if you search, for example, budget or, in this example, Panama Canal, the record comes up, and on the left-hand side you will see a view CGP record. If you click on it, it will take you directly to the record in CGP.

But that doesn't happen all the time. Sometimes if it -- sometimes you click on the record in FDsys and click on the view record. It takes you only to FDsys home page. It doesn't really get you to the specific record. So we need to do more about that, having the two systems talking more.

And other way is to develop metadata exchange requirements and procedures when adding new digitized content in FDsys and govinfo.

So with that, we need to equip our staff with new skill sets, increase our proficiency in XML coding, and familiarity with different metadata standards and metadata crosswalks.

We also -- you've heard about, you know,
improving organizational infrastructure to better meet the needs of processing U.S. Government information in the digital environment. So things that are in the works, we are working on collection development librarian end position and the digitization curation librarian positions. And we will definitely wanting to collaborate more with other business units within GPO, PST, and also Customer Service. So those are some of the things we'll be working on. So that's all for my session. And I think we are ready for some questions.

MS. WILLIAMS: I have a simple question, I think. So if I understand the process correctly, if an organization follows the guidelines that GPO has provided and GPO decides to ingest that information into FDsys, you're going to do an internal audit to make sure that the data comports with ISO standards? Will it be -- so if my scans end up somehow in FDsys, will that be distinguishable from your own digitized products?

MS. TIEMAN: So the guidelines that GPO will be providing will be informed by some ISO standards and also some non-ISO standards. Kind
of best practices.

The content that comes from FIPNet partners or from the FDLP libraries, the content itself isn't necessarily compliant with an ISO standard or not. Or it could be, depending on what standard you're looking at. But for the repository center, it is more about our systems and organizational infrastructure.

But we will be able to differentiate from where a content comes from because we do preserve information about the provenance of the content within our PREMIS records.

I don't know if that says it all.

MS. BERNSTEIN: This is Melissa Bernstein from the University of Utah, and I actually have a comment more than a question.

I just want to say that this presentation was extremely helpful, especially for someone -- I'm not the most techie person in the world. And I think this was really useful, and you guys laid everything out very clearly. And I just want to say thank you. So …

MR. CORNWALL: Daniel Cornwall, Alaska State Library. I have a comment and a question.

First, I really want to commend GPO for
putting out specific digitization guidance to libraries. I think this is a really important step moving forward.

And one question about -- aside from -- and I'm not sure if this is, like, on the institution side or on the GPO side, but will there be at some point a check for completeness and human readability?

MR. WALLS: Yes. This is David Walls, GPO. Yes, there will. We're building a quality assessment routine into the content that we get from FIPNet partners that would have to go through both a bibliographic completeness as well as technical specs to be sure that it is what it needs to be for long-term access in digital preservation.

MS. HARTNETT: I'm Cass Hartnett, University of Washington.

Along the same lines, as content flows in, as we hope it will, from partners, how does GPO anticipate staffing or other capacity building to meet that?

MR. WALLS: Right now, we have a digital curation librarian position that we're hoping to have approved and go out for someone to apply
for. We're also trying to look and see what
capacity we do need. It's hard to kind of judge
that at this point.

We're trying to streamline a process to
bring the content in, in a more automated way so
that with automated processes, there's fewer
chance for error -- there's more efficiency -- if
fewer hands have to touch it.

And as we analyze those processes and as
the partnerships develop, we will then be able to
see what other staffing positions we need.

Go ahead.

MS. HARTNETT: And Cass Hartnett again.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible
- off mic).

MS. HARTNETT: Oh, yes, of course.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just
want to add something to what David said.

One of the priorities that was given to
LSCM this year from Director Davita Vance-Cooks
was to fill positions. And you heard reported
how many we're down from our ceiling. But when
people retire or leave or, you know, move on to
other positions, we are looking at positions.

We're looking at the skills that we
need, the knowledge set, the skill sets and
knowledge, that we need for perhaps other kinds
of positions as we move forward in the digital
age and becoming more content-centric.

So we may be filling a position with
something else than what it previously was. And
so that's part of what David mentioned with the
preservation of the digital curation librarian
and the collection development librarian.

And we'll be looking at other needs as
well as we start into this process and get into
our regular work streams, the processes. We'll
be able to figure out more.

But we're not just automatically filling
positions as they become vacant. We're looking
holistically at what we need as an organization
to support the digital age and the processes for
it.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of
Central Florida. For partner digitized material
that meets the digitization specifications, is
there the feasibility of feeding that in and the
bibliographic metadata being added to it not
necessarily by the person, the partner, that
digitized it? It doesn't have all that detail.
That -- it could get -- the process could flow in, and then additional work can be done on it by either another partner or by GPO?

MR. WALLS: This is David Walls, GPO.

Yes, because there's a number of issues within what you said that I kind of hear, which is libraries may not have complete sets of things. So there may be content missing out of the serial. That may require talking to other libraries about filling in those gaps.

We try to set the bar precise but somewhat low for the amount of metadata that a library could provide. We would like, ideally, to have a MARC XML accompany the content. Some libraries will be able to provide that easily. Perhaps some can't.

So the purpose of all the guidance is to provide enough of a framework to show specifically what we want, but to also begin a conversation with the partner to see what we can negotiate, what the capability is, and where there may be gaps that need to be filled in.

MR. MATHESON: This is Scott Matheson from Yale Law Library.

So what I'm hearing is that you --
there's a wide range of -- once these guidelines are no longer draft. And if you scan to these guidelines, that's sort of one part.

But if I'm really ambitious or I've done a lot work in-house, I can talk to Lisa and she'll give me the SIP definition. I can just hand you a bunch of packages, if I want to go all the way the other direction.

MR. WALLS: If -- we had to kind of write them to recognize that there's a variety of people out there with equipment and capability and understanding.

If you regularly create content submission packages for your own internal digital repository and can do that with all the metadata, we can give you the content submission package guidelines and, yes.

MR. MATHESON: Great. So there's a wide variety of opportunities for people.

MR. WALLS: Right. We were trying to create a big table where everyone would feel like they had a stake and a place at the table.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

I just want to add to that. You won't see in the guidelines that are draft all of that
information about how to create the content packages. But what we have out there is basically just the digitization part of that.

If you then want to talk to us about ingesting your content -- and we encourage you to ingest your content into FDsys govinfo -- then we can have further conversations about, well, can you package, can you not package, and work out that and, as David says, the beginning of the conversation.

MS. HARTNETT: Cass Hartnett, University of Washington.

I might be confusing CGP, IRS, govinfo. But could you not have a little indicator in there as well as to whether this was an item for which there are already four presentation partners for the tangible? Or does that information, like, not go here?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.
Are you talking about in FDsys govinfo?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. ETKIN: What? Did I hear something?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).
MS. ETKIN: Yeah, that's in the CGP.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Right.

MS. ETKIN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. ETKIN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. ETKIN: Yeah. We've been investigating putting that, all of that, information into the Catalog of Government Publications, the CGP. So when somebody searches, they'll know where those preservation copies are located. We -- I hadn't thought about where that might go in FDsys.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So FDsys, we actually can create (inaudible) partner (inaudible) content versus metadata, so that's one option. And then (inaudible) there is also important discussions about what (inaudible) as well.

So (inaudible) about who's the partner in what kind of situation. We do that know. We provide (inaudible).

MS. ETKIN: Yeah. That's part of what
Jessica mentioned as tracking the provenance. But that's a little bit different from identifying the preservation stewards.

But one of the things that Fang pointed out as one of the things that we're looking at moving forward is doing some more automated extraction of metadata. And because that information will be in a field in the MARC record in the CGP, that could possibly then be one of those fields that's extracted and then would become part of the metadata record that's in FDsys to govinfo.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But not yet.

(Laughter.)

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida.

It would be nice if that record is able to be analyzed. Like, you've got one preservation partner. You could actually assess which ones don't have preservation partners and which ones still need additional preservation partners, so that some sort count that you could do of it in the way it's entered.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That makes
sense.

MS. WILLIAMS: Any questions from the audience?

MR. SULLIVAN: Is this on? Dan Sullivan, Northwestern University.

(inaudible) repository software are you using? We're using Fedora. I'm just curious.

MS. LAPLANT: Lisa LaPlant, GPO.

So Documentum is our content management system. We have a solid custom Java Parsers that we use to process and parse the content. We have a series of custom Java web applications, so that's on the front end. Does that answer your question?

MR. SULLIVAN: Not completely. In the back end, in terms of managing your objects and the content types --

MS. LAPLANT: Got it.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- that we're using.

MS. LAPLANT: So in terms of file format, we assess against (inaudible) for our -- we have a custom recording for integrity.

So when I talked about the SHA-256 hash value, we have a custom integrity report that we run against all of those hash values to assess
whether there's been any changes in the values
and assess our objects.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University School of Law.

I got a little bit lost in the middle of the alphabet soup, so -- and I have missed a basic premise of this, so this is sort of a premise question -- not PREMIS --

(Laughter.)

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: -- but prefatory question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Again with the alphabet soup.

It sounds like we're talking about taking partner digitized material and authenticating it. Is that what we're now talking about? Because that is a huge change from what we talked about in the past. So I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding what we're talking about now.

MR. WALLS: David Walls, GPO. Yes, that is what we're talking about.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Fantastic.
(Laughter.)

MR. WALLS: Why not? You've been managing the tangible collections in partnership with -- through the FDLP with GPO for years. The provenance on the content bibliographically says that the Government Publishing Office created it and printed it. You've been watching over it in the library for years.

If you want to digitize that publication and do it according to current preservation best practices, we can authentic that digital content, bibliographically account for it in the Catalog of Government Publications, and make it available to the American public just as you did for years in tangible format on your shelves.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: I would like the record to reflect heart eyes emoji, puffy heart paint --

(Laughter.)


(Laughter.)

MR. WALLS: Thank you for saying that.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: All the time.

MS. HALL: This is Laurie Hall. I know
you're excited, whatever, but I just want to put a little reality check on things because that's what I usually do.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: For -- every collection that comes in is different. There's different things that have to be potentially done. If it comes in as wonderful as Scott says his is, then we don't have to do a whole lot.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: If it doesn't, it requires additional work on a lot of our parts, which may mean our staff doing it. It may mean that we need to contract staff to do some of it. So yet you have the digitization guidelines in draft, assuming those have not gone up to FDLP yet, right?

MS. ETKIN: They are on FDLP. They're included with the documentation for the conference with all the handouts.

MS. HALL: Okay. So just everybody take a look at that.

So my reality check is the collection plans has a list of priorities that we have listed there, different levels of priorities of
ingestive (sic) collection types.

We get random offers of collections from agencies that we have to assess and prioritize for ingest. Lisa's staff and contractors are -- they're not thousands of people. There's tweaks to the system that need to be done for different collections, different assessment of metadata.

So I don't want to put a damper on it, okay? We're getting all of this stuff prepared to be able to do this, and so we have a lot processes in place now -- guidance, documents, staff working on doing this. So hopefully, that didn't burn anybody's butt.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Sounds good.

(Laughter.)

MR. JACOBS: I'll give you one jazz hand, how's that?

(Laughter.)

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University.

I'm just wondering if you could talk about fugitives and how they feed into this process, other than digitized content. I'm talking born digital collections that are
individual documents that members in the FDLP are collecting and sending to you. Thanks.

MS. GAO: Fang, GPO. Actually, yesterday we talked about it in LTS updates, and we also have a poster at the poster room.

So we've done an internal review of the document discovery process. We have several channels getting the submission, and we have -- so right now, we are working on two processes.

We have some backlog that has thousands of titles. So while my staff are working on the backlog, we are also having another process set up working on the new submissions coming in to the inbox.

So, so far, for the backlog, we've already made scope (ph) determination and cataloging of more than 700 titles. And for the new things that's coming in, we've cataloged probably more than 400 plus titles.

But all these -- so while we're working on this temporary process, we're also have come up with a plan looking at a long-term solution, maybe having a -- working on -- look for maybe a software technology solution and to automate some of this processes because we need to have a
better system to track when we get all these submissions and who is working on them and where they are in the whole process.

So definitely we are aware of the issues, and we've been working on it. And if you would like to have more information, you can talk with me.

And also, we have a poster upstairs -- I mean -- yeah, on the other side of the hall and there's some more information in there, too.

Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

I just want to add something to what Fang said. She's talking about all the work that they've done on fugitives. But I want to let you know of something that we're going to be entering into with the Federal Research Division of the Library of Congress, which is an effort to determine Agency web publishing practices, out of what offices does that information come.

We know that know this has changed from the tangible environment, so it's to help us better understand what the agencies are doing, the content originators are doing, with digital content, the born digital content, so that we
might better learn and be able to make
connections with them.

And this is part of one of those actions
-- make federal agencies more aware of the FDLP
and contributing their content. So when we know
where we need to go, then we can better work with
them to get their content before it becomes
fugitive.

MR. MATHESON: Cindy, just a quick --
oh, sorry, Laurie -- just a quick follow up. So
right now, when things are reported to
(inaudible), Fang's group is working on them.

When they catalog them, they create --
if they're born digital, which Jim asked -- James
asked about, they're creating a PURL. And that
means that there's a copy being made in permanent
as well?

MS. GAO: Yes.

MR. MATHESON: Okay.

MS. GAO: That's right.

MR. MATHESON: Thank you.

MS. HALL: This Laurie Hall. I just
wanted to tell you a little bit more about what
Cindy's talking about.

We're entering in an interagency
agreement with the Federal Research Division at Library of Congress for them to do a study, case studies, actually. It's going to be -- it's a two-year -- about two years, right, Cindy? I can't remember. A year and a half?

MS. EKTIN: A year and a half.

MS. HALL: A year and a half investigation of federal agency -- some federal agency practices on publishing. So you can get a sense of, A, how much the government is publishing and how much these agencies are publishing to help us figure out just how many documents we're not getting and to talk to them a little bit about their strategies.

So I suspect that probably by the spring we'll have something to report on that study.

Cindy, is that right?

MS. EKTIN: Yeah, I think we will. And the final part of the agreement is for them to come next October to report on this --

MS. HALL: Right.

MS. EKTIN: -- too. So the final analysis and report will be here next year.

MS. HALL: Right.

MS. EKTIN: Right.
MS. HALL: So it's one of the big --

MS. ETKIN: Yeah.

MS. HALL: -- unknowns.

MS. ETKIN: Mm-hmm.

MS. HALL: I mean, we usually just sit at the end of the trough and kind of get things in, find things. You guys find things. So we decided to see if we can get to the -- actually to the agencies themselves and find out what's going on.

MS. ETKIN: Mm-hmm, yeah.

CATHERINE: Yeah, hi. Catherine (ph), Rice University.

I was hoping to hear something about the catalog system evolving to, like, a linked open data system, but I didn't hear that yet. So I'm not sure where that is, if this is the right format for that.

MR. WALLS: Could you say that again louder? I have some troubles listening, but --

CATHERINE: Sure. I was wondering where the discussion is having to do with linked open data for a catalog system, whether it's BIBFRAME or some other system. I'm very curious to hear how that may evolve.
MS. GAO: Okay. I also mentioned it at the LPS updates yesterday.

CATHERINE: Mm-hmm.

MS. GAO: Okay. So we've got -- I've got some requests from our community asking us where we are with BIBFRAME modeling data. Yes, we are closely following the development of BIBFRAME.

So I don't know what all of you have heard about BIBFRAME. It's really an initiative from Library of Congress. It aims to develop metadata in coding standard for the post-MARC environment.

Based on the successful implementation of IDA, we wanted to do -- you know, move our bibliographic metadata from the library community to the web so the people outside our library community can make use of the metadata.

So, so far, our library staff of the whole LSCM, we've been following the development through webinars, attending conferences. The most recent conference meeting we participated is in May in -- at OpCo Meeting at Library of Congress.

We actually participated in the Moving-
Away MARC-a-thon and participated in a virtual tutorial. And they showed us the BIBFRAME Editor and how to create -- use the Editor to create work-level records and manifestation-level record. And we've shared that with our staff. Actually, after this conference, we'll be -- there's a BIBFRAME conference over in Richmond, Virginia, that our staff will be participating in. So stay tuned.

Yes?

MR. SMITH: Hi. Anthony Smith, GPO, Chief of Projects and Systems.

And just to add to Fang's comments, so we are in the process from a systems perspective of working on the next generation solution, which we've affectionately named LSS, Library Services System.

And so we're in the process now of gathering those functional requirements needed. And a lot of that -- those functional requirements will come from Fang's area, the technical service areas, and whether we need to be looking at how to accommodate in this new system environment semantic capabilities and so forth.
But that's in the works right now. We're very close to having a ConOps document where we'll have a model, a conceptual model, to begin building out this new system requirement. So I hope that helps give you a sense of where things are in the process.

MS. GAO: Yes. I also wanted to add, actually, in FDsys, we already have a perfect example of using the link date principle. So there's the capability of linking publications in FDsys.govinfo.

So if you want to look at different versions of bills, they're available. So if you find one bill, you wanted to find all the different versions of the bills, they are all linked together. Thank you.

REBECCA: Rebecca (ph) (inaudible) College.

Thank you for this presentation, for helping us to understand all the planning and the processes that go along with doing all of this amazing work.

My question is actually stepping back a little bit and looking forward to the future. And how confident are you that the level of
funding will remain so that this kind of work can actually take place or even increase?

Are there chains in terms of communicating all of this amazing work to the appropriate funding bodies in Congress? What kind of advocacy -- do you we need to do something? I'm just basically looking at that big picture moving forward.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

Laurie, jump in any time here.

I must say that GPO is very lucky to have a library community that is very supportive of our efforts and often, often go up to the Hill and voice their support for what we're doing not only for appropriations, but when we were building FDsys from -- we wanted to have an online catalog. So through the associations, library associations, we get terrific support for advocacy.

As far as predicting what might happen with the budget, I don't have a crystal ball. But GPO has been -- I don't know if lucky is the right word, but we've been very fortunate to get the funding that we've asked for if not at that level, not far below it. And we'll see what the
MS. WILLIAMS: Any other questions?
Well, join me in thanking these -- all these great participants. It's been --
(Off the record.)

MS. KRUMSEE: This will be the session on the Federal Information Preservation Network, also known as FIPNet. I know as I've heard about the different roles available at FIPNet partners, I could see a number of the different ways that my library could be a partner, whether it's by sharing some of the federal documents that we've digitized as part of a local project or just noting the documents that are so essential to our collection that we can't imagine discarding them and then becoming a preservation steward for the items (ph).

That's all why we decided on the title we went with, which is Could You Already be a FIPNet Partner? And I'm hoping that this will kind of spark you to consider the initiatives that you're currently undertaking and whether in one way or another you could partner with GPO and support the community at large.

This session's going to have a few
different parts. We'll start with Cindy Etkin, who will go over -- kind of give an overview of FIPNet, the policies that are in place, and what kind of different roles there are as a FIPNet partner.

Then David Walls is going to give an overview of the draft memorandum of agreement for FIPNet partners.

Thirdly, we're going to hear from a small panel of depository libraries who are currently partnering, or exploring partnering, or becoming FIPNet partners, and then we'll take your questions.

And finally, we'll conclude with the signing of the first MOA for preservation steward today. So I will turn things over to Cindy Etkin.

MS. ETKIN: Thanks, Kirstin.

Okay. I'll skip right by that. This also has a handout. I don't know if you all got it downloaded or not from the session on FDLP.gov, but there is a handout. It looks like this if you want to get it later.

So we have a lot of people who are interested in being FIPNet partners. Kirstin
mentioned a number of roles, and we'll talk about that. We've talked to a number of libraries. We've talked to some organizations, and a lot of people are interested. There's a great deal of interest in preserving federal government information and -- both tangible and digital. And so we've -- we believe that we are moving in the right direction with FIPNet, and I think this has been reaffirmed through a couple of national dialogues that have been held.

So as we continue to talk about FIPNet at various meetings and in just networking opportunities when where we're out and about on our visits, we continue to generate interest. But at the same time, we have to be back at GPO headquarters and building the infrastructure in order to support the administration of FIPNet. So starting out with programmatic preservation, one of the things in the national plan was to provide a programmatic preservation area within library services and content management. So we're looking at strategic initiatives, programs, and processes designed to maintain useful access to information assets, serving the information needs of both present and
future generations. And in this programmatic preservation, we are going to be looking at organizational structure, the policy framework and documentation that's needed, and then to look at FIPNet itself.

So in the organizational infrastructure, we've talked about lifecycle management. I don't know if all of you were in the last session or not. I see some new faces, so let me say that we've been talking about lifecycle management. We're implementing a lifecycle management workflow within library services and content management. We've been working on processes and workflows, and we have also been looking at what kind of personnel do we need to support this kind of infrastructure.

We know -- we already have a preservation library, and we already have catalogers. We already have technical services librarians, and we've just gotten more of them. We have in the works a position for digital curation librarian and a collection development librarian. And as positions come open, we're looking at the skills and the knowledge base that we need to move forward in a digital age and to
make sure that we have the right personnel with
the right skills to be able to do what we want to
accomplish in the realm of preservation.

So in the policy and framework, we have
the national plan, which was released earlier
this year. We have the collection development
plan for GPO's online system of access, and we
have the memorandum of agreement template.
David's going to talk more in depth about that in
a little bit. And we also have superintendent of
documents public policies.

And so in the first time we have
actually preservation built into the policy and
documentation of the superintendent of documents
and library services and content management. And
a lot of this documentation was created in order
to support the trustworthy digital repository
audit that we will be going through.

There are a lot of things that we
already have in our authority in Title 44 for the
program for cataloging and indexing and for the
federal system -- GPO's federal system -- federal
digital system, but we didn't have separate
documentation outside of that authority.

So what is FIPNet? It's a strategic
initiative to expand depository library program
collections and cataloging and indexing content
for the national bibliographic records inventory.
And we're working through collaborative networks
of information professionals, working in various
partner roles to ensure the future generations
have access to the national collection of
government information.

One of the things that we learned from
the forecast study that we conducted was that a
lot of libraries were not in a position to take
on additional roles. But there were a lot of
people that indicated they could possibly take on
additional roles if it were done in
collaboration.

So when we were looking at building a
preservation program, we wanted to build in a
network. We wanted to be collaborative. We
wanted it to be sustainable. We needed it to be
flexible, and we wanted to leverage the
activities that depository libraries were already
undertaking so that there would not be these
additional responsibilities that libraries would
have to take on.

And again, one of the underlying reasons
for even doing all of this is because you told us
in the forecast study you wanted GPO to take a
leadership role in preserving tangible and
digital content for future generations. You also
said that you wanted as much as possible to be
digital.

So in FIPNet, we're talking about
preserving tangible as well as digital. And so
we have the FIPNet roles. We have digital
imaging. We have content hosting, hosting of the
digital content, the creation of cataloging and
metadata. We have harvesting, tangible
preservation stewards, and collection care and
conservation.

I -- you've heard that we're going to be
signing a preservation steward agreement at the
close of this session, and I want people to
understand that being a preservation steward is
for tangible content. And it is a FIPNet role.
So as we have preservation stewards, they become
members of FIPNet. It's not two separate things.

If you look back at the roles, the
tangible preservation steward, if you look at
some of the older handouts, that we've had from
conferences that said storage of physical copies.
Well, we came up with a better name for that -- preservation stewards. So I don't want there to be confusion. I don't want you to think that we're going off in duplicating efforts and going off down different paths. It's the same path, and it all is under the FIPNet umbrella. Okay.

So David's then going to talk about the agreements.

MR. WALLS: Well, the next slide is simply me and my contact information.

(Laughter.)

MR. WALLS: So rather than have you look at me, we'll go to Kirstin or we can go back to the FIPNet roles. I'll talk about that.

The FIPNet partner roles that you see in the column on the right are the roles that we came up with that, if the community was partnering with us in those specific roles, we felt like would create digital stewardship, tangible preservation, and increase access of the collection for the future and preserve it.

The purpose of that is to reach out to the community, for you to reach out to us as the keepers of the collections. The premise of FIPNet is that you have undertaken these
activities for your own initiate, your own local

collection development, your own collection care,
your own preservation, your own digital imaging
projects within your own libraries.

The partnership through FIPNet is
sharing those activities in the context of a
national effort so that the things that one
library is doing contributes to what another
library is doing seen within a national context.
That's the importance of putting digital content
that is digitized by many libraries and the one
secure digital repository and system of record.
That's why it's important to get bibliographic
data about collections in the catalog of
government publications.

So when you look at the FIPNet roles, we
will be rolling out guidance documentation for
what it means to be a partner in each one of
those roles, but this is guidance documentation.
We have to frame what it means to be a partner
within some structure, but it should not be seen
when you look at those roles and in that guidance
documentation that this is the ultimate
definitive situation. We're creating a structure
for the partnership guidance, but we want you to
look at that guidance and see how you fit into it.

The purpose of that guidance is to describe a framework for the potential partnership that we can talk about and have a conversation about. We may decide in the conversation that what your work has done for your own local collection development digitization needs may not entirely fit. It may not be a good fit. It may not be worth the effort on our part and your part.

I don't think that's likely to happen. I think it's more going to result in a positive collaboration where your work can have a national context through a FIPNet partnership.

