

[ Please stand by for realtime captions. ] good morning everyone we will get started in 10 minutes.

>>>

>>> Good afternoon everyone welcome to the virtual meeting on regional issues, we will get started in about eight and its and I am going to give some intermittent sound checks so you can adjust your volume.

>>> Good afternoon everyone, welcome to the FDLP meeting on for regional issues, we are going to get started in about three minutes.

>>> Good afternoon everyone and welcome to the FDLP virtual meeting on regional issues. Before I introduce our Superintendent of documents Lori Hall to get started today I am just going to walk you through a few housekeeping reminders. If you have any questions or comments on the presentation feel free to chat them in the chat box, that is located at the bottom right-hand corner of your screen. I will keep track of all the questions that come in and at the end of each topic we will stop and take questions on each topic. We are also recording today's session and we will email a link to the recording and slides to everyone who registered for this webinar. Finally if you need to zoom in on the slides you can click on the full-screen button in the bottom left side of your screen. To exit that full-screen mode just hover over the blue bar at the top of your screen and then click on the blue return button and it will get you back to this default view you see here. With that I will hand the microphone over to Lori Hall who will take it from here.

>>> Okay. Welcome everyone, this is Lori Hall, thank you for participating in the meeting today. Good morning to some of you on the West Coast and good afternoon to the rest of you. We have been planning a meeting focused on regional issues for some time now. And every time we had a proposed date there was always a conflict, a holiday, or a possible government shutdown that impacted our ability to find just the right time. Little did we know when we selected this date, we picked the date right before a possible government shutdown, too. But we decided to go ahead and have the meeting today. We are so glad that you all could find time in your very busy overbooked the schedules to be with us today.

>>> So far we have over 300 registrants for the meeting today, we are glad that we have some staff from all the regional libraries that signed up to participate today. We are also happy to have attendees from our selective's as well. We have members of the depository Library Council with us and participants from the major library association. In reality, all of these issues that we are discussing today impact all of us in the FDLP. I hope you will find some of the information shared and discussed of interest to you as a member of the FDLP and we want to thank you for engaging and participating and please don't be shy. Ask some of those tough questions, that is what this webinar is for.

>>> For about two hours, we divided our time to cover numerous important topics so that we may give you the latest updates and gather your feedback on some important issues. After each topic is addressed by our staff we will have a question and answer. Focused on that particular topic. There will be a 10 minute break at 3:00, we will start immediately at 3:10 and try to wrap up by four because some of us have to do some potential government shutdown tasks. [ laughter ] before we close this afternoon. We have had a minor change, a major change to our agenda just a few minutes ago.

>>> We are going to start with Cindy Atkin giving us models for shared regionals so we flipped the agenda a little there, preservation, will come right after the 3:00 break. Each update session is going to be between five and seven minutes and then we will have a few minutes for questions and answers. Two of the bigger sessions will be 20 minutes longer and have a longer Q & A so those 220 minute sessions are the model for shared regionals and modernization. If there are no questions after each session we are going to go ahead and move on. We are going to monitor the chat like we always do and try our best to respond to the questions and chat. Once the webinar is over we will go back and review the chats to make sure we haven't missed any questions and make sure some of those questions get answered.

>>> Just to remind everybody, the topics that are here are likely to be updated or presented in some form at the spring virtual meeting which is scheduled for April 18 through the 20th and registration is now open. There is a draft agenda on [FDLP.gov](http://FDLP.gov). So let's get started.

>>> We are going to put Cindy on.

>>> Hi everyone, I appreciate the ability to make this quick change in the agenda. I am at the airport so if you hear background noise, I am really sorry but I hope we can get through this part. Without too much fanfare from boarding instructions. So -- okay. Can you get me to my part on the slides? Kelly?

>>> This is Lori, if we get too much static from Cindy then she and I will trade off.