So as far as -- you know, we have memorandums of agreement, memorandums of understanding, letters of agreement, things like that. We were trying to create enough of a formal partnership agreement in that memorandum that we would talk about how we're going to work together, but we were trying to get away from that memorandum being more of a contractual obligation because this is obviously a collaborative community.
We're in the same game. We're in the same business. We would like to framework in the guidance document what our partnership relationship is going to be and not make it quite so legalistic, contractual obligations, and things like that.

So keep the flexibility in mind. We've had -- excuse me -- we've had a number of conversations with different preservation steward partners and digitalization partners about projects and things that they're interested in looking at and sharing with us. It's helped us see things from the library's perspective and helped us actually change some of that guidance documentation.

So the memorandum is just that. It is a framework document of how we're going to collaborate together, and it can be modified depending on what we decide the strengths of the partnership agreement are going to be, what we're going together in -- within the guidance documentation for the various FIPNet roles.

Okay. And I will pass it on.

MS. KRUMSEE: Not to you.

MR. WALLS: Not to me.

In Ohio -- or at the state library, our first strategic planning goal right now involves digitizing more and more of our collection to make it more broadly accessible. And fortunately, we were able to get some really impressive digitization equipment.

And we've had several conversations with David and Cindy about possible ways that we could partnership with -- or have a partnership with GPO to make our content accessible on, like, that wider scale. Right now, we're exploring digitizing microfiche. We got a high-speed microfiche scanner, and we just kind of did a trial run with GPO to -- or with the annual reports of the executive branch agencies to see if we can get that content ingested into FDsys and kind of go forward and possibly do a -- an ongoing project with all that microfiche content.

In Ohio, we're fortunate to have a lot of space as well. So you know, we -- anything that we can do to help the community as a whole, whether through being a, you know -- being a preservation steward and keeping materials that
we know we don't have any intention of discarding
or through digitization efforts, there are a lot
of different things that we can -- that we would
like to do to help the community as a whole.

Now I'm going to turn things over to
Sandy McAninch.

MS. MCANINCH: Good morning. I'm going
to talk to you about a slightly different
preservation stewardship negotiation. It doesn't
relate to anything on the current regional
discard policy list of titles. It covers an
entire agency. It is a dead agency. It is not
on FDsys, so it doesn't meet any of the
qualifications one would think that a
preservation steward might have to meet.

What we're talking about here is our
center of excellence for the WPA via ASERL. That
collection, just as a very brief background, is a
dual copy collection. We buy -- we buy -- we try
to collect and catalogue two copies of every
title that we can find -- one for access, one for
archival, and digitization. That is generally
how we're going to meet, assuming this
preservation stewardship negotiation goes well.
That's how we'll meet the guarantee that we can
make sure we have a copy in perpetuity.

Here is some of the changes since David was talking about changing the MOA's to fit a situation. Ours is fairly unusual so far. I'll just go through a few of the changes that we've already negotiated are proposing.

The first thing we're supposed to do is verify the physical existence. We ask the question, okay, this is a dead agency, but our collection's not dead. We're adding to it. So we've added to that, number one, in the MOA, that we'll provide them with an annual list of new titles so that they can keep up with what we have.

The third thing that you're supposed to do is determine that the item is in good condition. Well, if anyone's ever seen a WPA publication, that is not going to be the case. They are mimeographed on very acidic paper, most of them.

So we came to an agreement, and we have an extra statement in ours that says, "For material from the," work's progress -- "Work Projects Administration, a condition of fair is acceptable because of the historic nature of the
material and the printing processes," okay, which
was great because we couldn't say good.

And the fifth thing is to ensure copies
are not withdrawn, and we are to stamp our access
copies. We have two questions about that --
stamps and archival ink. And we're going to be
provided with that, is a current agreement.

And then we also had the question about
all the material that's in our climate control
print archive. Do we have to pull all those back
and stamp them? And there is a statement in our
current draft MOA publication steward, and the
University of Kentucky library's climate control
print storage facility do not need to be stamped.
So those, by virtue of being in essentially a
dark archive, are not going to need to be
stamped, but their records will have the same
statement.

We'll have a second note. We already
have a ASERL statement that says we're keeping
them forever. We'll add another one for the
preservation steward if this comes to pass.

Then the seventh part of the MOA, for
those of who have looked at it online, is a
reporting. There are three bullets involved with
reporting to GPO. And in the third bullet, it says we need to do a condition assessment. This is how we are proposing to reword that third bullet, at least for us -- "Conduct with GPO's participation and guidance a condition assessment at least every three years using a random sampling of titles," et cetera.

That's all pretty much the same except for those that are housed in University of Kentucky's climate control print archives -- well, storage facility. The condition assessment of those materials will only happen if they are brought back for use for some reason, which is fairly unlikely.

So some of these changes are still being negotiated. Some of them are already in there. So I think we're moving down a good path in terms of being able to preserve and allow those of us who want to save the really old parts of our collection to participate in this process.

And now we have Kate. I obviously didn't press the right one. There you are.

MS. TALLMAN: All right. Okay. Hi, everybody. My name is Kate Tallman. I am the acting -- well, acting interim head of the
Government Information Library at the University of Colorado Boulder.

We are signing our preservation steward agreement in just a few minutes, which is very exciting. So I was asked to come here and tell you what the process was like, why we thought we would be good candidates, what it was like to work with GPO.

The very first thing I want to do is acknowledge my predecessor Peggy Jobe (ph). A lot of you may remember her. She just retired two weeks ago. So she laid the groundwork for this program.

After GPO visited us in the spring, they noted that we had a really nice comprehensive historical collection. And after the preservation steward webinar, we were very excited to contact them and see what we could work out.

When we first read the MOA we were concerned because we also cannot physically inspect every item. We cannot stamp every single item, or it's going to take a few hundred years for every item to come back to the library for us to do that.
(Laughter.)

MS. TALLMAN: So I'll tell you a little bit about what we've agreed to. So we are agreeing to preserve all serial set volumes, all congressional hearings, and all congressional record bound. The majority of these webinar offsite storage facility, we're estimating it's about 120,000 items. So that's why we can't recall every single one and inspect, but I'll go through that in a moment.

These are being changed to non-circulating. They will be available for patrons to use in our special collections reading room. And after use, they will be sent down to our preservation department for a very robust reservation treatment.

So why did we decide to become preservation stewards? And part of my role here today is to recruit all of you to sign up for a little collection. It doesn't have to be the whole serial set, you know. That's -- that was Peggy's big idea and mine, but both of us thought let's go big. But you really -- you could go small as well.

So were pretty good candidates for this.
We already had most of our -- well, actually, we had all of our hearings, congressional record, and serial sets offsite. It was in storage already. It was safe, packed away. So we didn't have to worry about that.

We've always been active collectors, and we see the value of these collections every day. My colleague, Leann Walther, uses serial sets and hearings in special collections classes, and we see the excitement that it brings to a lot of the students and faculty. And we get requests throughout the year for us to recall serial set volumes from PASCAL (ph), which if any of you know, that's a miracle.

So we see the value in this collection. We know how important it is, and we want to preserve it in a tangible format, which we already had.

Another reason why we wanted to sign this agreement is because it aligns closely with our own strategic goals in the library. One of those is student access, one is revenue generation, and the most important one is reputation. And this is a great way for us to demonstrate our relevancy and make a name for
ourselves in the university. I think it's a good promotional tool as well. For our administration to know that we are doing such a large project is immensely important.

Finally, this contributes to the mission of GPO and FDLP and helps all of us move forward. There can't be a regional discard policy unless we have those four copies of record. So this helps. Other regionals make important decisions about their collections if they're feeling pressure, and they can do this without worrying too much about losing access to the tangible collection.

So this has been really great for us so far, and part of that is because GPO has been really easy to work with. They've been very flexible with the MOA. Again, when we had first sent our email expressing interest, we were concerned that we were just going to be told no, you can't do it because we can't get all 120,000 items out of storage, stamped, and preserved.

But they were very understanding, and we worked through the agreement together. We made some concessions, and I think we've come to a pretty cool agreement at this point.
So any time a new item comes into the library, it goes through this preservation process. Our preservation librarian is actually working on a really nice rubric that she's going to use for each item as it comes through the library. And then anything that is coming from our offsite storage facility to the library will go through this treatment as well. In fact, it will go through a pretty rigorous preservation treatment. So it's similar to Kentucky, to Sandy's story. Every part of MOA that she mentioned, we had almost the same kind of agreement or a concession.

Another thing I really, really love about this project because it's actually rather large to be working with these three collections -- it has encouraged authentic collaboration within the library. I had a meeting on Friday, which I was told would have been unheard of 10 years ago.

I had almost every department in the room -- preservation, special collections, metadata services, circulation, and social sciences. This is not something that I run across often, and everybody in the room was
excited. They felt invested in the project, and
they were very enthusiastic to help move this
forward. So it's a true collaborative moment,
which I really liked.

And finally, just a little bit about how
our administration reacted. We -- after we had
our first phone call with GPO, we set up a
meeting with our dean, associate dean, and
department director. It was actually a pretty
easy sell, and I credit a lot of that to GPO
visiting in the spring prior because that really
impressed our dean. He was very excited to host
them and talk to them about where the FDLP is
going. And so I think when we came to them with
a new proposal to preserve these documents, they
were just simply excited to work together with
GPO.

So another thing I wanted to say is this
is a pretty large project that can have a big
impact but doesn't cost much. And in fact, even
GPO is saying, you know, we'll help you cover
some of the shipping costs. We're still working
out some of those details. But it's really a
low-cost, high-impact kind of project that you
can do for your library.
So if you're thinking about becoming preservation stewards, if you even just had a tiny little thought that maybe this one little section in my collection could apply, give them a call, send them an email, talk to them and see where you can go from there because they're going to be very, very excited to hear from you.

So that's what I have.

What are we -- where am I going to next?

MS. KRUMSEE: Let's see if they have any questions. Oh, we'll take questions from Council first.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Melissa Bernstein from the University of Utah. My question is actually for Kate.

Can you talk a little bit -- so you mentioned that things, like, when they come back from storage or whatever is they're going to go through a rigorous preservation treatment. Can you -- what does that -- just a little bit about what that entails. Thank you.

MS. TALLMAN: Sure. Sure. So she is actually consulting some best practices and coming up with a rubric to work from. So we're talking about -- it's going to be removing some
of the existing stickers, repairing some of the binding, minor repairs, making a lot of clamshell boxes for most of the items. Anything new that comes in is going to be shrink wrapped so that all the labels will go on the shrink wrap instead of on the -- the cover.

They're checking for completeness as well, so we're giving them some tools to see, especially for serial set volumes. You know, there are a lot of foldouts, maps, illustrations. So they're going to be consulting lists of illustrations and maps and all that. But they can check for completeness.

Now, if they find that a piece is incomplete, it's going to immediately go onto our needs list. So that's something that internally we're working out.

We're very excited that the FDLP eXchange is starting, and we have been talking to GPO, too, about preservation stewards receiving kind of like third dibs, you know. So yeah. I mean that's we're still figuring it out, but I think she's going to have a pretty good plan going forward. Yep.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University, a question also for Kate.

You mentioned that these collections currently are stored offsite. So particularly for the hearings collection, does that also mean that there are bibliographic records for each and every one of these?

MS. TALLMAN: Yes, there are. There are, and there is also a list at the offsite storage facility with bar code numbers that we can kind of cross check. So yeah, there's bibliographic records for this entire collection. Some of them there's a small collection of CIS microfiche that were mistakenly catalogued a while back, but those are being cleaned up.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson, Yale Law Library.

So I realize that I'm looking at a copy of the template for the MOA that is stamped Draft. But it actually has a definition on it for preservation copy of record digital content. Does that mean that there is contemplation at some point of having a stewardship agreement for actual either born digital or converted digital content?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.
Yes.

(Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: You want to take a look at those FIPNet roles, and digital imaging or digitization is one of those, so it would be included in that as well.

MR. CORNWALL: Daniel Cornwall, Alaska State Library.

As the MOAs signed, will there be a -- will they be publicly archived somewhere?

MR. WALLS: I think so. I mean, they would have to be. I think that there documents that certainly for our own records management going forward and our own relationship they would be referred to as the work continues and goes on.

MR. CORNWALL: Okay. Thank you.

I think it'll just be valuable to see what different institutions have agreed to and the different conditions. I think the fact that there's going to be some flexibility in negotiating the exact terms will come as welcome news to different libraries.

And I just want to throw in the -- yes, we all want to recruit you to preserve something -- no title too small. I'll be talking to my
staff back in Alaska and see what we might be
able to do.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Melissa Bernstein,
University of Utah.

What is the term of these agreements?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

There is a period of three years under -
and after that there's a review to see if
everything is working okay, to make sure we make
changes to the agreement, if necessary, that kind
of thing.

There is an out clause. And it could be
that after we -- you know, this is new territory
for us. So after we get going and we have
several partnerships, and it could be that we
lengthen that time period. It could -- you know,
I know some repositories have 25-year agreements,
that kind of thing. We're being cautious and
treading lightly as we move forward. And you
know, that may change.

But there are out clauses on any kind of
agreement that we have with the library that
allows a library to discontinue. We never know
what's going to happen. There could be a new
administration in the library, what have you. So
there's always an out clause. There's notification to GPO and given time enough to do what we need to do to make sure that the purpose of the agreement can be carried on in another manner.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson, Yale Law library.

This is sort of a question, I guess, maybe to follow up on the -- will the agreements be publicly posted. Could we have resources like people's preservation rubrics and checklists and things as appendices to those? Because I think that would be very helpful for all of us.

MR. WALL: I -- this is David Wall, GPO. I agree. I think that if libraries would be able to share the documentation and things that they've used to help become preservation stewards or FIPNet partners in any way, that that should probably go into some of the partner guidance on a nice preservation page on the FDLP website.

MS. TALLMAN: I for one would be happy to contribute whatever we've done. I have just a massive amount of documentation at this point because working through this process with five
different departments involves a lot
negotiations. And so I can tell you what we did
to our cataloging records and what status codes
we used and what messages we used.

And then I'll talk to my preservation
librarian. I know that she's eager to kind of
start -- you know, start this process and then
sharing it with the rest of the country. So
yeah.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University Library.

I wonder if you could talk or clarify a
little bit more about the relationship between
the preservation component of being a FIPNet
partner versus providing access to that preserved
material.

So Sandy talked about it in her model
where it's actually a two-copy model, if I
understood correctly, where one is specifically
identified for preservation but in the lock box,
so to speak, and then, you know, another copy
then is readily available for access. And it's a
little less clear in the FIPNet model. So I just
-- as a partner in this now wonder what your
perspective is on how you'll fulfill that side of
it.

MS. TALLMAN: So we were more than
willing to keep our collection circulating. And
again, it has lived in the offsite storage
facility for over 10 years at this point, not
much usage except for within the library.

But when we brought this to our
administration, it was our dean who said I would
prefer for these to not circulate and I want this
to be seen as true preservation copies. So we
worked in a process for them to still be
accessible in-house to our patrons. But knowing
that we have digital surrogates and that we work
very openly with the public, if anybody has a
request for a hearing we'll get them a digital
copy as soon as possible.

So we felt like we were not restricting
access to our patrons. But rather, you know, we
were making the right kinds of concessions if
that makes any sense. So there was no concern
from our part when he said I want these to be not
circulating. Instead, we just found a way to
work with that.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of
Central Florida.
We hope that nobody having decide this, you know, 10 years down the road they decide, okay, we're going to stop doing this. We think of -- so the federal depository material that we receive as -- that's distributed to us is federal property. Is there a sense that the preservation copies that are required by some other means that now become part of this FIPNet partnership and it's now officially the preservation copy, is that now part of the federal property that would then be sent along with the other material to a new home?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

Let me make sure I understand what you're asking. Whether the content for which we have a preservation steward is property of the government?

MR. GAUSE: Yes.

MS. ETKIN: Yes. The answer's yes.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County.

Building on a lot of what I've heard just in the last little bit here, I've got a question. We also have a Bienes Museum of the Modern Book which has a WPA -- small WPA
collection in there. And I'm well aware of the condition of a lot of those documents. I mean they were created in many instances already in a state of questionable preservation, but not necessarily based on the idea of the memorandum.

But considering that the investment that an institution makes with regards to these collections -- and I'm asking Sandra, in particular -- does this inspire you to take, perhaps, more aggressive measures as far as preservation is concerned? Like, for example, de-acidification in some extreme cases?

Or in other words, if you're going to all this effort to preserve this stuff, it would make sense to go the extra mile for at least some of those documents that may need some extra help. It wouldn't necessarily show up in the memorandum that one would have to do that, but it would make sort of logical sense to kind of keep up with that. Is that kind of anything that you're thinking about?

MS. MCANINCH: Well, when we became an ASERL COE for WPA and then a GPO partner -- actually, this will be our third agreement for the WPA if we can work this out.
(Laughter.)

MS. MCANINCH: We are three times committed. We just said the WPA collection is brittle. It is assumed that every piece in it is. We do not have the resources to de-acidify over 5,000 pieces.

It -- you know, if at some point someone wants to give us a gift, we could consider that. There certainly are -- we certainly have the capability to de-acidify pieces on a case-by-case basis. But doing all of that collection I think is not in the near future.

Am I answering your question? Okay.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: And I was thinking -- I mean, of course one would like to preserve everything in every way possible. But in -- particularly, it was more of the case-by-case basis. If you have some given -- okay. We managed to get a hold of a copy of the one thing that we'd been missing, but it's in shape that really needs additional assistance. You taking some measures along those lines or ...

MS. MCANINCH: Pieces certainly get boxed.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Okay.
MS. MCANINCH: We have digitized pieces that are in particularly bad shape. So we do have digital backups for some of those. Even if we've got two copies and they're both bad, which his often the case, we look for better copies.

So I guess I'd say our out right now is creating the digital copy. As I say, at some point, we may be able to afford to de-acidify some of them. If we did, we'd probably start with the Kentucky segment and work our way out. That's how we've done the digitization. We're almost done with all the ASERL states but not quite. So …

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Thanks.

MS. KRUMSEE: Questions from the audience?

MS. SELBY: Barbie Selby, University of Virginia.

Kate, yours sort of intrigued me. And I'm not making any promises here, but I am told that when we put something as we did, many long runs of government serials into our storage area when we first opened it, that it's harder to get it out of there than it would be worth doing. So I'm just sitting here thinking, hmm, you took the
good stuff that we stored. But we've put a lot
of stuff there that, you know, with some -- four
what?

MR. MATHESON: We need four copies and -
-

MS. SELBY: Yeah.

MR. MATHESON: -- Colorado is pretty far
away from Virginia.

MS. SELBY: Yeah. Yeah, true. I could
do the serial set, the older ones.

But it just -- it -- and that's
definitely something that I would be thinking
about and looking into as far as those, you know,
things that aren't the serial set but might be,
like the Lord knows, flood insurance studies.

(Laughter.)

MS. TALLMAN: I was going to say, too,
you know, a lot of these high-density storage
facilities, they arrange things by size so that,
unless you have a large collection that all went
together, which might be the case for some of our
volumes -- so we had a huge ingest of serial set
volumes from Colorado State University. And
those were all in excellent condition because
they had been in offsite storage since the 70s or
maybe even prior.

So that large group may have traveled together to our high-density storage facility, so we might be able to withdraw those kinds. And we're actually going to sample that in the next couple of weeks to see if they are geographically close to each other and if maybe there's something we can do with that. But yeah, it's a -- it's an interesting problem that we ran into.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale (ph), State Library of Pennsylvania. One question for Sandy. You said with your WPA these are tangible things? Is that correct?

MS. MCANINCH: Yes.

MS. HALE: Okay. Because we have a whole collection of WPA things for Pennsylvania from the national archives that were sets that were sold over time. Do you have those kinds of things, and is that part of what that collection is?

MS. MCANINCH: You got them from the -- I don't think I understand. You got them from the national archives?

MS. HALE: Yeah. From NARA. They were -- microfilmed sets of --
MS. MCANINCH: Oh, you're talking about film.

MS. HALE: Yes, film.

MS. MCANINCH: No. We do not have any film as far as I know.

MS. HALE: Okay. And are you collecting WPA documents from across the country or just ASERL or just Kentucky?

MS. MCANINCH: We are collecting everything we can find. We've had shipments from as far away as Oregon, Baltimore. A lot of people have contributed knowing that. Oklahoma State sent us some materials -- so as people are finding either duplicates or materials they can do without and send them.

MS. HALE: Okay. And that includes the writer's projects, all those kinds of things?

MS. MCANINCH: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

MS. HALE: Okay.

MS. MCANINCH: Our guideline for our collection is it has to have a publishing statement that says it is WPA or at least some kind of note that says it was produced under the auspices of the WPA.

MS. HALE: Okay. I also have another
question for the FIPNet people that you're saying
now that some of these partners can just do parts
of the collection rather than, like, doing the
whole serial set or something like that. So if
there is -- like, if we have a large run of
something from agriculture or labor or things
like that, then we could still be considered for
a FIPNet type of partner because some of at least
the eastern seaboard collections go back a lot
further than Colorado would do.

And I think we want to have a collection
-- these partners geographically disbursed. We
talked ago of having different archival types of
libraries that had very wide and deep collections
all over the place so that someone wouldn't have
to go to Colorado or someplace like that because
you're not going to let any -- let it out of the
library.

So my question is about parts of the
collection. Do we then have to talk to you about
what part?

MR. WALLS: This is David Walls, GPO.

Your collection is your collection. If
what you've got you think would be something that
-- and it sounds like it certainly is -- that
would be something to contribute, you don't have
to have a complete whole collection of something.

    MS. HALE: Okay.

    MR. WALLS: Collection development was
local. Time has passed. Things disappear.
Things get used. That was the purpose of having
the tangible collection. The collection is what
it is now.

    MS. HALE: Okay.

    MR. WALLS: How do we preserve it? How
do we bring it into partnership? How do we look
about, you know -- you -- preservation steward
partners may turn into digital imaging partners.

    MS. HALE: Mm-hmm.

    MR. WALLS: And it's certainly a
challenge for us that the WPA collection material
that a lot of libraries have, that's a very
unique time in American history, and it touched
every single state differently.

    MS. HALE: That's right.

    MR. WALL: So the state material could
be something -- you know, imagine all of this
beautifully preserved, accounted for, catalogued,
and digitized so that all that unique state
material is all one day accounted for and
preserved. That's something that I think we could certainly do.

MS. HALE: Whoopee. Okay. Because we'd definitely be interested in doing something like that because we do have a very old collection.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to say something.

Kathy, you mentioned the geographically disbursed, and I do want to talk to that point. And Scott mentioned earlier we need four. We need four preservation stewards for each title that's on FDsys to be eligible for the regionals to discard materials, okay?

Now, we know from our panelists that their preservation stewards were in the works to be a preservation steward for material that's not on FDsys govinfo, and that's fine, too. But -- so we are looking at geographic diversity. We are looking at other factors as well. And -- but that's not keeping us from moving forward. And we may get more than four. We may get a lot when you all go home.

(Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: But we do need that four number in order for the regionals to discard.
But again, I want to caution you that we're not doing this because of regional discard. We're doing this to preserve the collections.

Mr. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida. Although we're not necessarily immediate for that purpose, we do want multiple preservation for each title down the road even if it's not part of the FDsys, the regional discard.

And so we may end up with, like, with the WPA collection. Sandy may have one of those preservation copies. Another institution may decide they're going to try and do WPA as well, but we might end up with something that Pennsylvania's doing the WPA for Pennsylvania and somebody else -- and those -- how we're getting those others. So that's a way for people to start -- how can I participate in this. I'm going to do just my state's copy of this agency material and not have to do everything else. But somebody's going to do the whole agency maybe someplace and maybe someplace else, but the other copies may be scattered and be part of the collection.

MS. KRUMSEE: Now we can do the signing of the MOA.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The -- will --
pens will be handed out afterwards, I assume? Or
...

MS. ETKIN: They're at the registration
desk.

(Applause.)

MS. KRUMSEE: Well, thank you very much
to all of our speakers for this session, and we
really hope you'll consider becoming a FIPNet
partner.

(Applause.)

(Off the record.)

MR. MATHESON: The afternoon sessions on
Tuesday here at the Federal Depository Library
Council Meeting and Conference. I just want to
make a couple quick announcements that we're
going to have LSCM update an open forum in this
session. Remember that there are -- there's an
alternate stream if you're listening online that
has other programs in it, and we have a very full
schedule for the rest of the day. So think about
that.

Other than that, I think I will turn it
over to Laurie Hall.

MS. HALL: Thank you.
Okay. Okay. In an effort of full disclosure, Anthony and I were just chatting a few minutes ago. The open forum used to be the session the first day, or some of it was the first day, where we had like a LSCM who, LSCM is, what we do, you know, the different organizational piece. And then we would have a session that would be ask us any question you want. So -- or you have the courage to get up to the mic to ask.

So when we put this back on the calendar schedule again, we were a little bit concerned we weren't quite sure how we were going to do this session because most of the things that we have to -- the results that we were going to show you already have a separate full session.