>>> The other thing, the other thing we can do is, because of things going on with title 44 modernization, and shared regionals and all of that is included in the draft that we've seen, we may want to update to this and talk more about it at another time. Okay. I am not going to Cleveland so let me go on. [ laughter ]

>>> We started revisiting the issue of shared regionals a while ago and it was actually before the Title 44 modernization came up and it was one of the things that we really wanted to do within the national plan and so we started working on it and then it was just a confluence of events. A lot of time has passed and we continue to get the feedback from the community that regionals need flexibility to manage their large tangible collections. We heard it from the forecast studies, we heard it in the comments when we asked for your feedback or your suggestions for Title 44 Modernization, and one of the other things is that with the approval by the JCP of the Superintendent of documents it allowed regionals to discard materials under certain circumstances, they called for for geographically diverse tangible copies. Which by definition would mean that there would have to be sharing across state lines. So it was a confluence of a bunch of different things that we have been looking at. So it has been 10 years and some things have changed. But we did, we did look at the guidelines that we had drafted back 10 years ago and we modified them and updated them a little bit and then put them out for comments.

>>> So the guidelines were for shared regionals but we really want to make it a broader guideline for just different regional models but this is what we had put out for comment. That libraries, regionals would be able to share across state boundaries and within the state boundaries as well. And there would be a planning process and GPO could help facilitate that, there would be a review by the Superintendent of documents and any interstate shared regional models would have to be approved by the Senators of the state. Okay, I pause when they do that because I was told that you guys couldn't hear me when they are talking so let me go on then. There will be a memorandum of understanding that has to be drafted and signed by the participants and a transition. For the implementation. Along the way

GPO was there to answer questions and review plans and look at the memorandum of understanding. We want to make sure, we want to see the different documents that people are looking at. Because we want to make sure that they are in conformance with the title 44 obligations.

>>> That the kind of maybe up in the air to now. Lots of things may be changing. So back in November the end of November we put out a newsletter and we were seeking community input on the shared regionals. We sent out a reminder back in mid-January and we wanted the comments by January 20 so we could review them in time for this particular webinar today.

>>> We had six submissions, understand that it was probably a bad time of year with all of the holidays and the semesters, those kinds of things going on. But we did have six submissions, three were from regionals and one from a selective. And basically the comments were really very positive about JPL looking at this again and we got comments like this is long overdue, it will foster innovative and new collection models and we were really pleased that we were bringing this to the fore again.

>>> I thought one particular comment showed the commitment to support regionals by offering flexibility. I am glad to but he recognized that because this is something that the community has wanted for a long time, we tried this and we will try again. And we want to make it happen because most importantly, you all wanted and you all need it.

>>> Some of the edits that were suggested was to have at least one senator from each of the participating states. What I have put on the slide here is crossed out, what was in the guidelines, that they suggested we -- the suggestion here is that one senator, not necessarily both. And that the administration from all of the libraries that are assuming responsibilities need to be aware and sign off on the M review. That was just a phrase that was added. That number two in parentheses means that we had two comments, two of the six provided that particular suggestion.

>>> It was also suggested when the Superintendent of documents notified -- determining that the MO you meets the established criteria it was suggested that we take out decision and put determination. And there was a statement in the draft guidelines that say that there needs to be a clear statement that the regional requirement of the FDLP continue to be assessed in effect at our followed by the regional libraries and the suggestion was made again by two of the submitters that it is not the regional requirement but the statutory requirement that needs to be in effect.

>>> And changing it a footnote that Senators, at least one senator and I am going to pause again for just a second. [ Speaking in Background ] I apologize for this, I tried to find a quiet space, but I found a place here, that is next to a plug so again I apologize for the environment in which I am speaking here.

>>> Additional suggested edits were that there needed to be definitions between, so the people know the difference between shared regionals and multistate regionals. And there was in the guidelines a provision that regionals need to consult with the selective depository in the area, in their state, and to make sure that their concerns are addressed. And they suggested changes in wording there, -- and the third one on that slide is that JPO is not a signatory to the MOU but again we look at it to make sure there are no conflicts between the MOU and Title 44 and they suggested that we remove another FDLP guidance but the requirement would be in Title 44.

>>> [ Speaking in Background ] okay. Additional edits, were that we need more clarity on the models that are covered in the new guidelines and I agree with that. It goes to the point that I mentioned at the

beginning, that we called it shared regional guidelines but it really needs to be for all kinds of different models that we have in place or maybe suggested along the way. The guidelines need to distinguish between simple shared housing agreements and shared regional. And there was a suggestion that the consent of Senators might not be necessary under section 19 12 of Title 44, that Senators do not need to approve the collaboration.

>>> Those were the suggestions. And this slide shows the different models that are in place. One regional, serving one state, to regionals in a state, one regional serving multiple states, shared regionals with interstate of -- within a state there are states with no regionals, and states with one regional with a distributed regional collection. Those are the different models that are currently in place.

>>> And again, not all of the models that are in place are covered in the draft guidelines, for instance the model that isn't covered is the state that serves multiple states. So when the instance of Minnesota being the regional for South Dakota and Michigan, Maine for Vermont and New Hampshire, and others, those are not addressed in the guidelines.

>>> So I will take any questions but I also want to talk about kind of what is next as you all are thinking of questions. I mentioned in the Title 44 Modernization that shared regionals across state boundaries are included in the draft language that we see, so some things may be coming down the pike, it is still of course a question as to whether or not the bill will pass. But the attempt is there to include this into new statutory language. There is still some talk, we had our six foot -- we had our six admissions but there is still time for more comments. We can use the depository library comment form, upon [FDLP.gov](http://FDLP.gov). There will be, again, plenty of time to provide more comments.

>>> I think things will be stalled because of the Title 44 Reform that is taking place now until we see what happens there. Because that of course will impact, kind of trickle-down and impact what we are doing. Any questions? I am not seeing anything in the chat. Am I missing it?

>>> No, none so far.

>>> Okay, Lori said if we didn't have questions we would move on. [ laughter ] so I guess we can move on and then I will head on out to Denver. Look for updates, look for updates about this as things progress with title 44 and other things that are going on now. Thanks again and send me your thoughts. Thanks.

>>> Cindy, there is one question. Will this change anything for libraries that are all ready shared regionals?

>>> No. It won't. It won't change anything. The models that are in existence are covered by, the shared regionals that are in existence are covered by these guidelines and if the draft that we have seen, passes, in the transition part, it grandfathers in the selective's, to be the regionals. So everything that is in place can continue.

>>> Okay, thank you Cindy, if there are any other questions coming in, I will keep them until another break.

>>> Okay, I am going to go ahead and log off but you can send the questions to me in an email and I will answer them and then we can put the question and answers up with the link to the webinar archive, would that be okay?

>>> Sounds good, thank you Cindy.

>>> Okay, thanks everyone, goodbye.

>>> Thank you Cindy, good afternoon. My name is Suzanne a ban is and I coordinate -- with other federal agencies. I want to start by saying thank you to all of our partners. Your participation and assistance is important in all the work we do at TPO. -- GPO. Since the fall FDLP conference, the library at the University of Colorado Boulder is Lissa statues at large WS code, provides statutes of the United States, journals for the Continental Congress and Indian affairs treaties which is commonly knows as -- known as Kepler's. The Indiana State Library is preserving the official Gazette of the United States patent office. While the University of South Carolina is preserving the annals of Congress registered debates in Congress congressional globe, congressional record, publications of the US Department of education and the publications of its predecessor the US office of education.

>>> US merchant Marine Academy is preserving merchant Marine related publications. The law library of San Bernardino County is preserving the complete collection of the public papers of the president, proclamations, executive orders and proceedings of the United States Senate and the impeachment trial of William Jefferson Clinton. And finally the University of Maine is preserving the public papers of the president and please keep your eyes open as we will have more announcements coming in the very near future.

>>> In response to requests to make copies publicly available we have taken a couple of steps. A new section on public release was added to the template, the language in this new section reads the parties agree a signed copy of this agreement may be made public on the GPO website. The MOMA on the partnership page includes this new section. All current reservations should -- there agreement. No partners object to the release, the properties of all stewardship agreements are now available in the partnership page of FDLP .gov.