So we put together some general slides about the organization because we never know who's in the audience and who's never been here before, also so you get a little sense of names and faces of people that are here and in what area they work in and what projects they're working on. And then we'll run through those, and then we'll take whatever questions you have plus any suggestions that you may have on whether
we need this session, we can make it shorter, longer, what you really would like to see Council and community, too. So we'll start and run through some of these slides.

Because we do change on a regular basis -- people move from different organizations -- and so we don't report that kind of stuff usually. So we'll do that for you here.

So we'll talk a little bit about the organization's structure, the two superintendent of documents and library services and content management, quick little updates on some of the initiatives that I may have already talked about in the session yesterday, but some people may not have been here. And then we'll do what we normally do, is open questions and come to the mic and just ask us any question about what's going on. And we have staff from LSCM here to help us answer them or the people that are working specifically in an area that you may want to ask about. So that's sort of where we're going to go.

So briefly, the SuDocs office sets up the strategic direction of the FDLP and the other four -- three other programs that we administer,
which is the international exchange, bylaw, and
the Cataloging and Indexing Program. We
implement any strategic programs within the
operation. We do policies. We analyze data, you
know, conduct outreach for -- to our libraries,
and we communicate internationally and nationally
about the FDLP and the Cataloging and Indexing
Program.

We also reach out at the strategic level
to the Library of Congress, other national
libraries about our -- things that impacted FDLP
Cataloging and Indexing Program, that kind of
thing. So the SuDocs office oversees the library
services and content management division plus
also the publication and information sales area.

So these are the four programs and, for
those of you who don't know, the Federal
Depository Library Program. Then there's the
Cataloging and Indexing Program, which is the
bigger broad scope of everything that is not of
national security but may not be distributed to
the depository we -- catalogue if we get a hold
of it.

So if we disseminate or distribute to
you a tangible version of something and it may
also be available in CD, then we don't
distribute. We would still catalogue that CD
version. So that's not a very good example.

But, you know, we do a lot of administrative
internal documents that are really not meant for
the public but paid for with your federal tax
dollars. And if we get a copy, we will catalogue
it. So …

International exchange program, for
those of you who don't know, we do -- we
administer the distribution of international
exchange materials from GPO on behalf of the
Library of Congress. Our warehouse out in
Laurel, Maryland, ships a limited number of
titles in fiche and tangible -- primarily
hearings, Federal Register, Congressional Record
-- to international exchange libraries that are
the treaty libraries -- so National Library of
Australia, the regence (ph) library, other
libraries under treaty.

And then those libraries send their
government publications back directly to the
Library of Congress, although we end up getting
quite a few ourselves at GPO because they can't
figure out the addresses, and we take them over
to LC.

The bylaw program is kind of an obscure -- and it doesn't happen as much as it used to. In every law, or many laws, they always will request the GPO to print a certain number of copies, free copies that any citizen can request. So Department of Agriculture puts out a report on crop science, and at the end the committee may say or the agency may say, you know, have GPO print additional hundred copies for anyone that wants a free copy. And we store those copies out in our Laurel warehouse, so we kind of manage that. That doesn't happen as much anymore, but it's still one of our mandated programs.

So obviously, everybody knows that we are supposed to keep the American public informed and support these programs and, you know, expanded beyond now the tangible versions to the lifecycle of tangible and electronic information.

And this is our group on the day that we took the photo, so it does not include everyone. We do have some people who were camera shy and some people that don't want their photo taken and were on leave or telework that day. But we tried to get as many of our staff into the picture. So
this is LSCM.

And our staff is not just library professionals. We are archivists, library technicians, web developers, analysts, project managers, program analysts, and administrative professionals that all support the work that we do. So we have a wide variety of staff with a wide set of skills that help us get the job done.

So …

Okay. So do we need to do this? We've already done this. Everybody knows what the Federal Depository Library Program is.

(Laughter.)

MS. HALL: So there's Slide number 1.

Now we can go to 2. So I just explained the Cataloging and Indexing Program and our catalog of record for the national bibliography of government information, which is the CGP. So it's a comprehensive index, and it include -- I mean, it -- we have been putting monthly catalogue entries from the tangible -- when we were publishing the monthly catalogue into the CGP.

So our goal is to get as much of our bibliographic information from the very beginning
into the catalog. So there's a bunch of projects
 going on that we report, and we report those in
 the handout to increase not only 1976 forward but
 prior to 1976. And that's -- when we talk about
 national inventory, national bibliography, that's
 -- our system of record is the CGP.

 And I talked about the international
 exchange program, and I talked about the bylaws.
 So we don't have to deal with those anymore.

 Okay. So the internal LSCM
 organization. There's the director -- office of
 the director, and right now that's me. But
 actually, I'm the manager. But anyway, so I'm
 holding two hats right now.

 And we kind of do the strategic
 direction of the operational unit of LSCM. We do
 the budget. We do the staffing, the human
 capital resources. We do the communications and
 the marketing for the FDLP and other programs.
 We administer the biennial survey. We reach out
to the libraries. Those are all of our
 functions.

 The main divisions are technical
 services, and that's Fang Gao. Projects and
 systems is Anthony Smith. And LSCM outreach and
support, that is Robin. So all the functions of LSCM fall within those three groups at this time.

So here is a combination office picture I'm looking at here but not there. So you've seen a couple of these people already I know. These are the people that kind of work directly with me, and we work together on budget analysis, marketing, communication, strategic direction, policy, and technical services, and of course putting the conferment together and those kind of things. So ...

And Robin, you weren't in that photo because you weren't here.

So she was not purposefully not there, but she was out. So you won't see her photo in here. So she wasn't here that day. So ...

Okay. So technical services. And technical services is what you would normally think of the technical services in library organization. It's acquisitions, cataloging, classification, processing serials, serials control, serials check-in, harvesting, maintenance of the catalogue, SuDoc classification, Dewey Decimal Classification, LC classification, OCLC work. What am I missing?
Probably -- oh, yes -- item number maintenance, items and class creation for the SuDoc class and items.

So -- oh, yeah -- thanks, Robin -- agency outreach. That wasn't in my talking points, but that's a critical one. So it's all the -- all of the lifecycle management and work that goes on in technical services.

And here's most of the technical services team. And we've just hired five new technical services librarians. We had some additional positions. So I see -- in here. Yes, I see some of the new faces -- so new faces.

Stand up, new faces. So there we go.

(Applause.)

MS. HALL: So they're getting their first indoctrination to the meeting here today, so hopefully they won't run the opposite direction.

So there -- in the technical services area, there's also the tangible processing unit, which is out in Laurel, Maryland, in our warehouse. Some of our staff in Maine GPO. They do create your shipping lists, and they do your work on the microfiche contracts. And they help
classify the publications and get them ready for shipment, which then goes out to the Laurel warehouse to prepare your shipping boxes for tangible items.

And then there's the collection development working with agencies, working with other parts of GPO. When things come into the Agency to print, we decide if we're going to get tangible copies of materials to send to you or whether we're going to look for an electronic version. And that's part of the collection development and the SuDoc classification. If it's a new series, serial change in title, that kind of thing, that area researches class and takes care of web tech notes, right?

The bibliographic control and metadata section, we -- all of our technical services librarians, and our bibliographic metadata control librarians -- we have two categories right now -- they catalog in all formats and RDA. They catalog NOCLC and export to the ILS, which is the catalog of government pubs, and they do all kinds of cooperative cataloging work with the Library of Congress.

We're in PCC, which is the Program for
Cooperative Cataloging, so we are a council (ph) member of SACO (ph). We contribute subject headings to the LCSH. Not too many people do that, but we do. We do name authorities for government authors and other government agencies, and we contribute to the name authority file for those. So we do a lot of -- we're also now in cataloging and publication. So we --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: You're a slide behind.

MS. HALL: I'm a slide behind? Am I too far? Oh, I'm a couple slides behind. I'm just remembering things in technical services that we talked about before.

So we now are officially doing CIP. One of our first CIPs that you talked about this morning was the keeping America informed. So if an agency comes into GPO and they want cataloging and publication on the back of the title page and it's a government pub, we do the work for the Library of Congress with the exception of the Dewey Classification.

So they're -- we're just learning Dewey right now. So we were in that program a while ago, but we just rejoined because it's now
electronic. It's easier for us to contribute.

So I did mention depository
distribution. I forget to say they do handle and
fulfill all of your claims. They also manage
agency recalls, and we've had quite a few of
those recently -- so distribution working with
tech services and other staff in web content put
together. If we have to do a recall, we usually
do, you know, a news alert, some kind of survey,
a letter -- we work with -- if we have to have
things returned, stuff goes out to you.

So if we have a recall for PII or any
other reason, the whole organization chips
together to get individual parts of that recall
together. So …

And there's the distribution staff. And
we -- Tony Brooks (ph), who's probably not here
because his daughter had a baby yesterday or last
night, so he manages the staff. Some of these --
the staff and distribution were here yesterday.
That's them.

Okay. Projects and systems. And I --
since I need a drink, I'll let Anthony --

MR. SMITH: You want me to --

MS. HALL: Yeah. I kind of stole your
thunder. But Anthony, I'll let you speak for a while.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, this is my first time on the big stage, this conference. I feel like people are looking at me.

(Laughter.)

MR. SMITH: Projects and systems. Overarching directive is to provide support services to Robin's team, Fang's team, Laurie, as well as all of you in the depository library community. We have an amazing team of 25 individuals.

And I'm going to have to figure out how to work this clicker up here. Just the middle button?

MS. HALL: No. No. The arrows, yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

To carry out -- help us carry out our objectives. Okay, thanks.

We're also in project system -- in systems, very fortunate to have two GPO veterans and I -- managers and I -- Mr. Daryl Walker (ph) -- and I think he may be in another session; I know he's here today -- who oversees daily operations of library systems and the web team.
Also, Mr. James Malden (ph), who I know is back at the red brick building holding down the fort today, is responsible for archival management as well as the projects team.

We also have within projects and systems three senior specialists. David Walls, who I think many of you may have met at the session this morning on FIPNet, is our preservation librarian and provides leadership in preservation planning and program development.

Lisa Russell, who is the library services system. I know we -- it may be the first time this conference that that has been mentioned -- library services system program manager. In other words, we are in the process of developing our next-generation technical infrastructure. You got to see a piece of it, or a preview of that, with the new exchange tool which was an early release of -- for us in meeting the requirements for LS -- the LSF system.

But Lisa is our program manager for systems development. So the -- the LSF is a program, and it was made up of a lot of projects. The eXchange or Needs and Offers was one of those
And then also our most recent addition to the team, who I was hoping he would be here today, Dr. John Boseri (ph) is a -- our newest member. He's a senior operational research analyst. John brings some needed and new skills to our team. Like, for example, John is a Lean Six Sigma. I don't know what belt he has because it's all based on levels of -- all the way up to black belt like martial arts. But he is Lean Six Sigma and was really hired to -- with the -- to help us do data analysis work.

We have a lot of data that we've been gathering in this program over the years, and John was hired and has the background to help us to understand what all of it is saying to us and what does it mean and how we can use that in order to move in new directions going forward.

So that is the LSCM -- or the projects and systems team. I don't know if there's anything else. Let's see here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible
MR. SMITH: Oh, did I not mention -- oh, well I guess I can talk. I did mention -- let me just turn back here. My apologies. So -- and I'll just go into a little bit more detail.
Laurie mentioned web content group.
So I mentioned that Daryl Walker is responsible for library systems and the web content teams. It might help to know a little bit more about each -- each of these, and I -- and I'll take just a -- a minute to go through some of that.
Starting at the top, the archival management group has the responsibility for establishing best practices and providing harvesting services, web-harvesting services for archive -- archiving of federal agency web content. That is their primary focus. They do some other things in that group -- for example, provide records management services to support our program internally, the administrative records. But their primary focus is on archive -- archival management and web harvesting activities.
Library systems. I mentioned Lisa's
role as a senior program manager, which is --
which in her capacity, she's primarily involved
in development, right -- so as new services --
technology because she is specifically technology
services.

As we identify the needs for new
technology, we turn to Lisa and say here are --
here -- here's what we -- here are the
requirements. Here's what we need to implement.
And Lisa sort of leads that process. That's what
she did with the eXchange, the Needs and Offers
tool, and all of the planning that has gone into
LSS, which primarily involves the work practice
study.

For those of you -- I think some -- many
of you are at least familiar with the fact that
we conducted a work practice study using
ethnographic methods of the depository libraries.
And essentially, what that is is it's using
anthropological methods to do observation of how
people do their work.

We said when we started LSS that we
wanted it to be -- we wanted to be able to
demonstrate a user center and -- and ethnography
do that in a way that many other approaches
cannot match. I mean, you're actually going out and you're observing. You're gathering data on how people do what they do in order to support, in this case, the depository library program.

And so we're close to being complete. That work is close to being finished. We're -- we almost have a final report ready to go. What will come out of that is a CONOPS document, conceptual operations model, as well as our functional requirements that will then allow us to begin to look at implementation of additional tools and services to support LSS -- the LSS model. But it's really -- it was really intended to be a user-centered model.

So just backing up, Lisa oversees a lot of the development work. And so the development work is market analysis, developing and understanding what the functional requirement needs are. But then once that -- once the -- and Needs and Offers will be -- or the eXchange will be one of the first.

Once it is completed and accepted, it's beyond the beta stage, it then gets turned over to operations. They have to accept it. And so that is Daryl Walker and his team, the library
systems folks and the web content team. They're really -- we list them separately, but they're really one and they work closely together. And they benefit each other in so many different ways.

And so I think we have a tendency to list them separately because that's been the legacy practice. But it -- I think that in recent -- at least in the recent past one or two years, it's -- it probably has -- could be better represented by one team -- library systems which has traditionally been the ILS folks and the web specialist, the web content team led by Ms. Katy Davis who's the team leader in the back.

Katy, can I get you to stand up and just -- that's Katy.

(Applause.)

MR. SMITH: Katy does a remarkable job and has a spectacular team supporting her work.

So I mentioned archival library systems.

Web content -- you can kind of get a sense of some of the things that they're involved in FDLP.gov, Ben's Guide, and other web-related services and tools.

The conference app was developed by Sean
(ph) -- I don't see out here -- Tanya (ph), in conjunction with -- who's -- John is a member of the web team. He led the work on designing that app working with his colleagues and the web team -- on the web content team.

And then finally, there's the projects -- project management group. And what I really wanted to say -- project management traditionally has done a lot of work with regard to project management but also program management. I mean, they -- right now, one of our project team members, Heidi Ramos, who's sitting over here on the left, is heading up the program development for the regional discard project, which is a program. It's not just a project. There's probably a number of little projects that are be -- will be associated with developing -- implementing that program.

But it'll -- it's -- the resources that we really provide out of that group are folks that have the knowledge and skills to help us operationalize new programs as they emerge. And Heidi and Suzanne both are sitting over here representing the projects team, but do a lot of that type of work. Suzanne's actually involved
in a program planning project right now, which is the -- and I'm at a loss for words. It's the -- yeah, the preservation stewards. Thank you.

So the projects -- the direction that we're really trying to move in with the projects team is really more of a program management kind of activity or office. That -- we're doing some of that already, and it really is trying to -- where we're at right now, is trying to formalize that level of work in ways that we've not done previously.

Dr. John Boseri is a part of that. So having a data analysis person is an important part of program planning. Having someone with Lean Six Sigma skills that can help us operate efficiently and make the most out of the taxpayer dollars is an important aspect of operating these programs in an efficient sort of way.

So I'm going to stop there because I -- for the sake of time --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (inaudible - off mic).

MR. SMITH: Oh, yes, thank you.

And so there's -- there is a picture of -- and that's a -- your count is not 25 there, so
there's a few people in this group also that are camera shy and preferred not to have their picture taken. So …

MS. HALL: Thank you.

Let's see. Okay. Next up is outreach and support.

Robin, do you want to talk about -- okay. She's going to pass.

Outreach support currently is working on education and training the FDLP Academy, going out and talking to the libraries, outreaching. She was responsible for On the Go initiative, getting all of those folks out to the libraries.

And we didn't mention when we said LSCM staff or outreach people, we also included a lot of our technical services staff on some of these visits as well because I'm seeing Ben walk in the door, and you saw his picture yesterday. We wanted to include, you know, not just the outreach staff but our own -- our other folks so they get an idea, too, of who their customers are in the depository community. So we plan on including additional staff on some of these trips as well.

So that was Robin's idea, and that was a
really good one. So you got to meet some of our other staff that usually only get to go to conferences or -- or ALA, but they were on travel, too, to libraries as well. So …

Of course, they do your consultations and library visits. They manage the CDRP, the Cataloging Record Distribution Program that we have on contract with archive (ph). And they also do the legal requirements and program regulations. So they're going to be working on some revision of that, too. And here they are in the main hall of GPO.

And they're all here, too. So just some initiatives and updates. There's quite a few things, once again, in here. And somebody came by and asked me about the work practice study, so there is a little bit of additional information in here. We tried not to have sessions on things that we put in here, but that's not always true.

So we did update a few thing in here. We're going to be -- we talked about the regional discard policy this morning a little bit. I know we're going to talk about that probably today at the regional meeting this afternoon or this evening. You've seen the FD -- FDLP eXchange.
You see all the stuff that's going on, on FDLP.gov and then, of course, Ben's Guide, which we had a new revision this year and won an award. So that's cool.

The CGB enhancements has a brand new look and feel. And Patricia did that the first thing on Monday morning, so I'm not sure how many of you saw that. But news alerts went out, and it's --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: The room was full.

MS. HALL: The room was full, so more on that. News alerts went out, and you can see the new look and feel.

We're also at this particular time or coming up in a few minutes is enhanced content in FDsys. So Heidi's going to talk a little bit about our new content that we put in. We just put in admin notes, right, Suzanne? Yeah. And a couple other. We're going to do -- we're doing a lot of ingest of our own FDLP material. So we've got that in recently.

Web archiving. Our web archiving team is here. Dorian (ph) --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Actually,
Dorian is in a session right now.

MS. HALL: -- is in a session right now talking about our web harvesting efforts. We continue to add a fair amount of content. We're still talking about bibliographic issues with our content looking at different ways of promoting the content in there. Some of Robin's folks are working with the harvesting team to find additional ways to promote the content that's in that collection.

We're still part of the web archiving group with the Library of Congress, national archives, Smithsonian. And I think NIH just joined that group as well. So we have -- it's probably about monthly meeting or six -- every six weeks meeting to make sure that we don't overlap in what they're harvesting. And I think we did send out a news alert a couple of months ago about the end of harvest term if anybody's interested in participating in that.

The GPO On the Go initiative that Robin is presenting on this afternoon --

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: No, I did it this morning.

MS. HALL: you did it this morning?
Okay.

There is now -- just right before conference on Thursday, we launched an interactive map that one of the web team -- Corey, you want to stand up because you're new. You haven't -- Corey worked with some of the other folks on the web team and Robin's group --

(Applause.)

MS. HALL: -- interactive maps so that you can kind of see where we have gone. And it also links to the pictures of the library. So it also helps us because I think in your session this morning you had a chart where we had a map where we had, you know --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Was it ugly?

MS. HALL: Yeah, it was very ugly. So now we know where we have been, and we now know where we haven't been. So that -- the map is really helpful.

More stuff coming on the FDLP Academy. It takes a lot of time and effort, and we can't do both. We can't travel and do all of the Academy at the same time, so Robin's going to be working on -- in her group on that in the fall
now, the winter when it's -- we're not traveling as much. And we do have an additional staff member coming on board the 31st. And actually, she's here at the conference. So it's Robin's area.

Our partnerships continue to grow. We have a lot of cataloging partnerships -- obviously, the FIPNet partners, preservation steward partnerships. So we've added quite a few. And we -- the ones that we've had for quite a while with cataloging, we have lots of statistics in the handout that tell you just how much work goes on with the partnerships. I don't remember what page it's on, but there's some pretty big statistics.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: It's the last page.

MS. HALL: Thank you.

In the back of -- our partnerships that we're continuing to add content to and catalog materials.

Other initiatives? Ms. Kelly Seifert does a lot of work on promoting the FDLP.

And Nick (ph), is it your session --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: This
morning.

MS. HALL: God, I get my morning mixed up -- talked about some of those things, our new products and promotional items.

We continue to do the national bibliographic records inventory. That is our shelf list project, converting MOCAT (ph) and also adding materials from those cooperative cataloging partnerships. We are adding, I think, Kathy, 30 -- is it 30 -- 30 new libraries to the cataloging record distribution program. So we did have a waiting list, so we've tried to clean that up and add some more libraries every year.

We did report on the PURL usage reporting tool yesterday or right this morning or now.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I think now.

MS. HALL: Now. It's happening now -- so a really, really tool for you and for us. We've had a lot of good work and funds in technical services area and Robin's area working together on the team to get the kind of tool that we really want.

We have a couple new libraries coming
into the program. Robin's working those. So sometimes we lose some; sometimes we gain some.

So On the Go initiative was to identify vacancies. So we have that data, so we're going out to try to recruit libraries for those vacancies.

The communication tool, social media, and then we're also working on future events. Like, as soon as we finish with this, we're already starting to work on the spring virtual event. So …

Okay. And there's all our names and numbers and how to get in touch with us. So that's all -- I think all we have, so I guess it's open questions, right, Scott, or else questions from whoever.

MR. MATHESON: I think we'll start with questions from Council. Thank you very much, everyone.

This is Scott Matheson from Yale Law Library. I have a -- a couple of questions, just a little list.

But this is probably for Robin, but great news that you're getting a new person. Yay. And can you give an update on the Academy
and if the coordinator series of classes and what was the certificate program will be, or the certification will be, brought back and maybe when?

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: This is Robin Haun-Mohamed of GPO.

Yeah, the certification program is coming back. Our intent -- it was our intent to bring it back this fall, but somebody made us go out and travel.

(Laughter.)

MS. HAUN-MOHAMED: So our goal is soon after the New Year, and we do intend to run more than one cohort this time.

I also want to remind people that a subset of those -- of that program, they took each of those sessions and kind of compressed them a little and cleaned up some of the questions and made them available from the FDLP Academy. So you can access those that way, also.

MR. MATHESON: Thank you. Anyone else from Council? I can keep going. All right.

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: So digitization contract for content to ingest into FDsys and govinfo was
one of the goals that you had shared with us this
spring. Can you tell us a little bit more about
that?

MS. HALL: Yes. Laurie Hall.

We have done the internal review. I
think last Wednesday I got one of the final
copies of the statement of work.

So Suzanne, anything else on that in the
last couple of days?

MS. EBANUES: Suzanne Eubanues, GPO.

We've completed our market research, and we have
draft statement of work and two draft task
orders. It's being reviewed internally, and the
next step will be to work with acquisitions to
determine the best -- for them to review and
determine if we think -- if what we think is the
best vehicle that they agree with and how to best
go out. So more on that in the coming months.

MR. MATHESON: I'm looking at my notes
for the other questions I wanted to ask. Two
other priorities that we talked about in the
spring were Federal Registered digitization and
bound congressional record metadata. I know
we've talked about those sort of in passing and
that there are updates in the handout. Are there
any -- can you talk to us about the rolling releases and sort of what the schedule for those look like?

MS. HALL: The project managers.

MS. RAMOS: Okay. Heidi Ramos, GPO.

So the bound Congressional Record we did release. Just a little plug, at 4:00 o'clock, I'm going to talk all about this in detail.

So -- but to let you know just in general, we don't have a schedule but expect the ONCR (ph) to roll and continue to roll out kind of similar fashion that it did with the -- sort of a batch. And it'll continue to do so as the content is able to be processed and we continue to work on metadata.

The Federal register, I don't want to give away a whole lot, but same thing. We are -- we've made significant process, and we don't have a schedule as of yet right now, but we do -- have made significant process. And a lot of details will be shared this afternoon about that, but expect to see something -- additional information. And we plan to update the project page for the Federal Register that we'll give a little bit more about that in the coming weeks or
MR. MATHESON: And that will -- just so everyone knows, that'll continue to roll out in chunks going backwards in time?

MS. RAMOS: Yes. So -- both, actually. The plan is we'll do '94 -- for the Federal Register, '94 through '90, ideally, and then continue to roll back until we hit 1936. And then bound CR is the same way. We did the '90s, and then we'll be working on the '80s. So ...

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall.

Scott, I just wanted to take an opportunity because we just talked about the LSCM structure, but we didn't talk about -- and maybe it's obvious to everyone, that -- but maybe it's not -- the PST, Program, Strategy and Technology Office and LSCM work pretty close hand in hand. So I wanted to Matt -- some of you know Matt Langraf (ph) from PST and Heidi. The -- we -- the two teams for the bound Congressional Record.

And that project specifically, our responsibility is the metadata. And obviously, Matt's side is getting it ingested. So they work very, very closely together. So -- but I just wanted to point that out. It -- it's, you know,
not just us. It's a group effort to work
together to get that done.

MR. MATHESON: That's all of my notes of
questions for now.

So if there are no -- Council, any other
questions from Council? If -- then if you're in
the audience and you have questions, please come
up to the microphone -- name and affiliation and
ask your question.

Likewise, if there are questions from
the online folks -- no questions yet, but feel
free to type those into chat, and we will see if
we can get answers for any questions you might
have.

Here comes somebody with the microphone.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler,
Wake Forest University School of Law.

Scott mentioned ingest into FDsys of
partner materials. Wait, that was -- no, that
was earlier. Never mind. Sorry. I was having
flashbacks. I'm still super excited about that.
He did mention that, though, and I got happy all
over again.

I was reviewing the regional discard
policy, and I have some questions about that.
Can we talk about that? Awesome.

I want to know because I'm like a law
person. I want to know some of the details of
how it's worded about discretion and what the
levels of discretion are. What discretion will
the superintendent of document have to approve or
reject requests to discard material provided that
it meets the given criteria, right? Because
there's the criteria about whether it's been
superseded, whether it's around. Whether it's
been retained for seven years, it's in FDsys, the
-- there's tangible -- four tangible copies.
Like so assuming all of that's been met, does the
superintendent then have discretion to approve or
reject requests? Or is it just a yes, yes, yes,
yes, okay?

MS. HALL: Okay, Cindy. Let's make sure
I -- because obviously, from a lawyer
perspective, check, check, check, check, check,
but then there's always that 1 percent or 1.5
percent that's not covered.

I don't know. I mean, I would assume
there may be a situation where that has to be --
that would have to happen, right? But I'm not
sure what that exception would be or discretion
is. My brain is not working this afternoon.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: And I'm not going to
try to, like, hold you to -- I just want, like,
big picture.

MS. HALL: There's always an exception.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: There's always an
exception.

MS. HALL: Right. Right.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: So I just want a
sense of are we expecting big picture that then
there is discretion, or big picture generally
it's a check, check, check? We're just -- the
request is going to be made to make sure it meets
those four criteria and generally then it's
accepted?

MS. HALL: That's where we're looking at
it.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Okay.

MS. HALL: At this point.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Okay. And then
extraordinary circumstances being possible, there
might be, oh, wow, well, we didn't foresee that
exception screeching breaks.

MS. HALL: Right.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Okay.
MS. ETKIN: Can I interject something?

MS. HALL: Mm-hmm.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

And my cogs are turning here, and I'm thinking maybe I have an idea of one -- what one of those exceptions might be.

Yes, it meets superseded. Yes, it meets the four preservation stewards, and, yes, they are geographically disbursed throughout the program. And it's on FDsys, and it has the digital signature. But wait a minute. We really don't want you to discard those. Can you send them over here to this library who wants them? So is -- I mean, that's not really letting them discard, but it is allowing them to remove them from their collection.

MS. HALL: Yeah, I was thinking if about another exception once you started talking or something that I -- okay. So we have four -- we have the minimum four, right?

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Mm-hmm.

MS. HALL: And what happens if those minimum four are all in kind of like only fair or less than fair and you come up with one that isn't, that's higher, you know? And we're
worried about something happening to those four because they're not in that great of condition. So is that another possibility that we may say, oh, we want that? We may want that or someone --

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: That one.

MS. HALL: Yeah.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Not those ones.

MS. HALL: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Okay.

MS. HALL: So -- I mean, just like you, I'm trying to dream of scenarios but that might -- one of the -- I think that came up in one of our discussions.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Yeah. So what I -- my follow up question was, if there is discretion I want to have this conversation about what the principles might be that would be the discretion, like, where that discretion would lie and what would underlie that as a matter of principle -- not as a matter of this is the exact, you know, questions that we would ask, but to have -- start having this conversation that we would start thinking about, so brainstorming this kind of thing. I think this is a policy principle matter that is of great interest to some parts of this
community.

MS. HALL: And I think that's -- because we've done a lot of that brainstorming ourselves internally. So if we have -- we have to turn it into a -- more of an open forum brainstorm.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Mm-hmm.

MS. HALL: We'll have to figure out how to logistically do that.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Yeah.

MS. HALL: But yeah.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: I think there are some people in the community who are very hungry for that.

MS. HALL: Right. Well, I think everybody's sort of going to the next logical step. If we didn't do that, I'd be very concerned about this community.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Yeah. My second sort of follow up is about the number 4, and I know we've had a lot of conversations about the numbers. So I don't -- I kind of don't want to have a rehash of that.

But I do want to know if there are -- and maybe this is a piece of that sort of extraordinary considerations for some titles if
this is -- if we can put that on the list of extraordinary considerations for some titles that maybe the number 4 is not appropriate for all titles. So that can be an extraordinary consideration. Think about some titles might need more than four.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I think that's a very valid point, a good suggestion. So let us know if you have such titles in mind.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Primary legal materials.

MS. ETKIN: Okay.

(Laughter.)

MR. FISCHLSCHWEGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County.

I can think of one possible discretion scenario, not necessarily where things would be rejected in the sense, but perhaps put on hold. And I'm thinking specifically if there's going to be a review period at three years, pending the outcome of that review, especially because I don't think it's going to take place in a 24-hour or 72-hour period, that let's say, for example, institution X is about to undergo it's review
period that the titles for which they are having
their stewardship review that the superintendent
of documents or the director might want to put a
hold on any additional requests to weed pending
the outcome of that so that there's nothing in
the pipeline that maybe then weeded through when
all of a sudden if it turns out that now we have
only three. So there might be something built
into the infrastructure of this wherein that
review period sort of covered -- just a thought.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason. One of the
possible criteria for exceptions -- you know,
four are not enough -- could be related to a
density of population or sparsity of population
in a particular area as well as geographically
distributed -- so the east coast, west coast,
dense population, not so much in the middle. But
we need that in the middle. Anyway that's not an
answer but something to consider when we're
talking about geographic distribution and four is
not enough.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of
Central Florida. I -- I am concerned about
speaking of the exceptions being extraordinary
and placing the SuDocs in the position of having
to fight to defend a decision that may be reasonable but we've locked into so there -- there's this formula and you -- why are you not letting me discard this. And I think there are materials where just because it existed -- this is not necessarily currently. But as this progresses, there may be materials that the online product is valid but may not be the best method for working with something.

Let's say maps become part of this as a process or really big documents that are really difficult to work between five different volumes electronically. There may be a need for other material that has more than just four as a bare bones minimum.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Maybe the basic collection.

MS. HALL: Laurie Hall, again. Sorry. That's okay.

Like I said, we've had lots of discussion about this back in GPO. In the same situation where somebody really wants to discard and we can't, you know, validate or whatever that we would be willing to take things ourselves at GPO just on hold. Now, that obviously is all
about space, whatever. So that was one of the things we also discussed, too.

If, you know, somebody -- because you're saying that they're feeling anxious. They really -- why won't they let us take this? If our evaluation period takes too long, we can identify the four -- the preservation copies, or there's some bibliographic issues that we can't identify. Uniqueness, that we may be willing to take, depending on how big it is -- temporarily take that collection ourselves until we can figure it all out. But that's -- not everybody back at GPO likes that idea. So …

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause.

JCP identified is four as the bare minimum, and there may be other considerations that go into it to what Cindy said in terms of if there's a preservation partner, but lack (ph) of a term. But there's somebody coming down the pipe that's going to be looking at stuff that might be willing to take it, but they're not ready yet to receive it. Could you hold onto it for another six months, or whatever it is, until such time so we don't ship it to GPO and then turn around and ship it to that other
institution?

So I think there's a lot of other
considerations, and four was the minimum.

MS. HALL: Yeah, those were all
considerations that we've talked about, too. One
of the key concerns for us, too, is just what
happened with the flood. I mean, you know, what
happens if one of our four preservation stewards,
you know, has damaged copies and we, you know --
so are we willing to bring those copies in and
help get them back, you know, yeah, whatever,
clean them up or whatever, so that they can go
back to that collection? So -- or we would take
them over.

But if you did have a library that was
really anxious and didn't -- couldn't hold onto
them anymore, that we may have to serve as an
intermediary until we can ship them off to the
other library until -- when they're ready. So
yeah, it's that, you know, jockeying (ph) of
collections all over the country.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson again.

Another sort of option in that situation
might be to establish a selective housing
agreement with a -- another -- with a local
selective for that regional and say, yes, we'll take this collection from you and hold it for a while until maybe there's a better disposition for it. So …

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University.

It's great to hear that, you know, clearly, these discussions have gone on internally within GPO. And necessarily, they would've had to in order to reach the policy that you did.

But it's also great that there'll be a more open public conversation about this, too, because just as this brief conversation has raised some issues, you know, different possibilities may emerge for considerations.

Also, part of that process helps educate all of us to have a better understanding of what the working policy really is because as Rich pointed out, you don't want to be in a position where it seems like everything's been met and yet you're pushing back on a particular case because to have the -- with -- while there's always exceptions and exceptions to the exceptions, the extent to which there could be predictability in
this process will be really important because it's not a small undertaking for many libraries to start down this road. And they want to have some level of, you know, idea of where they're going to end up based on the under -- everybody's understanding of what those criteria are.

MS. HALL:  Laurie Hall again.

It is also a big undertaking for us as well because of the inventory part -- piece of it. I did -- because -- now we're talking about a potential venue for brainstorming. And I will announce, and I'll do it sort of as a caveat because we still have to do a lot of processing and work on it.

Davita has given me permission to have a regional meeting in Washington hopefully this spring and have one representative from each regional library attend. We think that would be probably a good time because we hopefully will have the exchange ready in January or December. We will have gotten some -- everybody's thinking more about it. We've gotten a few more preservation stewards. So we'll give you a little bit more information on that.
Now, granted, she's given us permission. And also, we have to find adequate facilities on a short notice. Who knows what's going to happen with the administration and budgets and things like that? So I'm only looking past -- to December 9th, so -- at this point. But she has given us permission to have that kind of meeting.

We would also then have it recorded virtually. So we'll more and more -- once we get through this meeting, we'll start talking about that. So I think that would hopefully open the dialogue and everybody's -- had been thinking we'd have a little bit more information and ...

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson again.

I had written some -- I went through the policy and tried to wrap my head around where I thought maybe there was some ambiguity. For Part 2-C of the policy, which is, "Publication exists in tangible format with at least four tangible copies distributed geographically within the FDLP," am I right to understand that that information is tracked in the new -- in some portion of the new LSS, the catalogue of publications replacement piece? The holdings information, do we know where we're tracking that
yet?

MS. HALL: I'll have Heidi come up because --

MR. MATHESON: Everyone's standing up.

MS. HALL: Yeah, everybody's standing up.

I -- we have talked about a wide variety of MARC fields. We've brainstormed on potential eXchange being the location for that information. So Suzanne -- I mean we bantered around a lot. We haven't made a decision yet, but we bantered around a lot.

So Suzanne, you want to --

MS. EBANUES: Suzanne Ebanues, GPO.

Basically, what Laurie said, but right now we're working -- we're documenting the workflow process for the new preservation steward program. So we're kind of implementing and developing at the same time, which isn't the greatest, but we're doing it. And we're -- I think we're doing pretty well so far.

So we've had discussions about what the requirements are for recording that information and what information we need to record, and we're going to be meeting with the discard team as well
as with Lisa to discuss eXchange and perhaps PST
because it's -- to discuss whether or not there
also needs to be an FDsys govinfo.

So there's a lot of options. And we
have discussed the 583 field, so that is on our
radar. So we are working on it, and we know it
needs to be recorded somewhere. And we hope to
get that done as soon as we -- as soon as we're
able in a practical and efficient manner to be
sure it's the right place for us.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. And this is Anthony,
Scott.

Susan said it very well. I think we
have tried to encourage not putting the cart
before the horse, making sure that we understand
what those functional needs are to support this --
this activity before we start really, really
looking at solutions.

So there's certainly some ideas out
there, and we've talked about those. But I think
at this stage, we're really trying to at least
give this some time so that we have a better
understanding of some of these exceptions and
other things that may come up and will need to be
factored into any sort of technology solution
that we put in place.

MR. MATHESON: And then sort of related with that policy -- in the policy statement -- I'm looking at 2016-3 in the section on Page 2 that says Policy. Part -- Point 1 is, "The publication is superseded or later issued in bound form is one of the conditions."

This, as I understand it, is not a new opportunity for regionals to discard material. However, I also know that some regionals choose to keep material that has been superseded.

Can we while we're building these systems, while we're working on tracking this data, ensure that we're able to capture the data for those regional -- for those libraries, generally, who choose to keep things that are superseded even though they don't have to? Because that tells us important information about their collection. Does -- am I making sense?

Okay.

MS. HARTNETT: Scott, Cass Hartnett, University of Washington.

I -- we brought this up, gosh, I can't remember if it was earlier today or yesterday, but it -- it's almost hard to put into words, but
I can sort of see where the supersession data is overlapping with the preservation partners. It'll become clear as we go forward, I think, that what architecture will need to be built to support that.

MR. MATHESON: Okay. Any more questions from Council or the audience? And I'm getting a shaking of a head from Kelly. Nothing from the virtual -- the online participants yet? So -- oh, Cindy.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just want to remind everybody that there is part of this policy that hasn't been brought up that I heard. I had to step out for a minute. But there is nothing in this policy that requires regionals to discard. And we have not seen the barn doors flying open with requests coming into us.

So this gives us, I think, some time to continue to brainstorm further and to work on the systems that we can identify the functionality that we need. I think the meeting in the spring if we -- if that gets on the calendar is going to be a good opportunity to discuss all of this.

But I think we still have to look at the
real possibility that a lot of these collections
are not just going to be dumped. There are a lot
of people in 2014 when we did the initial intent
survey where 25 of the regional depository
libraries indicated that they were going to
retain their current collection.

And I know things can change, and I know
it's been a couple years, but 25 is way more than
the four that we're talking about that the JCP,
the Joint Committee on Print, has asked us to
have as a minimum.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. Beth Williams from
Stanford Law School. I like what you just said.
I appreciate it from an emotional standpoint, but
it doesn't really comport with what we heard
yesterday about the number of libraries that were
leaving the FDLP. And that feels like it maybe
the tail wagging the dog a little bit, but I
worry, you know. Like everybody else in the
room, I worry a good deal that the barn doors may
not be swinging open right now. But
administrations see an opportunity and can behave
inappropriately.

(Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.
And I appreciate that comment as well.

And the numbers that we were talking about yesterday were for public libraries. Thankfully, we have not seen that kind of drop rates from regionals.

And we do also have a very large number of large selective depository libraries with very large collections that can also be preservation stewards. It doesn't have to all rest on the regional depository libraries. I certainly understand how things can change in libraries.

Yeah, thanks, Beth.

MR. MATHESON: So in terms of preservation stewards, actually, this is an interesting question. We know it's open to regionals and selectives. What about consortia? I kind of mentioned a bunch of those when I was talking.

And you know, if one of our consortia that one of us is a member of wants to retain something or is willing to commit to retaining that, is that something that GPO would be willing to entertain directly with the consortia? Or is it something that a member library of the consortia who is also a depository should pursue?
What's the best course there?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

I'm going to go back to the broader umbrella of FIPNet. And very early on, we identified potential partners, and we also identified that there are a lot of organizations or consortia on a lot of libraries that have a lot of government publications in them that are either no longer a depository or were never a depository. And if we can work with those libraries, those consortia, we can do that.

MR. MATHESON: Thank you.

MS. HALL: That's why we're visiting you, to find out about all this stuff. So you'd be surprised.

And I echo Cindy because I was thinking about all the libraries that used to be a depository who are no longer in the program but still may have collections or haven't moved those collections. So the more we visit you guys, the more we hear about these things and hear who's got what. So I'm hoping we can continue to do some visits. So ...

MR. MATHESON: All righty. Last call for comments, thoughts, questions. This is your
chance, folks, in the audience or Council. And one last look at Kelly -- no one from the online stream.

We're -- we're happy to take your comments or questions. You have email addresses on your screen, virtual attendees and folks in the room, too. So if you think of something later, you're welcome to contact any of these folks directly or, of course, to contact Council.

Cindy has another comment. Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: I'm back.

MR. MATHESON: Thanks.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO.

Let me add one more email address to that. And that is if you're interested in being a FIPNet partner, you're interested in being a preservation steward, you want to know anything else about this related stuff you can email preservefedinfo@gpo.gov.

MR. MATHESON: Preservefedinfo -- I am writing this down --

MS. ETKIN: Preservefedinfo --

MR. MATHESON: -- @gpo --

MS. ETKIN: -- @gpo.gov.

All righty. And one more pitch since we heard from Anthony about the web content team. If you are -- especially for virtual attendees, but people in the room who may not have seen this, on the FDLP.gov website, there are -- there is a section. There's a big banner ad for the conference. If you click on that, you'll see a little blue button in the middle of the screen, a cluster of blue buttons. One of them says Handouts and Materials.

If you click on that there are 60-some -- it was three screens' worth of 20 items of slides and handouts and the poster sessions that are so nice in the Van Buren Room here in the hotel. You can get a PDF version, sort of an online virtual version of those poster sessions.

So please, especially virtual attendees, but also folks in the room who may want to take things back to their staff or their supervisors, take a look at that FDLP.gov website and look at the conference materials.

Anything else from folks? Oh, one more.

A virtual question. Excellent.

MS. SEIFERT: No, it's a Kelly Seifert comment.
MR. MATHESON: Oh.

(Laughter.)

MS. SEIFERT: There is about 98 percent of all the slides and handouts that you'll have these three days. And by the end of the week, everything will be there. So what's not there today is just a small bit, and then by Friday it'll all be there.

MR. MATHESON: Thanks. And thanks for your hard work on that, Kelly.

And if you're interested, you heard a little, like, teaser about some program here that you want to know more about, remember that the LSCM folks are often presenting, for example, full sessions on PURL's or full sessions on the eXchange demo. So you can find the slides there and get even more information.

All right. Kate?

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University School of Law.

You guys talked too long. I have another question.

(Laughter.)

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Going back to the policy, the regional discard policy, Criteria 1
is that the publication is superseded or later
issued in bound form. And I don't know if this
is a new criteria or one that I just always
glossed over because now that I'm -- I'm looking
at it more closely, and I'm not sure I understand
it.

And you know, maybe this is a dumb
question and it's just because I desperately need
a pretzel.

(Laughter.)

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: What I don't
understand about it in this moment is how there
are hearings on the discard list because I don't
know what this means -- superseded or later
issued in bound form. What do we mean by bound
form? Because I know that hearings can't be
superseded, right?

MR. MATHESON: I think 1 and 2 are not
additive. They are alternative, and 1 is not a
new criteria.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Okay.

MR. MATHESON: That later -- so
superseded or later issued in bound form has
always been -- those material have always been
eligible for discard by regionals.
MS. IRWIN-SMILER: By regionals or --

MR. MATHESON: So I think later issued
in bound form, think slips, think prelim prints
and U.S. reports.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Right.

MR. MATHESON: So once you get the bound
volume, you can --

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: You can discard that.

MR. MATHESON: -- chuck the slips and
the bound and the prelim prints.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: So there's a four.

MR. MATHESON: Now -- and again, this is
something -- sorry, Anthony, to make you sad
again, but a lot of libraries actually keep -- if
not all three, they definitely keep the prelim
and the bound. And I've had researchers ask for
them because they change more often than we
think.

But -- so 1 is not new, Kate. And --
and that is -- and those -- that policy I think
has to be read as an or, or your way doesn't make
sense.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: That makes a lot more
sense and that is probably why I always glossed
over it because regionals could always discard
that.

MR. MATHESON: Correct.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Thank you for that clarification.

MR. MATHESON: Thanks for the question.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: I clearly am in desperate need of a pretzel.

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: All righty. So I'm seeing nods of agreement about a need for a break around the table. So no other -- I see nobody else waving me down to make further comments, so I will thank very much the LSCM staff.

(Applause.)

MR. MATHESON: And thanks for the productive conversation. Come back in 45 minutes.

(Off the record.)

MS. HARTNETT: I'm Cass Hartnett, a U.S. documents librarian at the University of Washington libraries in Seattle.

This afternoon's program reflects the broad theme of driving new connections to the FDLP. Now, we know that when one walks through a SuDoc classified government document stack area,
one comes to a very large section at the end, the SuDoc whys, where congressional publications live.

Those of us committed to making work fun give ourselves the luxury of diving into this literature at whim. Perusing a committee document or report basking in the serial set, taking -- talking a colleague into acting out a hearing or --

(Laughter.)

MS. HARTNETT: -- Congressional Record like a theatrical play.

More seriously, as we agree as a depository community, legislative materials are foundational to our collections -- a bedrock of our content.

Most of us are quite familiar with our tangible congressional materials in print and microform. We also use FDsys, soon to be govinfo, to mine the publications online expertly. And if we have access, we turn to cutting edge value added tools from vendors like CQ, Hine (ph), ProQuest, Readex, LexisNexis, Paratext, and East View.

Or we might augment our understanding
with Legislative Explorer, legex.org. How we love to see those little animations of bills flying from committee to the main floor and back to committee or sunlight foundation tools like Capitol words, the analysis of -- of congressional speech. Or we investigate projects described at congressionaldata.org.

We know that, in addition to historians who make incredible use of all kinds of primary documents, there is a parallel community to ours -- a parallel community of practice out there, congressional papers archivists who work tirelessly with the information output of Congress but from a different angle. A single U.S. senatorial office produces an archival output of approximately 100 bankers boxes per year, and most libraries hosting such collections struggle to keep up with processing.

Rebecca Melvin, Curator of the Joseph Biden papers at the University of Delaware Library, reflected that -- and I'm quoting her -- "Many congressional archivists plunge right into their primary sources without a strong reference context for the outcome, the outputs of Congress. We archivists work with the records of the
creators and their messy cooking process, all the raw ingredients. But we're not as familiar with the finished dish consumed by researchers."

The community of FDLP librarians has much to share with our colleagues in the Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists, SAACPR. These two communities got some traction going at a joint program held when the ALA conference was here in D.C. back in 2010. Six years have flown by, and we're glad to be returning to this conversation.

We're honored to be joined today by Archivist Danielle Emerling, Depository Librarian Gwen Sinclair, and Historian Jay Wyatt.

Let's continue to ask where the Federal Depository Library Program can be of service to these constituencies. Rich Gause will introduce each of our speakers. After everyone speaks, we look forward to a lively dialogue in which we consider our Shared Obsession with Congress: Librarians, Archivists, and the "Y" of it All.

So Rich.

MR. GAUSE: We'll start with perspective of archivist. Danielle Emerling is currently chair of the Congressional Papers Roundtable of
the Society of American Archivists. She also assistant curator congressional and political papers at West Virginia University. This past year, she's been involved in making papers and photographs available online for the collection of Senator John D. Rockefeller. Previously, she was a congressional papers archivist at the University of Delaware.

Danielle?

MS. EMERLING: All right. Well, good afternoon.

I would like to begin by thanking Cass Hartnett and our colleague at the University of Delaware, Rebecca Johnson Melvin, for bringing together government information professionals and those of us who work with congressional papers once again.

And I thank all of you for joining us today to talk about our shared obsession with Congress.

Those of us whose work orbits our representative body know that its numerous fluctuations individuals, interests, politics, rules and procedures make it a dynamic, complex, and sometimes frustrating body to study. But we
also know the importance of this body for history
and for education, but also for understanding our
policy and democracy in the present.

Over the last several years, Congress
has had very low approval ratings, and Americans
seem to understand less about how government
works.

In a recent survey conducted by the
Edward M. Kennedy Institute, less than half of
adults polled knew that each state has two
senators.

While disheartening, statistics like
this remind me that those of us who curate,
preserve, and teach government information have a
vital role to play.

I have been working with congressional
papers for about six years now, and I was quickly
intrigued by the vast number of issues they
encompass and the range of voices and
perspectives they capture. And the more that I
have worked with congressional papers, the more I
see how essential they are to documenting the
various functions of congress.

In congressional collections you'll find
unique and original materials like
correspondence, press releases, speeches, staff memoranda, and more, illuminating not just a member's career, but also legislative actions and the development of policy, interactions with internal and external constituencies that do not necessarily make it into a publication and work done on behalf of constituents.

These materials document the behind-the-scenes relationships and negotiations between congressional members and their staff, colleagues, lobbyists, and other branches and agencies. And they offer us a picture of the types of information available to members and how decisions are ultimately made.

Coupled with the materials traditionally managed by government information librarians, congressional papers help us to capture and teach the legislative branch.

So today, I'm going to provide an overview of the history and nature of congressional papers, how they are managed and processed, and some new ways of documenting Congress to help us think about potential intersections and collaborations.

So I thought a good and obvious place to
start is with an explanation of what congressional and political papers are. Political papers can be broadly defined, and definitions might vary across institutions. Political papers can include congressional archives and also the papers of political parties of state and local political figures, and of organizations and individuals involved in public policy.

Congressional papers, however, are more narrowly defined. They are the personal papers of members of Congress and the institutional records of the House and the Senate. Personal papers are the records that are created or received in connection with an individual's career as a member of Congress, and they are preserved either as evidence of the organization and functions of that office or as information about individual members.

The member may choose the disposition of these records and may donate to an archival repository of his or her choice. They also can stipulate closure periods on these records. These are distinct from the institutional records, which are the official
records of congress and consist of the committee records. They remain in the custody of the federal government. And once inactive, they are transferred to the Center for Legislative Archives at the National Archives and Records Administration. Senate committee records are closed for 20 years, and House records are closed for 30. Committee records related to investigations and nominations in both houses are closed for 50 years.