>>> My final update is on what titles are getting geographically separated. The University of South Carolina is becoming a preservation student as of last year, there are now three preservation stewards for the congressional record. The University of Colorado on the west, Ohio and South Carolina. We just need preservation stewards in Northeast to make this title eligible -- there are three geographically separated preservation sites, the University of Colorado in the West, the divided hearings collections between the University of Carolina Chapel Hills and the University of Florida. The University of Iowa and the Midwest deserves a small collection of 167 hearings. Additional preservation stewards in the Northeast and Midwest are still needed. Thanks to our two new preservation stewards, the University of Maine and the law library of San Bernardino County, we only need two additional stewards for the public papers of the president in the Midwest and the South. If your library is interested in becoming a preservation storage for the congressional record, congressional hearings are the public papers the preservation stewards team, the GPO and I would love to talk to you. The GPO partnership team has been working on providing more information about our other partnership options. Two guidance documents were released in the fall for libraries interested in becoming additional contact contributors. The first document cites guidance on best practices for publications while the second shows guidance on best practice for digitizing -- David Walz, Jessica and I will be sharing more information on additional

contact contributors during webinar on March 13 that I hope you will join us. If a library is interested in serving an eight -- we will use one of our institutions, for governance and digital management perspective. We finally we also released a similar document for digital access partners. Using these criteria as will allow GPO to assure digital access partners the fullest level commitment to providing access and discovery to government information. All of these criteria and guidance documents are available on the partnership page of FDLP.gov. Finally I want to encourage you to reach out and talk with myself and the partnership team. We want to talk with you about how GPO in your library can work together. Please use the partnership inquiry form on FDLP.gov and there is a link on the slide or email me directly at as EBA and you as@GPO.gov. There is also more information including a full list of our partners on FDLP.gov and we now have a few minutes for questions.

>>> There were a few questions that we did address in the stat but we can repeat them for the audience that is listening as well. How about a list of preservation stewards by publication title and we would like a list of preservation stewards and what they are preserving and I pointed out that those are available from the partnership page, and then we had a question, can these projects be directly linked into the catalog and we mentioned we are working on that. And Ashley shared, a link to a March 13th webinar in which David Walz and Jessica team and and Susanna are presenting related to some of this.

>>> Any other questions about this topic? Okay, as I mentioned if you think of one feel free to put it in the chat and we will capture it and address it a little bit later. Oh, one more. How will items like the record of war rebellion --

>>> We want to have as many preservation's as possible so we have one for the war rebellion and then if we have additional stewards who are also preserving material sets, as we all know, more preservation storage the better.

>>> Suzanne if you would like to present the copy let me know.

>>> Is a copy of the standard text and then MOU -- yes the couplet or preservation steward is available on the partnership page of FDLP.gov if you look under the heading for preservation steward there is a blue button.

>>> Okay thank you Suzanne.

>>> Hi everyone, I am Robin Mohammed and I am going to speak to you about GPO on the go. We are doing this because of course Lori says that's what you're going to do Robin. [ laughter ] so let me share a little information. Since the GPO on the go initiative began in 2016, GPO has visited about 472 libraries. We have visited all kinds of libraries, in response to requests for participation, when we are in a neighboring area to a GPO facility and if we've been volunteered to stop by the library so we established our face and our visibility with the libraries. With these visitations, we had three things we were supposed to do. This was put forward by the agency director and the superintendent of documents. And that was, one, listen to what the libraries had to say about their collection. Two, listen to what the libraries had to say about the FDLP as a whole. And three, what could GPO do, be doing better to help the libraries in the program.

>>> We did a lot of listening. We have done some questions and there have been no inspections or assessments. These were very interesting visits. I think we came back feeling pretty positive about them

and I think we hopefully introduced ourselves to a lot of folks. Now the categories for the visits with a couple of ways.

>>> There was the executive visits, then there were the LSD M visits and that was the different areas of LSD M going out and touching base with the libraries, a preservation visit, visit to look at a collection that maybe wants to become a preservation, steward program. And then there were the outreach and support visits which were generally done by people who in the past were done in sections or public access assessments. And one more thing related to this, when we get these requests they are often months ahead of time so we took a request for February 9 [ laughter ] and as Lori stated we don't know if we are going to be open or not so we had to alert that library that we couldn't make that visit. And we feel terrible about it but technically we can't travel, we can't span the stations, nothing can go forward. So we will be working with that library, I talked with him again this morning. To try and get a good resolution and the superintendent of documents has been volunteered to assist with that.