So you may be wondering at this point how congressional papers were split up this way. Senate Historian Emeritus, Richard Baker, positioned the beginning of modern congressional papers history in the early 1970s. Following the 1972 break-in at the Watergate headquarters of the Democratic National Committee, the Senate Select Committee on presidential campaign activities set in motion a process that led to President Nixon's resignation.

And this process and Nixon's attempts to withhold presidential records raised the important question of who owns the papers of federal officials. At the same time -- at the time, papers of federal officials were private
property. But in 1977, the National Study Commission on the records and documents of federal officials, also known as the Public Documents Commission, concluded that presidential and congressional records should be defined by statute as public property.

Congress considered the recommendation, but chose only to address the papers of the president. And in 1978, they passed the Presidential Records Act.

Now, archivists' and historians' continued efforts to preserve the papers of members of Congress and envisioned a network of congressional study centers modeled after presidential libraries. House and Senate archivists developed handbooks and retention schedules to inform office staff about what they should keep and what they should not.

And in 1986, members of the Society of American Archivists held the first formal meeting of the Congressional Papers Roundtable, a group that continues to develop best practices for acquiring and managing those personal congressional papers.

Two years later in 1988, the Center for
Legislative Archives was established as a more prominent and visible home for the official or committee records of congress.

Another important milestone I'd like to point out came in 1991 with the publication of the documentation of Congress. It established a working definition of the functions of Congress and identified sources that document each of those functions. These included legislation, representation, political actions, administrative support, and external relations. These functions remain a relevant framework for evaluating sources about Congress, and are often reflected in the organization of congressional papers.

In 2004, the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, the ACSC, was formed to further the public's understanding of Congress and to integrate congressional collections into the educational process.

By 2008, a long sought-after goal was realized when congress officially recognized the historic value of the papers of its members and urged preservation. That year, the House and Senate adopted Resolution 307, which said that members' congressional papers should be properly
maintained and that members should take all
necessary measures to manage and preserve their
papers.

Here we are nearly four decades after
the Public Documents Commission made its
recommendations and the congressional papers
community has made significant process in
preserving and providing access to congressional
collections, fostering collaboration among
congressional study centers, and promoting
education and outreach with congressional
collections.

As of 2016, there were 43 congressional
centers across the country that are members of
the ACSC. And in 2012, the advisory committee on
the records of congress reported that of 18
senate offices that closed in 2009 and 2010, all
but one designated an archival repository.

The disposition of personal
congressional papers remains the member's
prerogative. Any acquisition process can vary,
depending on the institution and how a member
leaves office.

As archivist Linda Whitaker wrote in
2012, these collections can be "high stakes, high
profile, and come with even higher donor expectations."

(Laughter.)

MS. EMERLING: For long-serving members, especially, several repositories may vie for the honor of acquiring the collection. Once the repository is chosen, a contractual document called the Deed of Gift is negotiated with the donor.

A member of Congress with the retirement plan may have time for a deliberate search for a -- the right repository, comparing factors like an institution storage capacity, archival expertise, and funding. Members in this position may even have time to hire an archivist to prepare records for transfer. On the other hand, a member who unexpectedly loses an election will find him or herself with about 30 days to vacate the office, box up years of work, and choose a repository to ship it all to.

On the institutional side, those with robust congressional archives programs may court donors for years, building strong relationships that often lead to smoother records transfers to their repositories.
But all institutions with the potential
to acquire congressional collections must assess
whether a collection fits their collecting scope,
has enduring historic and research value to
warrant preservation by the repository, and that
the institution has the resources available to
store and manage a congressional collection.
This last point is very important because modern
congressional collections have many merits, but
the nature of these collections means they can be
the stuff of nightmares for many archives.
Most modern congressional collections
are extremely large and very complex. While they
bear the names of the member who created them, in
reality the collections have more in common with
organizational records than with the records of
an individual. These collections document an
office or, more often, offices, and these
sometimes hundreds of staff members who worked in
those offices over several years.
I'll give you an example. I carried the
collection of Senator Jay Rockefeller, and he
served for 30 years and employed more than 300
people throughout that time. In addition to the
Washington, D.C. office, he had four offices in
his home state of West Virginia. And the cumulative work of these people over this span of time adds up to more than 2,000 linear feet of records, as you can see in the photograph on my slide.

And it's not just that they're large. They contain every potential preservation challenge faced by repositories. Though we call them papers, they actually contain multiple formats, which include audiovisual items like VHS tapes, betacam, and audio cassettes. Increasingly, they are also born digital, meaning materials that were created digitally.

We received offices' shared drives, those hierarchical labyrinth of staff folders and files with their multitude of naming conventions and formats.

We also received archived email accounts, websites, social media, and hundreds of files on CDs, DVDs, and, yes, even floppy disks going back to the mid-1990s.

Processing the materials encompass a range of activities that are essential to organizing a collection, attending the preservation concerns, and making it
discoverable. Processing is a messy and time-consuming endeavor, and congressional collections are prime candidates for what we call more product, less process, or MPLP, a minimal processing approach that expedites the availability of collections to users.

Even with MPLP, each box may take anywhere from one to four hours to process. Because of their bulk, congressional collections are heavily appraised. Now, I don't know who said this quotation, but a wise person said that appraisal is what separates archivists from hoarders.

(Laughter.)

MS. EMERLING: While much of our material is unique, redundant items appear in congressional collections across the country, and archivists have identified types of materials that receive low research use. I'd like to point out that appraising materials in collections, I think, offers opportunity for collaboration, particularly of government publications like committee hearings that we often see in these collections.

Collections are arranged with respect to
their provenance and original order, if any order is discernible, and described in a finding aid, a descriptive representation of the collection.

Finding aids provide details about restrictions, creators, and contents, and are organized hierarchically beginning with a collection level description and moving down to folder or item level descriptions.

Congressional collections will often be arranged to reflect the functions of an office in series like legislative files, constituent services, political activities, and press relations. And this goes back to the documentation of Congress that I mentioned earlier.

Many finding aids are available online, and some repositories are sharing these records in their ILS or with cooperative services like archive grid. Even when they're online, finding aids can be tricky to track down, and there is no comprehensive congressional papers finding aids site. So two good places to start are the congressional repository index hosted by the Center for Legislative Archives and the Biographical Directory of Congress.
Now, as I mentioned at the beginning of my talk, Congress is an evolving institution, and so is the documentation of that body. More records are created and managed digitally, and these foreign digital materials require early intervention, advocacy, and ongoing curation by archivists to successfully preserve and provide access.

Changes in technology have also brought about changes in the ways constituents communicate with congressional offices and in the ways offices manage correspondence.

Constituent services systems are databases used to manage correspondence and increasingly things like social media, schedules and more in a congressional office. They are proprietary systems that make it challenging to export the data in a readable and usable way to repositories. A new task force of the Congressional Papers Roundtable is attempting to find a common system for access to these data.

And finally, we need to consider what it means to web archive Congress. As many of you know, a lot government information is published exclusively online, and members of congress
interact with a variety of constituencies via their websites, Facebook, and Twitter accounts. Because the web is a mess, as people at the internet archive like to say, congressional archivists are looking to other stakeholders like state archivists, the GPO, and the federal web archiving working group to see how closure calls (ph) the end of term of web archiving project and more will overlap.

Archivists and government information librarians have a lot to learn from each other about the information that is created by, for, and about the legislative branch. In addition to the technological changes and challenges, these new sources documenting Congress will raise new methodological and ethical questions for archivists and scholars.

These sources will require more intervention from archivists and librarians to help researchers not only discover them, but also to provide context for their creation and guidance for new ways of engaging with them.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. GAUSE: Next, we have a federal
depository library who many of us already know,
Gwen Sinclair, who is the head of the government
documents and maps department at the University
of Hawaii at Manoa library in Honolulu. She's
also an adjunct instructor at the University's
library and information sites program and teaches
a course on government documents.

Her publications of research interests
range from government secrecy to disposition of
federal property in Hawaii. She has an M.A. in
geography, Master's degree in library information
science both from the University of Hawaii at
Manoa.

Gwen?

MS. SINCLAIR: Aloha. This is a brief
overview of what I'll be talking about when I'm
sharing with my own obsession with congress. I
admit to being a government documents nerd. So
I'm going to tell you a little bit about what
we've done at the University of Hawaii at Manoa
in regards to making government -- congressional
material more accessible and how I've improved my
own knowledge of this material in order to help
our patrons better.

So I'll be talking a little bit about
what we've done with instruction and LibGuides, reference questions that involve both congressional -- published congressional material and congressional papers, and cataloging work that we do as well as Wikipedia.

So many of you no doubt have LibGuides related to your congressional material in order to help patrons understand what's in your collections and maybe understand how to use that. In our library, since I teach this government documents class in our library and information science program, I assigned all of my students one year to do LibGuides, and I gave them a list of topics they could choose from. And one the topics that I allowed them to choose was finding Hawaii congressional papers.

So I had two students who got together and created this wonderful LibGuide called Finding Hawaii Congressional Papers, and they did research and found where all the papers of our congressional delegates prior to statehood as well as the post statehood senators and representatives were located.

Our library at the University of Hawaii at Manoa has a few collections. But many of them
are in our state archives, and some of them have
never been deposited anywhere. That's also
useful information.

So the basic guides that they created
just tell the location of the papers, and they
tell a little bit of biographical information
about the member of Congress. But the LibGuide
is a growing organism, to paraphrase (inaudible).

So initially, these guides just included
the locations and a little bit of additional
biographical information. But over the course of
time, I've added a little bit of information. So
we put in works in the library about the members
of Congress or by them -- point to videos
featuring (inaudible) with them and things like
that.

And that -- I've started to experiment
with some other additions to this material like
listing their -- the committees that they served
on and the key legislation that they worked on
and the content of their papers, if there's no
online finding aid. And of course, many of the
papers that have been deposited with our state
archives, the finding aids are not available
online. So no one would know what the papers
consist of unless we put a note in.

And in the course of doing all this research, I realized that we could also improve Wikipedia. So I'll talk about that some more in a minute.

But just a note about the level of research required to make these sorts of additions to this LibGuide is that LIS students are a great source of free labor. And you might be thinking, well, that's great for you, Gwen, because you have and LIS program right across the hall from you, but we don't have one or ours is across the state.

Well, let me tell you there are a lot of students attending online LIS programs, and we have had some students who are -- students in other LIS programs work as interns for us. We had one from the University of Washington who lived in Honolulu but was going to school there. We had one who lived in Utah, was going to the University of Maryland, and wanted to do her internship with us because she had lived in Hawaii.

We've also had undergraduate interns, and many universities have undergraduate research
programs. So you might actually be able to get some undergraduates to do this kind of research. So this is a little -- I know you can't see this, but it's basically a list of the committees that delegate Joseph Farrington served on. And it was actually quite a lot of work just to make this one list because it -- the information wasn't all compiled in one place and I ended up having to look in the congressional directory to find this information.

So I thought, wow, that's a lot of work. And if you had a whole bunch of people who served in your state or somebody who served in both the House and the Senate, they would have served on an awful lot on committees. So this might be too much work, but you could probably winnow it down to some of the key committees that they worked on.

And in terms of our own delegation, of course, Senator Inouye, served on many investigative committees like Watergate and Iran Contra. And both he and Senator Akaka have worked on Indian affairs, so those might be some of the things that we could highlight.

In terms of key legislation, of course
Patsy Mink is associated with Title 9. Pat Saiki worked on restitution for intern Japanese Americans. Prince Kuhio worked on the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, and Joseph Farrington had many unsuccessful attempts at Hawaii statehood. And he died in office before we became a state.

So these are the kinds of things that can be highlighted in order to help our patrons know, if they're researching Title 9, for example, they might want to look into what Patsy Mink's role was in that.

So in the course of doing all this research, I thought, well, I'm going to look at the -- some of these Wikipedia pages and see what they have in them. And I found that some Wikipedia pages for members of Congress are really skeletal or very sketchy.

So you know, we librarians, since we know all of this stuff and we also know how to cite it, we could actually improve some Wikipedia pages. And we actually had an event in our library -- and maybe you've done this, too -- where we had a Wikipedia editing day where the librarians all got together. And all we did was did add references to Wikipedia pages for things
that weren't well cited.

Anyway, this is an example of the Wikipedia entry for Senator Spark Matsunaga. And someone from our library went in and actually wrote up a description of his senatorial -- his congressional papers -- he served in both the House and the Senate -- so that some researcher who's researching Spark Matsunaga could actually know that they're deposited with our library, what's in them, what the extent of them is, and why you might be interested in looking at them. So this a kind of improvement that we could make on Wikipedia pages.

Some additional things that I've done to improve access to congressional material include cataloging records. We have added records for things like important speeches that came out of the congressional record or material that was submitted by a member of Congress as an extension of remarks that might provide additional access to that content. So this is a bibliographic record for extension of remarks that was submitted by Joseph Farrington related to statehood.

I've also taken records for House and
Senate reports that I've been cataloging, and I add summary notes to them because sometimes when you look at the title of one of these reports like County of Hawaii TH report to a company HR-4300, it doesn't really tell you what the subject matter of that report was. But I added a note that says that the purpose of this particular bill was to pay the County of Hawaii for some damage that was caused by the U.S. Marines at Camp Tarawa in 1944 because they had a big Marine Corps base there, and they apparently were driving around rampantly, damaging the County of Hawaii's road building equipment. So -- and I also included the information that includes a transcript of the hearing that was held.

So that's useful information for patrons, but it's not something that is part of the standard cataloging that we usually do.

I want to give you a couple of examples of reference questions that I've dealt with that -- where both published congressional material and congressional papers came into play.

The first example is I had a patron who was a researcher for the Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance,
and he was trying to find the establishing legislation for his center that he worked in. And the only thing that he could find was a 1997 Appropriations Act, but he knew that the center had actually started in 1994.

So we were trying to find the 1994 legislation. And after much digging and hunting, we finally found -- thank goodness for the timeline's (ph) legislative histories. We found buried in a conference committee report this little bitty mention of the Center for Excellence that it was buried in a paragraph about C-3I intelligence programs. And this is the only thing that we could find for 1994.

So in that case, I really needed to refer the patron to the congressional papers for Senator Inouye, who was the person who put this earmark into this Appropriations Act. Unfortunately, as Danielle mentioned, congressional papers are generally closed for a certain period, and Senator Inouye's papers are closed until 2028. So in that case, the patron actually ended up going to one of Senator Inouye's former aides and asking her what she knew about this particular act.
A second example I have is in the case of a private law that was passed many -- you may not be familiar with private laws, but many private laws are passed to benefit specific individuals who have immigration difficulties.

So in this case, this was a fellow who is researching his grandmother who had lived in Hawaii but she wasn't a U.S. citizen. And she had gone back to China to help an ailing relative and had overstayed the period in -- during which she could return to the United States.

So she was stuck in China while her 11 children were in Hawaii, and so she asked Delegate Farrington to help her. And he sponsored this private law so that she could be enabled to come to the United -- come back to the United States.

So in this case, I was able to give him the published committee report. But I also suggested that he look at Delegate Farrington's papers in the Hawaii state archives so that he could see if there was any correspondence related to this law.

So that -- it really helped me to know something about the congressional papers and what
might be in them. So going back to (inaudible),
the librarian is also a growing organism. So
I've done a lot of things for my own professional
development, and some of them might be things
that you could think about doing, too.

First of all, of course, doing course-
based instruction is a great opportunity to
educate yourself about the legislative process.
You may not have the opportunity to do course-
based instruction very much, but you can also
make tutorials on the congressional resources in
your collection or about a particular topic. And
that's a great learning opportunity.

Of course, I teach in an LIS program.
But you know, you can do webinars. We -- of
course, we have some great webinar series. The
Accidental Government Documents Librarian and the
FDLP Academy -- and those are also opportunities
for you to educate yourself.

I do research using congressional
material. I've got a paper coming out in the
Hawaii Journal of History in a couple of months
that's based on some research that I did that
involved congressional material. So that was
also an opportunity for me to learn what's in
congressional material.

   Of course, you can also possibly take a class. I am taking a class in archives management right now, and it's being taught by our congressional papers archivists. So it's great because she's always giving us these examples about what she finds in congressional papers, which look exactly like what Danielle was showing us in her slides.

   But I know you -- some of you might be thinking, well, I don't have time to take classes. I don't have money to pay tuition. I can't do all of these things. But there are -- there is one thing that I bet all of you like to do because librarians all like to read books, right? So read a book that is based on research in congressional papers or congressional material, and you will really learn a lot about the -- what's in congressional papers, what's in congressional material, and the legislative process.

   So that's all I have. Mahalo.

   (Applause.)

   MR. GAUSE: Thanks, Gwen.

   Our third presenter is an historian, Jay
Wyatt, who's currently president of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress. He's also the director of programs and research at the Robert C. Byrd Center for congressional history and education at Shepherd University West Virginia.

Jay has a Ph.D. in history from Temple University, and his research interests include the history of the federal government, presidential biography, media history, and popular culture.

MR. WYATT: Oh, well thank you, everyone. Thanks for hanging in there until the end of the day with us.

Thanks to Cass and Rich for putting this panel together, and thank you to Danielle and Gwen for excellent presentations.

I'm excited to be here today to talk to you all about ways that we can collaborate on Congress and find ways to engage new audiences.

As you said, my name Jay Wyatt. I'm the director programs and research at the Robert C. Byrd Center for Congressional History and Education, which is located in -- at Shepherd University in Shepherdstown, West Virginia. And
I'm also the president of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress. And so before I get into sort of the meat of my talk, I want to give you a quick overview of those organizations, and you can feel free to visit the -- their websites to learn more.

At the Byrd Center, we hold the personal papers of Senator Robert C. Byrd, who was the longest serving senator in U.S. history, as well as those of a few members of the House of Representatives -- Harley O. Staggers, Sr., and Harley O. Staggers, Jr., both of which represented West Virginia.

In addition to supporting research into our collections and supporting scholarship, we also develop and produce public history projects from those materials. And our most recent endeavor is a large traveling exhibit as a career retrospective of Senator Byrd's life. And that is going to tour -- is touring West Virginia through 2017.

And in addition to that, we also host and sponsor a variety of public programs about Congress, about the Constitution, and
specifically about representative democracy.

The ACSC is a national organization of about 40 institutional members. That includes the Byrd Center. It includes West Virginia University libraries. It includes the Edward M. Kennedy Institute for the Senate up in Boston, the Carl Albert Center at the University of Oklahoma, the Dirksen Center in Pekin, Illinois.

And there is a tremendous variety among ACSC institutional members in terms of the scope and range of their holdings, our staffing levels or organizational structures, our operating protocols, and definitely our budgets.

The one common goal, the one common idea that sort of links us is that we all want people to use our stuff, right? We really specifically want people to use our stuff in relation to facilitating the study of Congress. And unfortunately, this is no small task in our current environment, right?

We all know that the build-it-and-they-will-come model doesn't work anymore, if it ever did. We know and we hear constantly that the humanities are under fire. At Shepherd, we see what seems to be a continual decline in the
number of registrants into our humanities classes.

And even within this sort of environment, congressional study, political science, history majors are really sort of on the wing. I just -- as a historian, was sad to see a report that said less than 5 percent of college graduates in 2015 were history majors, and that's not good.

And so that -- that kind of brings us to this sort of pivot point, right? Where do we go from here? Senator Byrd's not here to sort of give us any insight on how to do that. I'm not sure he would know all of the answers were he here.

But at the Byrd Center, what we've attempted to do over the past couple of years is to really turn over a new leaf, to really look to be proactive and engage in a public-facing manner to find new ways to re-engage our established audiences and to cultivate new audiences to hopefully generate more frequent and varied uses of our holdings.

And so my boss, his name is Ray Smock, and he's a former historian at the House of
Representatives. And he's very fond of referring to the U.S. Congress as the fulcrum of democracy, and I -- I really like that turn of phrase. It's one that we sort of talked about and debated at the center. And I love the idea of positioning Congress as the sort of pivot point in American society, right, the part of the federal government that -- through which the electorate can most directly exert its influence.

And I think that relates, at least in part to what we're talking about here, because my own work within our collections on our research projects has highlighted to me the many ways that Americans interact with their elected officials and the many, many ways in which the members of Congress impact an influence what happens in their states on the local, the regional level, in addition to sort of the national and international scope that we more often see on the nightly news.

And so it's with that in mind that I think one step that we can take, or that we should take, is really to try to step back and recognize the tremendous utility that these congressional collections hold. Of course, they
support political history, political science, policy history, sort of the traditional sort of topics.

But there's -- there's much more that we can glean from these records, as Danielle and Gwen have shown. These collections are rich with resources relating to the social and cultural history of America from the local level on up. There's so much more than just the institutional histories that we tend to think of when we talk about sort of this big entity that is the United States Congress.

It's -- in my three years at the Byrd Center, it's been surprising to me to really sort of come to understand the scope of the materials and to realize that they very much document the physical, the cultural, the economic development of West Virginia since the end of World War II.

So in addition to sort of all the official memorandamas and interoffice documents, we have thousands of images. We have thousands of flyers and pamphlets that promote local projects. We have transcripts from community hearings, zoning board meetings where Americans are debating the wherewithal of local projects. This
is local history. This is about as far from the floor of the United States Senate as you can get.

We have boxes upon boxes of constituent correspondence, which often provide new perspectives. And context regarding the attitudes of West Virginians and Americans were at large because lots of Americans wrote to Senator Byrd when he was the Senate Majority Leader toward specific projects and initiatives.

And I think that in terms of thinking about how we can collaborate the materials in congressional reference materials can really sort of support this sort of exploration into our holdings.

I think recognizing this utility and developing a broad sense for the types of projects that our materials can support can provide a foundation upon which we can then cultivate more use of our materials by traditional audiences and by new users as well.

So one group that we've really focused on over the past couple of years, we've targeted at the Byrd Center, are educators -- at the university level, at the high school level, and also at the junior high level. Being located on
a college campus, the low hanging fruit in this sort of environment is, of course, the faculty at Shepherd University and, more specifically, the history and the political science faculty.

And so over the past few years, we've worked with faculty to go beyond the standard archives tour that we sort of -- is so commonly given to freshman. And what we've done is we've really sort of partnered with them and worked to develop numerous specific -- content-specific tours that relate directly to their upper-level courses.

These tours have provided then a mechanism for highlighting the variety of student research projects that our collections will support, everything from black lung to civil rights opposition to Cold War foreign policy. Across the board, we have -- our collections can support a plethora of topics.

And supporting these projects and sort of working to sort of pull students in, this has then also helped to generate additional buy-in from university faculty. And so now each fall semester we generally get somewhere between two to four students from Shepherd's introduction to
public history course who volunteer at the center to fulfill a class service requirement.

When volunteers come in, we teach them some basic processing procedures. We give them a little bit of experience in that, and then we turn them loose into our collections. We work with them to develop possible research topics, and then we have them write some blogs for our website, which we then go through an editing process with them.

So we're sort of pulling them in, making them partners. And what they get on the back end of this volunteer period is some tangible takeaways.

This has been a very successful endeavor, and what's grown out of it is a relationship with Shepherd faculty whereby they're now referring students to us for their larger internship projects. All Shepherd history majors have to do a 400-hour internship. And so now we're pulling in interns to do that.

Sometimes they begin as public history volunteers, and they transfer that experience into a full-on internship. And then the work that they do as interns in our collections
ultimately then provides a foundation and a jumping-off point for their senior research capstones, which oftentimes they come back and provide -- do more research in our collections.

So generally, by the end of the spring semester we have three, four, maybe five undergraduates doing some serious research in our collections producing a variety of different types of capstone projects, everything from kind of a traditional research paper to digital humanities projects.

And all of this sort of works to sort of help increase our profile on campus. It also helps us think differently about the collections that we have and the different ways that we can use them. Undergraduates are really savvy, and they use these resources in ways that I haven't necessarily thought about. So I like working with them and talking with them.

If we were sort of thinking beyond -- thinking beyond the higher education world, we've also begun to reach out to high school and junior high history and civics educators to try and find ways that we can make our materials available to them. I've worked with individuals at the local,
the regional, and the state level to increase
awareness about our collections. And in doing
so, we've developed and contributed to LibGuides.

But what I've really found out and what
I've heard most from educators and from
administrators around the state is that teachers
want plug-and-play materials, essentially. They
want to be able to go download something and plug
it right into their course and, at the very
least, have something that is very readily
adaptable to meet their curriculum requirements.

And so none of us at the Byrd Center are
education specialists. I don't know that much
about Common Core in West Virginia. I know more
about it now than I did a year ago.

But what we've done is partner with
education staff from West Virginia's Division of
Culture and History to figure out how we can
develop specific lesson plans that meet the needs
of state educators.

And so as we work through this process,
what we'll end up with is a group of teaching
modules and lesson plans that will be made
available through the State Division of Culture
and History's website. They'll be made available
to the -- through the Byrd Center's website. And then we'll -- we're going to turn around and use them as part of a future workshop for teachers, and that provides a nice sort of segue into my nice -- my next slide.

So this past August, we collaborated with Shepherd's continuing education program and NARA Center for Legislative Archives for a one-day teacher institute at the Byrd Center. And what we've kind of realized is that these sorts of teacher training workshops really offer a tremendous opportunity to get face time with junior high and high school educators. And this is no small task, especially during the academic year.

And it's through these sorts of events that you can introduce them to your organization, introduce them to your holdings, and really sort of introduce them to any of the educational resources or projects that you have developed or in -- are in the process of developing. We were able to give all of the attendees at this institute a full tour of the archives, and we actually developed a separate specific content tour related to our collections.
I'm sorry. I'm getting ahead of myself.

So our workshop was led by Charlie Flanagan, who is the director of outreach at the Center for Legislative Archives. Charlie is a 30-year -- I think he's in this. Nope. I thought I had a picture of Charlie in here, but I don't. Sorry -- 30-year educator who has a tremendous amount of experience in not just sort of working with teachers, but also developing educational resources.

Attendees were able to register in advance, and they had the opportunity to provide -- or to earn professional development credits through Shepherd. And providing this sort of incentive we figured out is really important to getting teachers to come out and giving up their Saturday afternoons. They need to get something out of it beyond the actual resources.

And so we broke the event up into four specific stages. And during those stages, Charlie walked attendees through four active learning lesson plans that related to teaching the Constitution, teaching the Bill of Rights, and then two that were specific to teaching about Congress -- one that dealt with how a bill
becomes a law and one that dealt specifically with the compromise of 1850s.

And during these sessions, we were able to get the educators up, get them working, actually participating and working through the lesson plans. And then at the end of the day, they were all very excited to find out that everything that they had done over the course of the previous six hours was available for download on the Center for Legislative Archives's website. So they could take everything that they worked on that day and apply it immediately to their course, or something relatively close to that.

And what the teachers told us was that developing resources that combine active learning techniques and the use of primary sources, which our collections are rich in and is a real key to -- toward driving student engagement.

And so one of the things that we've sort of been working on as well as part of this is to find ways to engage younger students. The students in this picture are fifth and sixth graders who actually came to the Byrd Center to do research during their fall break last year as part of a research project for the West Virginia
Social Studies Fair.

They traveled about four hours to make the trip and to sort of go through the archives, and it was a real treat to sort of see the way that they engaged with the materials and getting behind the scenes tours of the archives.

And I think this is an area where developing new and creative LibGuides can be of great help. They can give educators an idea of how your resources can be put to use by their students and how they can be put to use in support of projects that will go towards local-, regional-, or state-level history or social studies competitions.

At the Byrd Center, we support the National History Day Competition at the state and the national level. We participate in the state's history bowl, which is a sort of trivia kind of contest for eighth graders. And we also then support the state's social studies contest as well.

And so all of this sort of volunteer activity is very rewarding in and of itself. But it also then provides an additional opportunity to get out there, to fly the colors, to talk
about your collections, and then to also talk to educators about what they want, what they need, and the topics that they're trying to address or find new and creative ways to address in their classes.

If you were thinking broadly and you still have the energy to sort of go that big, I also -- we also work at the Byrd Center and through the ACSC when some larger initiatives, things that we like to refer to as collaborate, celebrate, and create.

So at the ACSC, one of the early initiatives that we've -- that we established and have been working on over the past few years is Congress Week. Congress Week is the first week of April every year, April 1 to 7. And that commemorates the week in which the House and the Senate reached their first quorums in 1789.

And so as part of this we've developed a website, www.congressweek.org. We filled it with fun facts and resources and links relating to Congress and congressional history. And each year we sort of add a little bit more, try to add some different creative elements to it.

We also use it as a -- as an opportunity
to market the ACSC. We developed a promotional packet that we deliver to each member of Congress and to other organization that we may be looking to recruit as potential members. And in sending those packets to Congress, we generally have them hand-delivered to each office to sort of make them aware of what we do and the importance of congressional history.

Congress Week then also provides an opportunity and incentive and, really, on some level a rationalization for organizations to promote the study of Congress through their own initiatives and projects and programming. In the past, ACSC members have coordinated social media campaigns. We've developed blog series. We have sponsored traditional lectures and book talks as well as film screenings. So there's a multiplicity of things that you can do under this umbrella.

And then finally, if you're really feeling energetic, one last mechanism that you can -- that you can utilize for engaging new audiences can be through collaborative projects such as the Great Society Congress. And the Great Society Congress is a digital exhibit that
Danielle and I have been working on for the past two and a half years or so with a small but dedicated team of ACSC colleagues.

And so the Great Society Congress focuses on the 89th U.S. Congress, which sat in 1965 and 1966 and which passed most of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society Legislation. The exhibit itself is built on the Omeka platform that was developed by the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media at George Mason. It's open source. And our particular exhibit is hosted by the University of Delaware libraries.

It has three core sections focusing on the makeup of the 89th Congress, the key pieces of legislation that passed, and then we have a broader section called the Political Environment, which is sort of a catch-all. And we have features in that that focus on civil rights and Vietnam.

The exhibit now has over 400 primary sources and were contributed by more than 20 different ACSC members. And we also then just completed work on a five-day teaching module that works off of the exhibit for educators, and we developed that in collaboration with the Center
for Legislative Archives as well.

So over the course of the next couple months, we'll be rolling that out and hopefully getting some feedback from educators.

The project has been a tremendous amount of work. There's no denying that, but I think it's offered a fantastic platform for reaching out to different audiences. We developed it with the idea that we wanted to engage scholars and educators as well as the general public, particularly people interested in Congress but then also perhaps more broadly with the history of the 1960s as well.

So it launched on April 1 of 2015. We've since had about 10,000 users with almost 13,000 sessions. And it's provided us an opportunity to write for and promote the exhibit on the National Council for Public History's website, the American -- or the Organization of American Historian's website, as well as several other online publications.

And then right now, we're also working on essays for the National History Day 2018 theme book, which we hope will sort of then bring the exhibit to educators across the country and an
academic article about the process of developing it, which we'll submit to the public historian. So the idea is, I think, that there's a lot of different ways that you can go in terms of looking for ways to reach out to and engage in different audiences. Some of them are more achievable in the short term. Some of them require a lot of work and can be multi-year projects. But they all can bear fruit in their own way, and I think they're all sort of reflective of where we need to go with congressional materials, which is to find more and new users to sort of take advantage of them. And of course, the more people who use them, the easier it is to sort of legitimize the work that we do in them and then to also then make the case to our congressmen that, yes, it is important that they take care of this stuff and they think about how it gets transferred into the hands of archives and archival repositories and libraries. So with that, I'll conclude and say thank you again all for coming. And I look forward to answering any questions that you may have. (Applause.)
MR. GAUSE: Thank you all three of you.

We'll move to -- I think it would be making it happen together how the depository community and the archive -- archives community -- how we could work together on this. We'll move to questions from Council.

So any comments?

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan -- pardon me -- Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library.

This is a question about potentially being on the receiving end of such a collection. Lots of libraries have deep and broad special collections kinds of things and would deal with the multimedia issues and the, you know, multiplicity of everything that goes with a -- a rich archival collection.

But I sense that there -- you tactfully, I think, used the phrase donor demands, was one of the things. I wonder if you could speak a little bit to some of the unique considerations that might attach themselves to congressional collections that might be a little bit out of the ordinary from a typical archival kind of possible donation.

MS. EMERLING: Sure. Thank you for that
question. This is Danielle Emerling.

Congressional collections do have some unique considerations. I think one is that because I mentioned that their staff members are often documented very well in these collections and their memos and decision-making as well that, even though a member is out of office, their staff members may continue to work on Capitol Hill. And some of them, you know, may have 30- or 40-year careers ahead of them.

So sometimes the closure periods that we consider are for staff members as well as the donor themselves.

And I would also say that there are a lot of privacy concerns in congressional papers that we deal with. So we've mentioned that constituents write in about different issues. So there are concerns about issue now that we receive -- that are received in congressional collections.

And there's also something called casework. So constituents who have problems with their Social Security or disability or they're trying to adopt a child overseas or -- those sorts of concerns may end up coming to a
congressional office and then being transferred to the archives. And so we take protecting privacy of those folks very seriously.

Some archives will choose, in fact, not to keep casework at all because it usually is voluminous and, because of the privacy concerns, will have to remain closed for quite some time. Others may choose to only keep parts of it that perhaps document the state specifically, like in West Virginia, for example, that might be black lung casework.

MR. SHAW: This is Jim Shaw from the University of Nebraska at Omaha. And I sort of have a comment and an appreciation for Danielle and her photographs.

In 2008, I came to the DLC conference and disappeared one afternoon because I -- my dean told me get up to the Russell Senate Office Building and talk to Senator Chuck Hagel's staff because my dean had cut a deal.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHAW: I -- it's a long story. Meet me at the bar if you're interested after.

But in any event, one of the staffers took me up to the attic of the Russell Senate
Office Building. And I had my camera with me, and I shot a bunch of pictures. And he smiles at me and says and this is just the second term. The first term is in temporary storage over at NARA.

So we ended up getting an entire 18-wheeler, 53-foot van of papers just out of the Russell and NARA. And then we got all the four regional offices in Nebraska.

And the reason why I comment on the photographs is it's exactly true. Some of the boxes we opened up. And it was as though someone had just swept their arm across the top of the desk and everything --

(Laughter.)

MR. SHAW: -- into the box, including a can of spaghetti.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHAW: Hey, Spahettios, you know. And you know, we're still processing, processing, processing. And my job has changed. I'm no longer the director of archives and special collections as I was back then.

But so a heartfelt appreciation to any colleague in Archives Special Collections that
takes one of these things on. They are amazingly
informative.

I can't say much because our records are
largely still closed. But I saw things in there
that I know decades from now students and
historians will look at and marvel at. So you're
doing the Lord's work.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHAW: But -- so I'm starting to
ramble here. But you know, one thing thinking
about -- we've got really, really strong
congressional collections in our depository
programs. And those Senate foreign relations
hearings that we have dovetail so well with
Senator Hagel's Senate Foreign Relations
Committee records.

And I could tell immediately, almost
immediately, that over time we would find all
sorts of synergies and in how we could work with
these and researchers moving back and forth
between the depository collections and the
archival papers. So they are enormously
valuable. There's lots of opportunities.

And you know, we all look for ways to
spread the work around. The librarians out on
the main floor and the archivists back in their area, these are things we can really collaborate on.

So thank you very much for this presentation today.

MR. MATHESON: Scott Matheson from Yale Law Library.

Gwen mentioned this sort of in her presentation of adding bibliographic references to -- in the context of history and the context of archives. And I'm wondering if it might make sense where you've got a collection -- maybe folks have done this -- where you have a finding aid that then says by the way, Senator Hagel was very active on the foreign relations committee. Here is the block of hearings that you should look up. Or here are the -- you know, the related works that are most important.

Do those sort of things make it into finding aids as a rule? Or I mean, have you seen that? Is it something that archivists could request the docs librarians work on since that's sort of what -- the material we work on?

MS. EMERLING: This is Danielle.

We would love to have the GovDocs
librarians work on this with us. I haven't seen
a lot of that in finding aids because, especially
with congressional collections, we tend to stay
on a higher level of description.

I mentioned that sometimes I might get
into the item level, but that's pretty rare that
that happens because of the time it takes to do
that sort of work.

So I think you're absolutely right that
those sorts of collaborations would be welcome.

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of
Central Florida.

I think dovetails with what you just
said, Scott. I'm thinking in terms of we often
deal with a piece of legislation, a significant
bill that went through, as opposed to exactly who
the players were -- and it may be across multiple
states in terms of who the key players were -- or
the participants who made significant
observations in what they have in their personal
collections.

And so try to identify from state to
state from a (inaudible) guide that deals with
Title 9, for example, and then identifies where
personal papers may reside that are open and that
MR. GAUSE: -- and then somebody's investigating to see before you refer somebody there that, yes, there does appear to be some material that would be relevant to somebody doing research in this area.

But that would be state to state to state on a piece of legislation as opposed to starting from the member of Congress.

MS. WILLIAMS: Beth Williams from Stanford Law School.

I'm just echoing the comments here. I think you'd find this community really engaged with the opportunity to work with you. I feel like we have a lot of skills that can kind of flush out a lot of the work that you're doing. So I hope you'll consider the group a resource.

And just a couple of comments, too. I don't have anything as sexy as a spaghetti can.

(Laughter.)

MS. WILLIAMS: But for academic law librarians, we are often on the receiving end of faculty paper collections. And I'll just say as a -- you know, an offering of solace. At least
at the end of your process there's something that
might be of value at the end of all that.

(Laughter.)

MS. WILLIAMS: But my -- that's not
including any of the fine colleagues in my
current institution.

(Laughter.)

MS. WILLIAMS: But I also wanted to just
say for each of you because you mentioned
teaching elementary, high school students,
undergraduate students incorporating all of your
work into a curriculum and doing the heavy
lifting of actually curriculum-building
yourselves.

It makes me feel so much better when I
teach my law students that there is maybe a lot
of work that's going on at lower levels that may
make them better informed by the time they come
to our classes. So it is much appreciated from
those that come after you. So thank you.

MR. WYATT: This is Jay Wyatt.

Just to kind of reiterate on that, the
people at the Center for Legislative Archives
have developed an app called -- an e-book app
called Congress Creates the Bill of Rights. And
it was specifically developed for junior high, high school classes.

And one of the things that we've learned in just kind of talking about these things with them is that they've gotten feedback from law schools that law students really enjoy the app. The app actually has tracked some of the bills, the initial bills, through the process of becoming the Bill of Rights, looking at the markups and that sort of thing and created, you know, really interesting conversations within law school.

So you know, I don't think that they necessarily developed it with that audience in mind, but these sorts of things really do translate very well.

MS. RUSS: Karen Russ, University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

To follow up on what Beth said, or Jay, the work that you've done for curriculum is fabulous. As an Arkansas judge for National History Day, I know what it's like to try to get some of those students into material like that without intimidating them and their instructors. So it's wonderful to see work at that level.
MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown University Library.

More of a curiosity, really -- you know, Senator Byrd's collection, that was years in the making, obviously. Whether it's Chuck Hagel or Kennedy Center or Dirk Center (ph), wherever, you know, one can see research centers built up around those kinds of things.

But there's 535 members of Congress in any given time. And I'm guessing that some of them don't always make it to, you know, some courted institution that, you know, will house their papers in perpetuity.

So what happens to the rest of the stuff?

MR. WYATT: Sure. Well, what happens is a variety of things. Because the Congressmen have jurisdiction over it, they can determine whether some parts of their papers go to repositories, whether none of it goes at all, whether it sits in a barn.

(Laughter.)

MR. WYATT: One of the collections that we have is actually sort of split with West Virginia University Libraries, and that's the papers of Harley O. Staggers, Sr. We didn't
really know it at the time, but he was a pretty -- as we got into it, we learned that he was a chairman of the commerce committee for 15 years. He was involved in all these sort of national-level issues.

WVU, you all have most of the ledged (ph) files, and we have the personal files. The only reason we have them is because someone reached out to my boss, Ray Smock, and said hey, there's a barn full of boxes at Harley's farm. Do you guys want them?

And we actually had to go get them and go through a prolonged process of treating them over the course of six months before we could even bring them into the center. So there is no real process.

And the idea of have -- Danielle and I were talking about this earlier today. The challenge of having these collections spread out across the country is really an obstacle in terms of engendering research and the sorts of things that bring attention to these collections.

Presidential collections that are sitting in presidential libraries get lots of publicity, and they carry a lot of prestige if you can get a
research grant to go there and spend three weeks
at the Johnson Library. And that really points
researchers in that direction. You go where the
money is.

And that's a problem that needs to be
overcome. But there's real differences, too, in
the way -- in the rules that govern presidential
records as compared to congressional records. So

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair.
I'd like to add something, that I think that over
the past couple of decades, congressional papers
archivists have gotten to be a lot better about
making contact with members of Congress while
they're still in office so that they can make
them think about where they're going to deposit
their papers.

I know in -- at our library, the rumor
has it that we missed out on getting Patsy Mink's
papers because the Library of Congress was really
on the ball and got their foot in the door first.
So we only have a little bit of her memorabilia,
but the rest of it is at the Library of Congress.

And I'd also like to echo what Jay just
said about finding things in a shed. You know,
we have a senator named Hiram Fong, and his stuff
was in a shed on his lawn for a number of years.
And apparently, nobody had made contact with him
about, you know, maybe you should do something
with this where it will be in a better
environment and so forth.

So -- and you know, there are some
members of Congress who we -- nobody knows where
their papers are, and some of them don't retain
their papers. You know, they just don't think
that they want to have them someplace.

MR. SHAW: I'm -- this is Jim Shaw again.
Now I'm just curious. I heard, though I
never took the time to try to confirm it, Senator
Tom Tancredo, Colorado, that he just arranged to
have his papers picked up, taken straight to the
shredder. Does anyone from Colorado know?

But I bring that up because it is true
that these -- the personal papers of members of
Congress are their personal papers, in spite of
what -- remember, that was a concurrent House
resolution we saw. That wasn't law. That was a
suggestion.

And so yeah, a lot of them don't survive.
A lot of them don't survive.
MR. WYATT: This is Jay Wyatt again.

One of the, I think, the things that we're sort of seeing -- Danielle, you can correct me if I'm wrong -- is that the Senate collections tend to be more reliable in terms of finding their way towards archives of senators or sort of tend to be, you know, longer term.

They're there longer, whereas the member of the House, in some cases, they're there for two years, they're there for four years. And from some of the people that we've talked to, there's a sense that, you know, they didn't really do much there, or it's not really all that valuable.

And so I think that the Senate is definitely moving into, you know, pretty good territory. I'm not so sure about the House.

MS. EMERLING: This is Danielle again.

I think that over that history that I was talking about, a lot of what was happening is outreach, as Gwen mentioned -- outreach from archivists to Congress saying, yes, your papers are important. We need to preserve them.

And so there has been an increase in the number of folks who are saving their papers and
sending them to archival repositories. And there's definitely a difference in quality, too, in congressional papers between, say, someone who served 30 years in the Senate versus someone who served 2 in the House.

I'm not trying to say that they shouldn't be destroyed, necessarily, but there is some conversation that repositories have to have with themselves about what is worth the effort of keeping and maintaining in their collections and what is not.

MS. THORNTON: Lori Thornton, New Mexico. And I want to echo. Thank you so much. This is absolutely fascinating, and I can't wait to get back and start digging into the New Mexico congressional history and find out where some of those things are, if they are.

But a matter of curiosity, does a state law enter into this? I know there is a state senator in New Mexico whose widow refuses to relinquish her husband's papers. She is protecting his reputation, in her mind.

(Laughter.)

MS. THORNTON: And now she's passed into -- well, two of the siblings are willing to
relinquish. The son is not.

And does that enter into it at all?

MS. EMERLING: This is Danielle again.

This is someone who served in the state legislature?

MS. THORNTON: Yes.

MS. EMERLING: Well, I brought some information about that because I thought this might come up. And it really -- it does vary a lot across the states.

Some states have -- well, I'll start here. In 2013, Brian Keo (ph) and Elizabeth Navar (ph) are two archivists, I believe, at University of New York at Albany and University of Maryland, if I'm correct there. They published an article about state papers. And they had conducted a survey.

And so some states do have public records laws. That's about nine. About five states say that they are private by law or policy. Twenty-six states say they are private by tradition. And 10 states are inconclusive about what should happen to state legislators' papers.

So I know in our state, sometimes they end up coming to our center, our archival center.
Sometimes they go to the state archives. And sometimes I imagine they are kept by the legislator.

So I would say just check with that state law. It may be that they are indeed private.

MS. THORNTON: What about nationally? Does the state law come into it there at all?

MS. EMERLING: Not that I know of, no.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If we don't have any other questions or comments from Council -- did you have -- you did.

MR. CORNWALL: I had one quick one.

Daniel Cornwall, Alaska State Library. Just to satisfy Jim's curiosity, I have a February 9th, 2009, political article that does indicate that Tom Tancredo did indeed send his papers to the shredder, said he had no idea why anyone would want to see them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. We'll move to questions from the audience and anybody online.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University School of Law.

This is not a question. It's just a comment because I was actually upstairs. I was
going to take a nap, and then I saw (inaudible) that Cass said something about the serial set. So I ran downstairs. (Laughter.)

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: But this is actually a comment about the serial set because I happened to have seen, like, two weeks ago that there's a volume of the serial set that lists where federal -- like, national -- what do you call those -- senators' and representatives' papers are from 1789 to, like, 1995.

So I didn't know if everybody knows that. I only know that because I was down in our movable shelves, compact shelving, looking for a different volume of the serial set and I happened to see that volume. And I thought it was one of the coolest things.

It's just like one of those weird things that's in the serial set that you happen to trip over. And I thought it would be an interesting, relevant thing to mention to people.

I think the serial set is one of the coolest pieces of government documents. And it's -- I was telling my boss. I think it was, like, the congressional attic and, like, you never know
what's there.

And so I wanted to share that little piece of information because how else would you know that's there unless you happened to trip over it. So …

MR. GAUSE: Rich Gause, University of Central Florida.

I always like the -- it looks like the biographical directory --

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Yes.

MR. GAUSE: -- is probably the most complete that I've seen. But in going through it for Florida, you know, I'm finding a dozen other members of Congress that their papers are showing up in special collections in different libraries around Florida.

And so I've gone through their listing, and I've got a list for Florida of where those are held. But they're not in -- including what's at my institution, they're not in any of the lists. And I've contacted my special collections library to say can you contact to say we have this and get it added to those lists.

But state by state, I'm sure there are many other collections that you have to go
through to dig around.

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Yeah.

MS. ORTHAL: Carmen Orthal (ph),
University of Kansas. I just really have a
comment.

I really appreciate this presentation.
Being from Kansas with the Dull (ph) collection,
I do some work with the Dull archives on history
day projects and stuff like that. But you guys
have generated some new ideas for us. So thank
you.

MS. KA: Suzanne Ka (ph), University of
Montana.

Again, thank you for this great, great
presentation.

I'm wondering if it would even be worth
it when someone is elected to an office to send
out a representative with, perhaps, a fact sheet
on how they should maintain things and have,
like, regular file names and what things look --
archives are looking for to kind of perhaps limit
that box of Spaghettios and various papers and if
that would even be feasible in most cases.

MS. EMERLING: You make a very good
point, and that sort of thing does happen.
Senate and House archivists go out and do workshops for new members.

And I think probably it just depends on the person. Sometimes it sticks; sometimes it doesn't. I would say generally, though, they are just so overwhelmed with getting a congressional office set up that sometimes that's not what they're really worried about, is that moment that they have to leave office and send their papers somewhere.

But you're right. That sort of ongoing outreach is really important, especially now that we're dealing with so many electronic records.

MS. SINCLAIR: This is Gwen Sinclair. I'd like -- also like to follow up on what Danielle just said.

I know that our former congressional papers archivist went -- moved to Washington and worked for Harry Reid and helped his office set up their files so that they could -- they would be organized appropriately to be deposited once he leaves office.

So I think that happens sometimes. But as Danielle remarked, I think it happens more often with senators than with representatives.
MR. ABERCROMBIE: Brent Abercrombie, Indiana State Library.

With communication now going from paper and pen to electronic keyboard, have you come across any congressional collections that are entirely born digital? And how does that change your processing and access if it's granted?

MS. EMERLING: This is Danielle again.

I haven't come across any that are entirely born digital. I'm -- I think we'll be seeing more that are maybe more half-and-half digital and paper. I don't know that we'll see paper going away any time soon. People still like to print a lot of stuff out, which is fine.

In the archives world, there are a lot of -- special collections are grappling with how to treat this born digital material, and we are the same. We use a lot of sort of digital forensics techniques to kind of try to retain that -- the way that those materials were originally created and try not to change too much about them because we want to preserve them as they were created.

In terms of access, when I was at the University of Delaware, we actually did open a collection that had a significant amount of born
digital material. And what we did is we created a reading room workstation where people could access that material because we weren't quite ready to put it up online. It was a lot of staff files that are now open to people but in the reading room situation.

And I think other special collections are looking at things like digital reading rooms so that you might need a password, say, to get into it, but you could still look at the materials offsite. And I'm sure we'll see lots of other methods of accessing born digital as we get all kinds of data sets and social media accounts and email accounts as well in our collections.

MS. SINCLAIR: Yeah. I'd just like to briefly follow up -- this is Gwen Sinclair -- that I don't really see congressional papers collections being all digital because so much of what is in them is -- in my limited knowledge, is it's stuff that is given to the members of Congress. They're -- they're given reports. They're given publications. They're -- they have tons of memorabilia, gifts from constituents, gifts from other people.

We -- I was looking at some of Senator
Fong's papers, and he had all this campaign material from the Nixon campaign because he worked on Nixon's reelection campaign.

So you know, those are the kinds of things that you're going to continue to find in congressional papers collections even if all of their internal communications are electronic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Danielle, I was hoping you could clarify. You had said that you allowed viewing in your reading room for born digital. Do you mean that you print out the material and make it into a physical form? Or did you have a computer that you were able to -- an offline computer? I'm just kind of curious how that worked.

MS. EMERLING: Sure. So we had an offline computer that was a dedicated workstation only for born digital materials from collections. And it had its own server. None of it was connected to the internet. We kind of took away any way to plug in a USB drive or anything like that so that you couldn't take the materials with you when you left the reading room.