>>> So our current focus for fiscal year 2018 is to visit regional libraries. In 2016, 2017, we tried to get those libraries but we were responding to a lot of different kinds of initiatives. We did a review last fall and found out we have visited most of the regional libraries, there are about seven or eight left. And I want to share with those regionals, if you haven't been visited you will. We will be talking with you or you have all ready talked with us. We have several set up including Alabama, Missouri, Georgia, Georgia has had lots of visits. There are several. And if you are wondering about it, drop us a note, after DLP outreach@GPO.gov. So why is it a good time to visit regionals now? It is a good time because of the many changes and updates that are going on such as the approval of the regional discard. And the preservation steward partnership program which is essential to allow the regionals to get to that point.

>>> There has also been some training visits related to the FDLP exchange and of course information as that site went up for people to be able to go in and test it. The other thing that we would like to do is, when we are visiting libraries and they are showing us their collections, and in most cases there is still a collection, we are looking for ways to highlight the library's participation. If they should decide to participate in the preservation steward partnership, for example, on a recent trip to Indiana we visited a library that had a 1930 census to a particular county in Indiana. We don't think that is going to be requested widely except for Indiana and we suggested if they were interested, there is an item that they could be helping us with. So we are always coming back with a couple of recommendations and we are very excited and we know Suzanne -- Suzanne's email very well and make referrals a lot of times.

>>> Okay. So while we have been setting up these visits and we also have library coordinators going and registering as the new coordinator, we have sent out messages welcoming them. We have noticed that there are many new regional coordinators, a lot of folks have been hiring. And in prior years there has been a lot of change in the communities. That is not really unexpected. We have seen change over the years, it is one of those reasons that it is imperative that we continue to train and share information about the depository program and all its slightly strange quirks. With item selection and how you find out what is on shipping list and all those kinds of things if you're still getting this tangible material.

>>> When we are doing this, we noticed that there is a lot of changes in how libraries are making materials available. What kinds of materials they are selecting, where they are putting their coffee shop, and the changes of course that have been happening in the administration with the FDLP where you don't have to select anything in a tangible format anymore. So in looking at this, we think that it might be helpful to have a depository coordinate certificate program developed for new regional coordinators. So we have brainstormed ideas and started putting this together so I will let you know as time goes. I

should get someone to write an article on this. We do look forward to your comments and suggestions related to what you would like to see. In a regional coordinators program.

>>> Feel free to send that in. These regional visits also provide the opportunity for the regional library to share information with the GPO about the libraries in their region and vice versa. Sometimes we find out information from selective's that for one reason or another they didn't go to the regional or didn't go to GPO, and we follow up on some of those questions, too. It also provides an opportunity for us to attend regional meetings, and that tends to be one of the more, the staff really like attending them. We get to meet a lot of people and it allows us to share information about GPO more broadly. It also provides us an opportunity to meet library administration.

>>> It is very important, these visits, we want to go and see and hear about whatever you and your administration want to show us. But we want the library administration to know that even though we haven't been out in 10, 15, 20 years, we are realigning ourselves with the community and we hope that we are filling a need for you all also.

>>> In addition to attending the regional meetings, we also have takeaways. We have attended some state meetings, too. Conference presenters for the fall conference and speakers are sometimes green from these attendants, so it helps everybody.

>>> The last thing I wanted to share about was promotional materials. We know that you have a lot to do. But promotional on the regional level may take a different view than selective promotion. But it is an opportunity to make yourself more visible and more well-known in the community. Last fall material was sent out to libraries and I believe people were advised to -- here is a couple of things that went out last fall. In the left-hand corner, the upper left-hand corner you see the Constitution day packet with pocket Constitution, our friend Ben and an info card on government information that we are totally out of this packet. We did a lot of handing out of it and one of the takeaways we learned was to start a little earlier people got a little backlogged in sending the material. We don't want that to happen. So look for those to be advertised about June of this year.

>>> This is also a little bigger picture of our Ben's hello there who I think looks like many of our documents, what if you got for me today? And I think he is a cutie. Also highlighted is our catalog of US government publications, that blue square and we have pencil sharpener's because of course it doesn't work like a regular pencil sharpener. And then one last thing to share with you all, take time to go out and look at your depository library emblem. On your door, on your windows, if it's peeling, maybe missing totally, going to the FDLP site and promotion, put in your password to get into it, to order, and order yourself the kind of sticker that will work best for you. Does anybody have any questions?