MR. MATHESON: This is Scott from Yale Law Library.
Just something that happens in our -- in addition to the offsite kind of, you have to apply for access, and then maybe it's granted, that sort of fancy passwords.

But there's also ways. We blend, here, have this laptop, and we'll watch you use it and --

(Laughter.)

MR. MATHESON: -- bring it back when you're done.

But there's also emulation as a service, which is a new sort of way to actually make the files useful because if you have a Word Perfect 5.1 file, how do you open that on a -- so there's lots of technology here.

And I think, actually, our -- one of our archivists wrote an article for LC -- maybe LC Magazine or a blog post about emulation as a service, which is just a -- it's a really interesting way to kind of -- you click a button, and then it spins up a picture -- you know, a snapshot of that computer that then you can use on either a restricted terminal or not, if that's the case.

MR. O'MAHONY: Dan O'Mahony, Brown
University Library.

   Just sort of a quick follow-up on this topic, it seems that at least in the category of constituent correspondence that the -- my impression, at least, is that many offices are really pushing correspondence through their web service. So that for sure will be an area where born digital tips the balance in the other direction, although there's plenty of other stuff that's clearly going to be tangible.

   MR. GAUSE: With that, we can take one more question from the audience, and we're at the -- our hour.

   MS. COOVIS: Thanks. This will be quick, hopefully.

   Alicia Coovis (ph), University of Minnesota.

   This goes with some of the previous questions. It sounds like some of this material may not be worth digitizing. But are there certain, you know, gems in these collections that have been pushed to be digitized? And is there some place where that's collected? Or is there some push for digitization of these materials?

   MS. EMERLING: This is Danielle again.
I would say that researchers often ask us to digitize everything in the collections. And as you've -- yeah, as you've seen, they're rather large. We'd be here for a lot of years doing that.

I think I've seen a lot of, say, like, photographs from congressional collections digitized. And they do seem to get a lot of use. But for a serious researcher writing a book, I don't know if the photographs series would really make that much of a difference.

Jay, do you want to …

MR. WYATT: No, I -- and this is Jay.

And well, we've had some members of Congress out to the Byrd Center and then sort of consulted with them about, you know, getting their papers ready and what they should think about keeping. And they always kind of want to figure out a way to get rid of most of it.

And it's three has -- you know, two historians and an archivist on staff, and we're kind of like, yeah, we want you to keep it. And that's because history is fluid. And the way that we study and examine it changes.

And so you know, there's lots of
different ways to use these materials, and they change. You know, there's really sort of creative use of materials in terms of gender study, sexuality, that you never would have thought would have been applicable to that. And so -- and you're right. From a research perspective, the pictures are nice. They go in the middle of the book. But --

(Laughter.)

MR. WYATT: -- the more documents that I can access online, that's what I want to see. So...

MS. SINCLAIR: Yeah. And I know from the Inouye papers that some of that material is being digitized. But I think the digitization is really being driven by Senator Inouye's widow. So that goes -- kind of goes back to the donor expectations aspect.


I -- Danielle, Gwen, Jay, thank you so very much for coming to talk to this conference. This has really been a wonderful, wonderful discussion.

I just want to say before I came to work
at GPO, I was at an institution that got the Natur (ph) collection. And we were just starting to work with special collections -- in the documents area working with special collections. This panel almost makes me want to go back and finish that work.

(Laughter.)

MS. ETKIN: But thank you. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MS. HARTNETT: Well, I think I will -- Cass Hartnett, University of Washington.
I think I'll close the session from just sitting right here instead of coming up to the mic.
I'll resort to some high school language and say that I think we've made super cool new friends today --
(Laughter.)

MS. HARTNETT: -- and our existing friend, who's gotten even more rad in our estimation. Thank you so much.

I can see not only are these friendships and collegial relationships significant here, but if we really follow SAA, CPR, and the ASCE, we'll see even more connections. And it would be easy
to at least read some of your literature online
and follow what you're doing.

And if SAA happens to come to your home
town, it's -- oh, it's cycling to Seattle, not
too far from now, I think, to make a point of
going and participating.

The two areas that I could see for
collaboration that wouldn't require too much
heavy lifting, I think there is an essential
collaboration that happens in our institutions
when a new legislative papers come in of -- I
don't want to say deduping because I know
sometimes things aren't taken out -- but sort of
a deduping of understanding, okay, if there's
five copies of a hearing here, insert it into a
folder.

And they duplicate what we have in our
Federal Depository Library collection, that kind
of sensitive nuanced look at the collections with
the depository librarian would be essential.

And then the ability to do things like
online exhibits together would be wonderful. The
great society one seems just like such a great
example for us.

And a very quiet point within Gwen's
presentation was the content management system that we have the most in this program, the program that has the depository eagle behind you, is the FDsys, or soon to be called the govinfo system. And that system allows for great granularity so you could tease out with a secure URL one person's speech from the congressional record.

I think that kind of thing could feed into an online exhibit very effectively. So yay, GPO, for providing that system for us.

And thank you all for coming and participating with such great enthusiasm.

Thanks.

(Appause.)

(Whereupon, the foregoing adjourned at 5:39 p.m.)
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MR. MATHESON: Good morning. I am actually going to start now. Nobody said, hey, you're sitting here making notes. It's time to start. So, welcome back to the last session, the wrap-up of the Depository Library Council meeting. I'm Scott Matheson, from the Yale Law Library. I'm Council chair and I'm going to sort of facilitate this discussion.

I am going to -- thank you, Rosemary. Maybe I'll turn it up a little or something. I am going to facilitate the discussion, sort of a summary of what Council heard, some of the issues that we've teased out through our sessions, through attending other meetings, from talking to all of you.

And then, we'll ask for your feedback to hear what issues we may have missed or thoughts that you have about issues, questions you have about things you've heard. We have a lot of GPO staff here available to answer specific questions if you have them. You can also always contact Council or GPO directly. You see they're not shy about giving out their emails.

Please, you'll hear us say this a couple
times because we've kind of discovered this is
the beginning of a conversation for a lot of
these issues, and we want to keep having those
discussions about what we need from GPO, what
they need from us, how we can work well together.

So I wanted to do a little bit of
business here. Laurie got from I assume Lance or
Kelly final numbers for registration and
participation. It looks like we had 500 people
participating between the virtual sessions -- the
two different virtual sessions and the in-person
registration. And that is really just a great,
great turnout. Thanks, everyone, for your
participation.

(Applause)

I want to remind you about your booklet
from your registration packet. There are notes
in here, I think places for you to make notes.
If you've used this or if you liked it, great.
Tell us. Tell us on the evaluation form. But go
back through your notes and fill out the
evaluations. I saw a lot of them getting turned
in as I was sitting out by the registration desk.
That's great. There's a box on the reg desk.
You can turn these in there. You can send them
in -- it's probably easiest to turn them in before you go.

So if you have a chance while we're -- we're going to go through all the sessions and might refresh some of your memory on some of the things you saw. Please fill out your evaluations. It really -- we take this feedback seriously. It really helps us have a really productive meeting and make it work for everybody. So work on those as well.

All righty. This is also traditionally where we go through the recommendations from our last meeting. Those are recommendations of the Depository Library Council to the GPO director, spring 2016. This document is on FDLP.gov. You can read it. There's a picture of it, I think. Actually, my clicker's not working. Oh, please hold. There we go. All right.

So there's a picture of it for the online attendees. You can absolutely just go get this from FDLP.gov and you can go through. But you'll see that we made several recommendations and this is where we go, and GPO then responds formally to those recommendations. And this is sort of where we review them with the community,
just so that everybody knows we have this
dialogue with GPO.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS RECAP

So recommendation number one was to
incorporate various social media outlets into the
Federal Depository Library directory profiles.
So this was in the spring we had a session about
social media and using that to promote your
depository and government information generally.
We also were lucky to have GPO publish at the
same time some really nice social media
guidelines for doing depository outreach work,
which was really, really helpful. That document
is also on FDLP.gov, and it's got some great tips
in it.

So Council had this discussion. We
looked at how social media was being used. GPO
did their #lovemyFDLP campaign, which was
successful. And we thought this would be really
important to have our local depository social
media accounts listed so that other depositories
and our patrons could find them. So we thought
Federal Depository Library directory, that's the
place to put it.

GPO responded that they supported the
suggestion, that they included it in the requirements document for the next enhancement cycle of the Catalog of Government Publications -- sorry for the acronyms on this slide -- which is the one that's forthcoming. The great enhancements that we saw earlier this week were already in the books. So in 2017, next year, you'll start seeing these things.

What we actually need now -- so we made a suggestion as sort of your voice and GPO responded. The next step is when this is released -- and I know not all of us are in this room. There aren't 1,100 people here. Go to all of your peers who are depository coordinators and make sure they update their listing in the depository library directory so that they can include their social media profile.

So once this is done next year, make sure you go in and update your profile to include that information so that this all comes full circle. We had an idea. GPO listened. They made it, and we have to follow through on filling that in.

Recommendation two was to increase communication about what was then the test phase
of the regional discard policy implementation.

GPO responded at length in the document. The summary is that they developed, and we have seen over the past several months implemented, a communication plan, hosted a lot of webinars, including in their travel, coming to our conferences, ALA and AALL to speak to us about -- to speak to those roundtables and interest sections that are particularly concerned with government information about the discard policy.

We've seen some discussion at this meeting that indicates a lot more people understand it, but that there are still some ambiguities there. There are still some questions. Again, we're having an ongoing conversation. So this is something to pay attention to, and GPO also acknowledged that their outreach on this and their education around this policy shift would be ongoing as the project moves forward.

Some of the questions that we all have can't be answered until we start doing this work. And you know, there's a lot of pieces that have to fall into place for this to work and to be implemented fully. And as those pieces fall into
place, we need to stay engaged and continue to work with GPO to have this conversation about how best to manage our collection, right?

So recommendation three was that GPO set and publicize future dates for FDLP meetings as far in advance as possible. This was something we all agreed on. It makes Lance and the staff's work much easier if they can plan things in advance with the hotel and the venues and all of these things. So it also makes it easier and less expensive potentially for some of us to attend.

So this was something that we could all agree on. GPO absolutely acknowledged that they wanted to continue having the annual in-person meeting, which was important to Council. And they released the dates for the spring and fall, so the next two meetings after this one, the 2017 meetings, in July of this past summer.

As a pattern going forward for your planning, for planning for your colleagues who might want to attend in-person meetings or schedule some time to participate fully in the virtual meetings, the virtual meetings will always try to be held -- they will be held the
Wednesday through Friday following tax day. So find April 15th on your calendar and it's the next Wednesday through Friday that we'll be doing the spring virtual meeting, barring other, you know, force majeure.

The fall meeting and conference, this meeting, will be held the Monday through Wednesday following Columbus Day. So find Columbus Day, Indigenous Peoples' Day, on your calendar. Monday through Wednesday following that will be this meeting. These are helpful planning tools and we really thank GPO for sort of setting these guidelines, which have sort of -- if you look at the calendar, these are not necessarily surprises to any of us.

But this helps us all plan and hopefully will enable people to continue to participate really fully in these meetings, which I know Council gets a lot out of and that I hope that the rest of the community gets a lot out of as well. In addition, we're also -- we've also been told that for the spring virtual, once again, Council will be invited to D.C. to meet in person while we're conducting the spring virtual meeting because that was so productive last spring that
we'll be able to reprise that again this year, which is -- we're very grateful for.

We also had one commendation included in our set of recommendations. And this means that GPO doesn't really have to respond to a commendation. Recommendations are sort of official and they have to produce an official response. And that's work. But we wanted to take some time just to thank, again, Mary Alice Baish, the now retired superintendent of documents, who pushed GPO staff really hard.

I just had a conversation with one of them. She said, you know, she was -- she pushed us really hard. But that's -- the reason you see so much of the progress that we see reflected in the meeting today is due in part to her vision and her energy, translated by the hard work of the GPO staff, of course. But we did want to thank Mary Alice again for her hard work over the past almost five years. So, thanks.

(Applause)

All righty. So now, we're going to do a recap of the meeting, by which we mean the Council meeting, the sessions that were in this room. This is sort of an ongoing little gripe
with Council is that we don’t get to see all the other great educational programs. Of course, this year, one of the streams was in fact broadcast and recorded. So we'll get to go back and watch those, which will be really great.

But we wanted to -- for some of you who may not have been in all of these meetings because you were at the other great presentations learning from your colleagues and our agency partners, we wanted to recap what Council presented, what we discussed and what we think the issues are with just some highlights and key takeaways for each of those.

And then, we'll open it up for questions after that so that folks can comment, so that you can ask us questions, so that you can give us concerns that you have going forward. And I'd also like for you to think about the second and third bullets on this slide. Think about collaboration opportunities and what you'll tell your director or your dean or your board about the FDLP.

What did you learn here? What is great for your patrons, for your library, for your collection? What did you take away from this, so
that you can share those a little bit, as we have
time, so that all of us can say, oh yeah, that
was a really great program. I really -- that's
important. I want to make sure I tell folks when
I get home that this -- or this is the next step
I'm going to take. I'm going to make sure that I
go home and read the memorandum of agreement
template to see if maybe I can be a preservation
partner, a preservation steward. My library
might want to do that.

So we'll have a discussion about those
jointly. But first, I wanted to have Jim come up
and talk a little bit about our first program,
which is the public library report.

COUNCIL SESSION REPORTS
PUBLIC LIBRARIES

MR. SHAW: Hello, everybody. I'm Jim
Shaw, from the University of Nebraska at Omaha.
And the public library session was on Monday
afternoon, and if that seems like a long time
ago, it does, yeah.

So what we did on Monday afternoon was,
with our colleagues from GPO, we reviewed a draft
-- again, it's a draft of their report on public
libraries in relation to the Federal Depository
Library Program. And the genesis of the idea was noticing that over the last several years, going back to the depths of the Great Recession in 2008-2009, well over 40 public libraries dropped from the program.

So the question becomes, again, why. Are there patterns among the libraries dropping that could be identified that could be addressed with support or something to help out and encourage people to stay with the program or even, even better, have new public libraries join the program.

So our colleagues, Cindy Etkin and Susan Miller from GPO, walked us through the draft of the report and they referred to information that was gleaned from the official drop letters that were submitted by the libraries that left the program.

They gleaned information from the biennial surveys and also addressed at least a little bit some of the comments and remarks and information they are picking up in the GPO on the Go visits to public libraries, where they're, you know, talking to people out in the field in the trenches. And so, we walked through the report.
The report is posted at FDLP.gov. So you can go to it, go through it yourselves. And so, what we're thinking about now as Council, what do we do going forward. This morning, at our review session, a couple of ideas came up, that over the next few weeks the next couple of months councilmembers will be working on.

We need to take a look at program requirements and what options might be available to address those requirements and remain in the program. You know, what are -- what does it mean in terms of essential titles, a basic collection, what kinds of options are available to maybe really pursue being an electronic depository? And whatever those options are in relation to the program requirements, make sure that our colleagues in the public libraries have an appreciation and understanding, help them understand what they are so they can choose what might work best for them.

This all goes towards fostering more communication with our colleagues in public libraries. And, you know, promoting things like the FDLP Academy, things like that where people can get more training and support for what
And one idea that's come up a couple of times this week, which is really, I think, generating some enthusiasm is approaching our colleagues with COSLA, the Council of State Library Agencies, who very much have an interest in civic engagement and working with public libraries from that perspective. And potentially there's a partnership or collaboration available there between the FDLP and COSLA to help provide support to public libraries as well.

So that's where we're at right now. You can expect councilmembers to be doing some real homework over the next few weeks and months to try to put together some ideas, potentially a recommendation for GPO to move forward.

But my last thing is, is the last thing on Monday was if you have comments about the session on Monday or on the draft report, please by November 18th -- November 18th, could you send your comments to Cindy Etkin, cetkin@gpo.gov, or Susan Miller, skmiller@gpo.gov, by November 18th so they can incorporate that information into what they're doing to move the draft report to a final report. Thank you.
MR. MATHESON: All righty. It's back to me, Scott Matheson, for a review of the last program on Monday afternoon, which was a program about regional discard. What we included in our program was a discussion of sort of the history of the policy, change that GPO is implementing, a demonstration of a key tool that will help us implement that policy as a community and then a brief discussion of sort of some issues around it.

This discussion continued in two other places, one of which was on Tuesday morning. There was a discussion as well in this room, and then also on Tuesday evening, last night at the regionals meeting, there was a discussion about sort of how this might be implemented and who might be interested in working on this.

This is a -- again, I'm going to hold up the handout. You can -- this is not in the program materials for the conference. This is on a separate policy page that is all of the public published policies from the superintendent of documents. It is four pages and never has four pages caused so much discussion. This is great.
And this is a policy. There is some background and purpose statement. The policy itself is really, you know, a page -- you know, half a page and then some definitions and application.

So this is brief. And really, if you're interested in this, if you're concerned about this issue, please read the policy. And then, participate in these discussions because really that is I think what we've come to understand, is that this is the beginning of a discussion about how we move forward with this policy.

There are some ambiguities in the policy. There is some discretion for the superintendent of documents in one of the steps about whether to allow discard or not. We started to have a discussion yesterday morning about some of the frameworks or the decision points that the superintendent might use when making that decision.

I don’t think this is something where we're ever going to have a very strict rubric, you know, if this, then that. I don’t think we're going to get that, nor do I think we want that, frankly. I think we want some discretion with the superintendent.
But we do want a list of principles that the incumbent superintendent would use or should consider when making this and when exercising this discretion to allow regionals to discard or not. So that is the beginning of one discussion around regional discard.

Another discussion that we heard in other -- in a different forum was a discussion about what titles are available and how big the runs of materials are that are available for the regionals who are feeling some space pressure or feeling acute space pressure. They want to do the work of discard only if it's going to buy them a lot of space back. And that makes sense from their point of view.

So things, projects like adding the Federal Register, the historic Federal Register and the bound Congressional Record, going backwards in time to FDsys, when those projects are complete -- remember, I said all these things fit together.

When those projects progress and are complete and then those materials are available on FDsys, then you can start having a discard list -- you know, a potential discard list that
regionals might choose to exercise that looks
different to them, that looks appealing to them
because, if you know the Congressional Record,
you know it's huge. If you know the Federal
Register, it's 70 or 100,000 pages a year, 1936
forward. That's a lot of space.

So as those projects come to fruition
and we see them completed in FDsys, I think then
we'll start to see more movement around this
policy. What's a little unsettling for some of
us is that this ambiguity is there around some
issues with -- you know, around all of these
issues in the policy. And we're not going to have
an answer in six months. We're not going to have
an answer by the next meeting. This is an
ongoing conversation, and please stay engaged
with it and continue to be concerned about the
management of our collection and about the
ability of our colleagues to continue to provide
the services that we rely on.

So that was regional discard. There's a
lot of motion in some areas. And then, there are
-- there's more ambiguity and there are more
questions raised as we move forward. And expect
those answers to be forthcoming. Please continue
to stay engaged in the conversation with Council, with GPO directly, through REGAL, through other bodies. This is all to the good that we air these issues and get good answers and have good decisions made about what really is our shared collection. So that was Monday.

MS. MASON: Scott, could I --

MR. MATHESON: Sure.

MS. MASON: This is Marianne Mason, University of Iowa. Could I interject a couple of things about the regional discard process and the conversation?

MR. MATHESON: Absolutely.

MS. MASON: Lisa Russell provided a nutshell demonstration about the exchange. She had a more thorough presentation at a separate session. But just I want to remind the benefits for the regionals as well as the benefits for the selective libraries. And sometimes they are interconnected and they're the same.

Just to reinforce the notion that the regional discard is voluntary, and I learned at the regional meeting last evening that there are two libraries who are prepared to submit -- be the first to submit lists for discard. And of
course, they can't be fully approved until there are those four preservation stewards in geographically distributed areas.

The benefit for both the regionals, as well as selective libraries, is that there is a single tool or application. So that's super. Also, there -- the added -- the combined benefit for both regionals and selectives is being aware of the opportunity to become preservation stewards.

And that's through that knowledge gained from revealing in the discard lists, since they'll be visible from both. And I think that's -- you've covered a great deal and it was a great summary. But those are some nutshell and very practice-oriented benefits. Thank you.

MR. MATHESON: Thanks, Marianne. So in addition to the two folks who were thinking about preparing lists to request to discard, which of course can't be approved yet -- will be, maybe -- there were going to that, getting four preservation -- four stewardship partners on record piece, there were maybe a dozen folks in that room alone who were interested in becoming stewardship partners for some portion of their
collection.

But what was pointed out there is there's a very small list of titles that are currently eligible for discard by regionals. We need the four preservation stewards for those titles. We heard great stories about WPA. We heard a great story about serial set from Colorado. Now, these are wonderful efforts. And I plan to participate in some of these. I mean, I really want to get our folks involved in some of this as well.

But again, I'm not sure that we have -- I know we don’t have agriculture -- or agricultural hearings, which are some of the titles on this, on the first discard list. So I can't help with that, getting us to the four preservation stewards to actually start trialing this, this discard process.

But the more of us who take on these things, the sooner we will start to have some of these answers as we start to move some of these things through the process. So even just within a relatively small group of us who are regionals, there were a lot of people who were interested in these preservation stewardship roles. And I
would encourage all of you to go back and talk at
your local meetings, you know, to your
administrators.

These -- as I've said over and over
again, I feel like a broken record, these are
things we do anyway. We're already committed to
keeping some of these materials because they're
vitally important to our patrons. So read the
agreement and see if there's a way you can make
those materials -- put them under this
stewardship agreement so that you're then one of
the people helping to move this process forward.
And regional discard will continue to be a
discussion that we'll have for sure.

Digital stewardship -- Tuesday morning
we started with a digital stewardship discussion.
And some more great work reflected from the GPO
staff. And Beth's going to give us a rundown on
that.

DIGITAL STEWARDSHIP

MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning. I'm Beth
Williams, from the Stanford Law Library. Right,
we had a great program. For those of you that
didn't have the opportunity to attend on Tuesday
morning, our large panel gave us a description of
GPO's preservation plan in both broad and specific terms.

So just a few highlights for those of you that didn't have the opportunity to attend. We had a great discussion from Jessica Tieman about GPO's own internal assessment of its status against ISO standards. And we learned a lot about what it is to be a trusted digital repository. It was fascinating. I know there was a longer, more in-depth session, so lucky those of you who had the ability to attend that. I was sorry to have missed it. But if you have the chance to review that, I highly encourage you to do it.

We also heard a description from Lisa LaPlant about GPO's own process of ingesting materials into FDsys that really provided a perfect framework for the highlight for me, which was David Walls' description about the preservation guidelines that are in draft form and have just been released. They were made available on the FDLP conference website Monday morning. So four pages, much less wrought four pages.

So I encourage you to take a look at
these guidelines because this is a very simple, straightforward process that you can follow for contributing federal digital information into FDsys or for trying to become a FIPNet partner. So what I learned, most of all, as a non-technology person in my real job is that the process is very simple. It's not onerous at all.

We also learned that those of us that are embarking on complex institutional repository digitization projects have the ability to transfer all of those processes very simply and to contributing material into FDsys, soon to be govinfo, which I'm going to have a hard time with. So I encourage you to take a look at these guidelines. Again, they're on the conference webpage.

And GPO has asked for comments, feedback no later than December 9th. If you have comments, feedback, suggestions, send your feedback to preservefedinfo@gpo.gov. I assume that's going to be fairly straightforward and easy to find, preservefedinfo@gpo.gov.

So thanks to all of those -- all those folks and people that provided information also that was just a real rich discussion about
preservation activity at GPO, which makes me feel
good about the future. Okay.

MR. MATHESON: So again, I think this is
where I stole the starting a conversation idea
from, David Walls. But this again, these
guidelines for the digitization projects are
something that are sort of a starting point for a
discussion with GPO.

So if you're starting a project or if
you have a corpus of material you've already
digitized and it comes close to these guidelines,
it seems like, yeah, maybe that's right, please
contact GPO. Contact David or just ask GPO and
they'll get you to the right place. And have
that discussion about I have this material that
I've scanned and it's got this metadata or it's
in this format.

Have that discussion and see if your
material that was important enough to you and
your patrons to scan is probably important to
other people's researchers and citizens as well.
And why not add it to FDsys as well? My library
recently did a project and we put things in our
local repository. We put them in the main campus
repository. We put copies in Internet Archive.
Once you have this stuff done, put it everywhere.
So talk to GPO about getting it into FDsys as well.

The next session was about FIPNet partnerships, and whether or not something your library is already doing today could lead to being a FIPNet partner. We also had a great ceremony where University of Colorado signed their formal agreement to become the first preservation steward. So Kirstin is going to talk a little bit about that session and some of the takeaways from that.

FIPNET PARTNERSHIPS

MS. KRAMSEE: Kirstin Krumsee, State Library of Ohio. I feel like I'm going to be repeating a lot of what Scott and Beth both have said already. But in the session, could you already be a FIPNet partner, we talked about the different opportunities that are available to serve as a partner with GPO, the cataloging and metadata creation, digitization, Web harvesting, hosting that digital content, the preservation stewards and conservanishment and also like more opportunities that have yet to be seen.

We talked about, again, like how those
local projects that you're already doing, whether that can be, you know, the collections that you're storing and are definitely not going to be getting rid of anytime soon or those collections you're digitizing in your library already could then be ingested into FDsys and make great partnership opportunities.

We covered the sample MOU for FIPNet partners and then we heard from several institutions interested or as of yesterday currently serving as FIPNet partners. And just as a reminder, if you're interested -- if you and your institution are interested in serving as a FIPNet partner in any capacity, please reach out to GPO at that preservefedinfo@gpo.gov and start the discussion.

MR. MATHESON: One of the key things that I took away from that session was that when we talked -- when we heard from the Colorado and Kentucky, one who's completed an agreement and one who's sort of in process, is that it really is a template MOU that they were both able to make changes where GPO gave a little, they gave a little.

You know, there was some discussions
because if you read that, it's like, oh, I mean, Colorado is not going to pull back the entire serial set from their remote storage in order to stamp every single volume. That's crazy talk.

But there are ways to work around that and to actually improve the preservation agreement and the stewardship of those materials, which GPO is certainly open to discussing with you. So talk to your director, your dean, your board. Talk to GPO. See where you can get with those partnerships.

LCSM UPDATE

MR. MATHESON: After lunch, we had an LCSM update. Some of you got -- all of you, when you registered, got this handout, which is library services and content management update. This is a brief summary of the things that we heard from Laurie and her staff about all the work that they've done over the past six months, but really over the past year, all of the projects that are coming to fruition and that are moving along through the pipeline.

Council finds this useful because we don’t get to go to those individual sessions where you get a very specific, in-depth update on
those -- on those programs. But there is a question about whether that's valuable to the rest of the community to have a session dedicated to what's going on with the folks in the big red brick building. Council can certainly find another way to get that update. We could take that offline. We could do it the week before. All of these things are options.

So in your feedback forms, in your conversations with councilors, let us know whether this is valid to you as a community as well, this particular type of session where we have sort of the summary of what's been going on and bring everybody up to date. If that is useful to you, we'll continue to do it. If it's not, maybe we'll find a different way for Council to get that information and use that time for something else.

Just a question that had come up, should it continue. But whether you attended that session or not, please take this handout that was in your packet, your registration packet. I think it was on the right side on the folder, and go through it.

These are great just bullet talking
points for your staff, for your director, for your dean, for the people back at your library, people who didn't come to the conference. Give it to your neighboring depository coordinator who wasn't able to come and didn't have time to watch all of the stream.

This is a great update on what's going on and what projects GPO is working on, how they're being responsive to the community and areas, frankly, where maybe we could provide some input to make these even more useful and better.

So that's two questions, or a question and a to-do for you. The question is, is this a valuable session for everybody. Council finds it valuable. But is it valuable for the audience? And then, also take this update and make sure that it gets out beyond just you. You were here. You heard a lot of this material, even if you didn't hear everything on this sheet. But give it to somebody else. Talk to them. Go to coffee. Have a chat about what's going on at GPO because there's a lot of good stuff to talk about.

One other item that has come up as sort of new business recently and is something that we
just wanted to make sure that everyone knew GPO is on top of and that we are keeping our ear out for as well, Council will happily serve as sort of a sounding board or advisory panel, as is our role on this issue, which is the issue of government information online, the virtual reference service that many of us volunteer to answer questions for, was run out of the University of Illinois, Chicago, by John Shuler.

So that is under review. That sounds bad. It's not under review. It is -- people are looking at how that program can continue, what the benefits are, what the use was and sort of looking at the cost-benefit of that program and how it might move forward.

There were discussions underway already for perhaps transitioning that to another institutional home. There are some cost issues involved with the software service that it runs on. So all of those are being looked into. This is not going to just fall by the wayside. It is on the radar of GPO and Council and the folks involved in that program. So we'll have updates on that either from GPO directly or at the spring meeting as information is forthcoming there.
So that is the last of our new business -- oh, sorry, Cass. I missed the most -- the one session that Council got to do that wasn't just about business, that actually was about partnerships and people who share our content issue on Wednesday afternoon. Cass Hartnett is going to talk about our shared obsession with Congress.

CONGRESS

MS. HARTNETT: Slight correction for the record. Cass Hartnett, University of Washington. That was on Tuesday afternoon.

MR. MATHESON: You're right. You're right.

MS. HARTNETT: Wednesday afternoon --

MR. MATHESON: Wednesday is today.

MS. HARTNETT: -- hasn't happened yet.

Our session yesterday afternoon was on the broad theme of driving new connections to the FDLP, and I like that active verb, to drive, because we're not passively sitting back and sort of wondering what connections we might have to other communities. We're trying to make some of those connections happen. And the group we decided to connect with this time are people who love and
work with congressional papers, congressional papers and the professionals who love them. And we were lucky to hear from three different speakers.

The first was an archivist from the Society of American Archivists congressional papers roundtable and that specific group is one we'd like to watch closely. And Danielle Emerling provided a wonderful overview of some of the challenges of working with congressional papers collections and was happy to report that, I think it was in 2009, the 19 senators leaving office, 18 of them had designated a repository. We certainly -- it didn't hurt for many of us to be reminded that our institutions may have a congressional members -- or more than one congressional member's papers in it. So check with your special collections. Check with your archives right in your institutions.

Next, we heard from Gwen Sinclair, longtime member of this community and depository librarian, about some wonderful projects she has done around congressional papers, including a unique build of LibGuides about Hawaii's congressional delegation using the brainpower and
good work of LIS students.

And then, the closer was Dr. Jay Wyatt, from the Byrd Center at Shepherd University, also the current president of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, which is an association of 40 institutional members, including such centers as the Dirksen Center and so on.

And Jay Wyatt talked about a variety of their outreach efforts, both at the association and at the Byrd Center itself, K through 12 groups certainly and history day, state history competitions as well and a unique collaborative online exhibit about Congress during LBJ's Great Society, the Congress of the Great Society.

So one of the things that was a great little line from Jay Wyatt's talk was that as one of their objectives at the Byrd Center is to see more frequent and varied use of their holdings -- to see more frequent and varied use of their holdings. And I thought that was a wonderful phrase to think of with our depository collections as well.

As Scott was encouraging us with preservation partners, I'm going to go home and
see if I might be a FIPNet partner. I think what Council would like is for all of us to go home and to look to see if we already are a repository for congressional papers at our FDLP location and see what kinds of connections we can make with the archivists so close to us, either right there or perhaps in our metro area and so on.

And then, my question to this community is what should be the next target group that we reach out to, to drive new connections? We'd like to invite stakeholders from a different community of practice next fall for this conference, while not losing our connections to congressional papers archivists. So think about that.

MR. MATHESON: All righty. So as folks have mentioned, we had a -- Council had a working session this morning. You'll hear more about what we decided and there may be formal recommendations and commendations. I will say I'm pretty pleased that it seems like we have a long list of commendations and a very short list of recommendations, which makes me happy. I know it probably makes GPO staff happy as well.

I just wanted to let folks know that one
we are going to pursue is a recommendation that
SuDoc policies that are referred to in public
documents are also made available publicly on the
FDLP website with the rest of the current SuDoc
policies. So this is just an artifact of history
that some of these were not made public when they
were created. And they are being reviewed,
updated as needed and approved and then they will
be posted going forward. That's work that folks
are already working on.

So we'll be recommending that. But just
know that that's already in the works. They don't
really need us to tell them that. But we'll do
that as a matter of course because it was a good
suggestion actually from outside of Council. So,
thank you for that.

There are one or two others that we're
thinking about. But we probably will -- it seems
like maybe we were leaning towards not
recommendations, maybe just doing a little bit
more study and then thinking about it in the
spring, especially around the public libraries
report and our outreach and work with public
libraries, how we might be able to support our
colleagues.
The other thing we did was elect a new chair, who will take office in June, of 2017. And I am very pleased to announce that that will be Karen Russ.

(Applause)

One of the commendations that is actually on our very long list is a great thank you to GPO and the staff especially. Oh, she's not here -- for putting together the handouts page. And we heard yesterday about 98 percent complete every handout and slide deck from the conference is on the page. That will get updated -- actually, there she is -- this week, going forward. And we think that's just great.

We also -- you know, here's an example of a great handout, a little infographic piece about preservation and life cycle management from David, I think put this together. And it's on the handout page. So once again, go to the handout page and look for these things. They're really great resources.

Okay. Are there any other items of business, things that we need to talk about from Council before we move to sort of open discussion about the issues that we've all raised?
MS. BERNSTEIN: We have one thank you commendation here, on behalf of Council, to Scott Matheson for leading a wonderful -- leading us in a wonderful conference and we appreciate all of your hard work and leadership and guidance.

(Applause)

MR. MATHESON: Thank you. Thank you. It's a privilege to get to work with these very, very smart, very energetic people. I talked to Holly the other day and she said, how are you doing? And I said, well, I think I'm okay because I kind of -- I wrote that little intro and I'm doing the wrap-up. But pretty much, I said, guys, do good programs and they did. It was a great program. So thank you all for your hard work as well.

So we have this sort of -- we've done this recap. We've talked about what the issues are. I would like to talk about next steps you can take and then collaboration opportunities and really some concrete things. What will you do when you get home, maybe not tomorrow, but next week? What are you going to do that's different because you were here? What did you learn? What are you hoping to accomplish in the next couple
months, the next year, all of that?

So we'll do the usual -- we'll hear from Council first, if you have ideas. And then, we'll hear from you. I'm also of course open to questions or other feedback at this time. Maybe be brief if you're coming to the microphone. But also, you can always send us email or contact us. So, Council?

NEXT STEPS/DISCUSION

MR. SHAW: This is Jim Shaw, University of Nebraska at Omaha. Next week, I'm not kidding, I'm going to block out at least an hour just to walk up and down our ranges because I'm certain I can identify several shelves, just two, three, four shelves of material that might really work well for us to offer to be a digital steward.

With our size of staff and our facilities and equipment and everything else, I can't go real big. But I can probably identify a few real nice things that we could help out with in Omaha. I've got -- the one that leaps to mind first is our federal civil defense stuff, with how to build a bomb shelter and an original copy of Bert the Turtle's *Duck and Cover*. 
So we've got some really cool stuff. And even small places can do that. You know, that's one of the neat things about this era we're living in. Even smaller places might have some things that, hey, this is something we could do. So that's my commitment. Next week, at least an hour walking up and down some ranges just trying to eyeball to see these things out there that potentially we could handle and do ourselves.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Melissa Bernstein, from the University of Utah, the law library. And I've already spoken to my colleague here from the main campus library, Dave Morrison, to try and figure out along the lines of what Jim said, are there things that Marriott has much more space and a larger collection than us, but to see are there things that they might be able to commit to.

And I fully intend on hitting up my colleagues at other libraries within the state, some of whom I know have rather robust collections, to see if they might be able to volunteer to be stewards as well.

MR. MATHESON: So that's a good example
of collaboration, and I'd actually even say, you
know, Jim, if you were scanning a relatively
small number of items, you might even be able to
go in partnership with one of your other local
repositories so that you could create a -- you
know, a single project where several repositories
could feed into one GPO workflow, which would,
you know, maybe even work in other areas as well.
I know there's two depositories on my campus as
well. And I can certainly go talk to Melanie and
say, hmm, what can we do.

MS. MASON: Marianne Mason, University
of Iowa. There are a couple of things I'm going
to do. I'll be sending a message out to my Iowa
selective libraries suggesting that they would be
good hosts for GPO on the Go staff. I've already
kind of had a brief conversation with one of the
outreach librarians at GPO, inviting them to my
library. I already told them that Iowa has cold
winters. But I've been assured that they can
handle it.

The other thing that I've already
started, but now have motivation to complete, is
our preservation steward titles. And during the
regional meeting last night, I got an idea for
another title that I could add and it's one of those big ones.

MR. MATHESON: Great.

MS. MASON: So I'm going to finish that up when I get home next week.

MS. RUSS: Karen Russ, University of Arkansas at Little Rock. I'm already planning on going to a meeting when I get home next week because we have an Arkansas Documents Consortium meeting next Friday. But one of the things I'm looking forward to doing is actually welcoming a new depository to the program. Arkansas Baptist College has joined the Federal Depository, and Jacqueline's in the back.

(Applause)

I'm happy to say that Arkansas is bringing someone in instead of losing someone for a change.

MS. THORNTON: Lori Thornton, New Mexico. I'm going to go back right away -- oh, my staff's going to be so thrilled because I'm going to be giving them a new, fun project. And I'm going to investigate from beginning to end our congressional delegation. And I'm going to get that stuff up online in a LibGuide because,
wow, I really had no idea.

When I started thinking about it, I thought that's information our state needs, and I'm going to collaborate with our legislative council library and the Supreme Court law library so that we can all get this done together for the benefit of New Mexico.

MR. MATHESON: Kirstin, what are you going to do with your microfiche scanner?

MS. KRUMSEE: Clearly, I'm not escaping from this. Honestly, I'm going to go back and look at the condition of our microfiche. We had that discussion last night about possible vinegar syndrome that some libraries are seeing and, you know, consider what might be those next collections that would be worth moving into scanning and talking more with GPO about our being a FIPNet partner in that regard.

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. All right. I'll let Council -- the rest of Council off the hook for the time being. Keep thinking, and we'll open it up to the audience. What did you take away? What did you think was great? What did you -- especially sessions that Council didn't get to see, and what are you going to do
next? What are you going to tell people when you get home? Ashley, anything from the online folks while we're waiting?

Okay. There are folks coming to the microphone, but we'll wait for them. Online folks, please chime in as well. We're happy to hear especially what you've thought.

MS. HALE: Kathy Hale, State Library of Pennsylvania. Two things that I'm really taking away from this is us looking at our collections, like the rest of Council have said, to see what we can do as a trusted partner because our collection goes way back, so that we might be able to put things in our vault that would make it protected.

The other thing you haven't really mentioned is about the FDLP exchange. As a regional, I'm very excited about this because it's going to make my job so much easier because right now I have a Facebook page to have people do this, and not everybody can get to Facebook.

So I think that this will be a really great program to go forward, to make it easier for me to look at what's out there that people do want to get rid of and for other selectives to
see what other selectives are offering out there across the board because even if they put it on my Facebook page, not everybody goes and looks there.

So I think it's going to be a really good program to see across the board what people are offering. And especially as we become these partners, we can see if I have most of them, but I'm missing two or two, the pages are coming out, this will allow me to look and see what other people are offering that I can fill in those gaps.

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. Thank you very much. That's actually on our list of commendations is the exchange is a great new tool. I will let folks know that there are some -- one or two issues came up around the exchange and that's the issue of the existing ASERL tool and how that might integrate or how we might be able to have -- realize the dream of one place to shop for everything.

And so, we're talking to some of those folks and thinking about that also. Indiana has a new tool that they've just started using and we're working with folks on how we can bring
those tools into the FDLP exchange on the national level too because, as I said at the beginning, all of these pieces are interconnected.

And we just heard, you know, if you know somebody is a preservation steward, that's great. It helps you when you're processing your lists. But at the same time, while you're processing those lists, you'll see, ah, this preservation steward needs these two volumes or they have these three volumes that are not in fine condition. And I have those three available. I thought to grab them and send them along.

Even things like we've heard GPO say that it may be possible for preservation stewards, that they would pay the shipping if you're sending along a couple of volumes to fill in somebody's collection. All of these things are sort of dependent on the tools and the policies and our moving forward with the collection management. So, other comments?

MS. HARPER: Beth Harper, University of Wisconsin-Madison. A couple of things I plan to do when I get back, not that I'm retiring soon, but I want to document more of my processes and
thought processes and the decisions I made. That was brought home really well at this morning's presentation on transitions. So you know, I spent a lot of time when I started trying to figure out why did they do things this way. And it took me several years to figure that out. And it'd be so much easier for the next person to just see it laid out.

The other thing is hope, at long last, that maybe some of our digitization projects, like foreign relations of the U.S., can be ingested into FDsys.

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. Kate?

MS. IRWIN-SMILER: Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest School of Law. When we were talking about numbers of preservation stewards and print copies that were going to be necessary and the number four and whether that was the appropriate number for each title, there's a project that I've been thinking about doing that -- for a year, literally a great.

Greta Bever and I sat in that lobby and talked about looking at how many times the Federal Register gets cited, which would primarily be print citation, so print access to
the Federal Register. And I think I need to go and actually do that study now. So I'm saying it out loud to get it in the record. This is what we call accountability. So I'm going to go home and start working on that. That's a little different project.

MR. MATHESON: Excellent.

Bibliometrics, wonderful. Good job.

MS. LASTER: Shari Laster, University of California-Santa Barbara. One of the sessions I was glad to attend was the preservation of federal digital information -- federal digital information preservation, those four words in some order, which was a presentation on the burgeoning efforts to really coordinate not just, oh, well we need to capture born-digital, but how are we doing this. How are we -- what is the bigger picture of how this content is going to be collected, stored, eventually made accessible?

So my immediate action item is to email Robbie to get on the listserv for that project. And I've also had some really interesting conversations with folks about small-scale, born-digital collections, small-scale Web harvesting, needs, ideas, opportunities in those areas. So
I'm really excited to go back home and start to work on that.

MR. MATHESON: I wonder if that might not be somebody -- a group that we might not want to reach out to for our driving connections for next time, the folks who do Web harvesting, maybe even IA or somebody who's using Archive-It a lot. That would be an interesting idea to hear from GPO and some other folks who do similar work. Don't be shy. We'll listen to Council again, but as you think of things, come up.

MR. FISCHLSCWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County Library. I'd like to put in a shameless plug for me. No, not really. But as was just mentioned with regards to succession planning and such, I ran across this issue myself.

One day, I was actually hired originally as the state and local government documents librarian. And when the position for federal docs coordinator came up, they didn't fill it. So guess who was now gifted with a collection that in some ways made no sense to me whatsoever. So after putting together some kind of a collection development policy, I was asked to
actually make a presentation to the FDLP Academy about collection development policy. And one of the things that I stated was put in -- if you do not have a collection development policy that has this, put some kind of a statement in there because at some point you're going to be the one that will know why it's there, which is a roundabout way of saying we are talking about preservation. We're talking about preserving digitally. We're talking about preserving in print.

One of the things that we need to consider is preserving the institutional wisdom and knowledge of our respective institutions and the group as a whole. We have the FDLP Academy, which has started up in the last few years. Make that also a repository for the institutional wisdom that you as individuals may have. Don’t take this knowledge with you when you retire. Get some kind of a program together. Put it out there for everyone else to use. Let everyone else benefit from your experience.

MR. MATHESON: Thanks. James?

MR. JACOBS: James Jacobs, Stanford University. No specific highlights, but I always
appreciate coming here and sharing the gov-docs
nerdiness with all the knowledgeable and
energetic folks. It's really a great thing to
see, and I like it that we come together as, you
know, physical entities, not virtually
necessarily.

But I did have a shameless plug for you
congressional nerds. Go to everycrsreport.com.
there's a new website out. I've posted about it
on freegovinfo.info. There's a bipartisan group
who are putting out every CRS report. So,
thanks.

MR. MATHESON: Thanks, James. And also,
I wanted to just acknowledge, I asked James
specifically to go to one of the meetings and
report back to me some of the details and
questions he had, and he graciously did that.
Thank you very much.

MS. WAGNER: Hello. My name's Megan
Wagner. I'm from California State University,
Fullerton. I'm a first-time attendee. I just
wanted to thank Amy Quinn and Chris Brown for
their sessions on both space place and what's
happening in your library, as well as downsizing
your collection. It's very nice to see the FDLP
family -- and as a first-time attendee, to have
two people dealing with similar challenges.

I know that a few of the takeaways I got
from those meetings, number one, was ways that
you can supplement material that you are being
asked to weed. So, saying yes, if we are getting
rid of this, then how am I going to be purchasing
it in a digital format that we can still provide
access to that information.

But also, that Amy had reinforced to
make sure that we are the advocates for our
collections and making sure that we are that
person in our library who is always advocating
that this information is not only needed, but
should be kept, both in a way that it is
sustainable and for future generations. So I
just wanted to thank the FDLP family and for the
great work that you all have done.

MR. MATHESON: Thank you, and welcome.

(Applause)

MR. CORNWALL: Daniel Cornwell, Alaska
State Library. I think one of the highlights was
the poster sessions, which I think is the second
time we've had them. It was very nice to be able
to take some minutes here and there and see what
was available. And one of the ones that most
impressed me was Gwen Sinclair's Hawaii to
Arizona poster, where they dug through the --
Hawaii dug through their data, realized that a
lot of their interlibrary loans were going to
Arizona, disproportionately large.

And so, they asked themselves why might
this be. And the largest driver they identified
as a catalog collection. So please to the extent
that you can, to the resources you can, just keep
on cataloging because a cataloged collection is a
used collection. Thank you.

MR. MATHESON: And I'll put on my tech
services hat for the time -- for a minute and say
there's a lot more copy than there used to be.
So if you haven't gone through your docs
collection in a while, like if it's been 10
years, there are huge collections that had to be
shipped offsite and there are institutions like
mine that paid lots of money to have all that
stuff catalogued and it's -- our records are all
on OCLC. Please take them.

MS. McANINCH: Sandee McAninch,
University of Kentucky. This is taking the
conversation in a little different direction.
I'd like to extend my comments from last night's regionals meeting. I was one of the ones who commented that FDsys is not quite rich enough yet to give regionals a wide variety of things to discard.

And I wonder if there's been any progress in moving all of that rich digital content on the permanent server onto govinfo. I did not get to go to that session. So that information may have been provided. But I wonder if FDsys is going to ingest that at any point because that's a lot of stuff we could look at discarding.

MR. MATHESON: Okay. Thanks, Sandee. I see GPO chatting amongst themselves. We'll give them a minute or two to decide. Do we need to take the answer offline or -- okay.

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. That's something we have looked at. I know the collection development plan went up a little late for most of you to download and read before today's -- or this week's conference. But part of that plan is to look at the permanent server and to identify what content can be migrated. And Mark Ames has been working on a project plan
to get that started.

MR. MATHESON: Thank you.

MS. ETKIN: No guarantee on the timeframe.

MR. MATHESON: And just again --

MS. ETKIN: But we're looking at -- we're looking at it and the plan calls for -- did you see it in there?

MR. MATHESON: It's here.

MS. ETKIN: Yeah.

MR. MATHESON: I'm just holding up the plan. And look, folks, it's a lot of pages.

MS. ETKIN: Yeah.

MR. MATHESON: So this is really thorough. Take -- again, this is a next step for all of you, all of us. Go home, grab the plan from the site and --

MS. ETKIN: Yeah, and the plan calls to investigate that and to do a pilot. And Mark is working on the project plan to do that.

MS. ELDRIDGE: Hello. My name is Jacqueline Eldridge, from Arkansas Baptist College. I'm so excited. I now know what all the abbreviations mean, FDLP, FDsys, GOP, all of those. I have so many notes. So now I can go
back and I have a starting point. I'm so excited
to be connected to Ms. Karen Russ. I will be
needing a ride in your C-A-R next week for the
meeting. But okay, but she's right around the
corner. So I'm so excited and now I have a
starting point. And it all makes sense. So I'm
glad I actually came. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. MATHESON: Excellent. Good job.

And just a quick plug, there is a new depository
coordinator packet, info packet, on the FDLP site
and there are a great summary -- great online
courses in the FDLP Academy that are part of the
coordinator certificate program that were made
available as kind of review.

So you can actually -- any of us who
might need a little review -- it was worth it for
me -- go through those videos and kind of you can
see what the current rules are. You know, like
what is this thing about -- I have to have those
in print or -- no, no. There are new rules. The
rules change over time. So it's worth going
through the new depository coordinator, even if
you're not a new depository coordinator.

MS. ELDRIDGE: Thank you, and I am
collecting business cards from everybody.

MR. FISCHLSCHWEIGER: Tom Fischlschweiger, Broward County. Always remember, if you're a selective, your regional is always a very good point of contact. You know, you can also always ask GPO. Ask somebody. Don't grope around in the dark like I had to for a while. Ask someone. Someone has an answer for you. Don't be afraid to ask. Make use of the information that's out here in this community. That's one of the reasons that we are such a strong community and one of the reasons why we want to keep this program going and to keep this community going.

MR. MATHESON: And why we like to keep meeting in person in the fall. I am not seeing comments from Council. There's no one standing at the microphone. Is there anyone online with comments or questions? All right. Council, have I forgotten anything? All rghty. GPO, have I forgotten -- ah, here comes Cindy. What have I forgotten?

MS. ETKIN: Cindy Etkin, GPO. I just wanted to thank Council and Scott and the rest of council for a wonderful three days of meetings
and discussion. And it's been a great jumping off point for further discussion. And a lot of issues have come to the fore, a lot of things for us to think about at GPO. And so, thank you all very much for your hard work for this conference, as well as all of you for attending and staying until the very last day.

MR. MATHESON: Absolutely. Thank you.

Thanks, Cindy.

(Applause)

All righty. Then, all that remains is for me to officially close the depository library meeting and federal depository conference for fall, 2016. We will see you all virtually in the spring, just after tax day, and then again back here next fall. Thank you all so much for attending.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, the foregoing adjourned at 11:46 a.m.)