>>> We have a lot of enthusiasm and volunteers to help with the regional coordinators program.

>>> Oh good.

>>> Some suggestions for FDLP tattoos and laptop stickers. Left

>>> Kelly wants to know, she misses the normal red pencil, are there plans to take that back, and we do feature one pencil at a time so if you notice last time we had the carpenter pencil, they went out and we ordered the regular pencil, those ran out, now we are back to the carpenter but the regulars will be

coming back. What are some ways that I can make the free materials more appealing to college students?

>>> Usually tie it into something that is going on on campus. Or something that is being talked about on the news. A lot of folks have done websites where they just update it daily, they take whatever is going on and they updated daily so it is being active and what is important to your students around you.

>>> We have a request for Snapchat filters. And since GPO is an agency -- as an agency doesn't have a Snapchat account we can't do that but it has been suggested to our administration.

>>> Any chance we will go back to pends? We got lots of complaints because patrons were using them in writing and books so we took away the pens and brought pencils but pens can always come back, yes.

>>> Thanks everyone.

>>> All right. I am an outreach librarian in the outreach and support unit and I am here today to talk with you about the 2017 by annual survey, and the biannual survey regional reports that are being compiled right now. First up here is general information about what we have done to date with the survey, as a reminder it is a requirement that all depository libraries complete the biannual survey. We had 1143 depository libraries when the survey opened and we had 1094 libraries complete the survey before it was taken down from the website. We are working with the nonresponders to get the information in. Here are some more tidbits for you.

>>> 46 regionals completed the survey, zero regionals reported that they were reconsidering their regional status and all regionals reported that they planned to remain in the FDLP. 16 selective depository libraries indicated they did not plan to stay, 49 reported they were not sure if they would stay in the FDLP. 92 libraries reported that they had less than 10,000 tangible publications in their libraries other than Gabler -- government publications and we will be following up with them to assess if the question was misunderstood or if in fact the library has dropped below the minimum legal threshold for being in the FDLP. There was a question that asked what the biggest issues libraries faced as a whole and out of that we found that 763 report constraints in the budget, 675 report that there was a problem with the use of physical space and 650 through libraries reported that the staffing were issues at the library. Interestingly only 28 libraries report insufficient number of computers and only 17 report Internet access to be issues at the library.

>>> Moving on, the biannual survey regions report is something new that GPO is doing, they are a direct product of what my unit has been -- seen a need for when we are out visiting depository libraries. Over half of the regional coordinators in the FDLP have less than two years experience at a quarter of the regional coordinators have less than a year of experience at this point in time. What we found when visiting different states is that new regional coordinators in several areas are not able to travel to visit their selective's. Some also where so many hats that they are not able to do collaborative work like coordinate statewide meetings. The impact is not being able to travel and getting a chance to meet selective coordinators is very apparent to us when we visit them. We were hearing from the newer regional coordinators that they were struggling to understand what their selective libraries had in their collections and what those future plans for those collections were.

>>> We added some new questions through the 2017 by annual survey that were specifically geared towards a compilation report that we had in mind for the regionals. This compilation report pulls

together all of the individual library responses for a region into one document and we are going to be sending that out into the regional coordinators. Questions 18 through 23 in particular were laid out in a way that hopefully a regional coordinator can understand the quantity of material a library has broken out by format and the libraries plans for that content, and whether or not it is catalog. That will hopefully help a regional coordinator understand which libraries need outreach and a big weeding project may be on the horizon. The estimated release of the survey is early spring. As of today I am working alphabetically through the regions for the regional compilation report, I am in Pennsylvania as of today. Here is an example of those questions 18 through 23 that I compiled together.

>>> The font is incredibly small here, sorry about that. The gist of it is that we can see a library reporting that they have a collection that they want to massively weed and it has 15,000 volumes in print but it is 100% catalog which may make it easier -- easier so from a regional perspective if we are seeing this they might want to flag this library as needing follow-up. They also indicate that they want to remove materials from the collection when the online equivalents are available but they also didn't select any of the other leading options so maybe the regionals should contact this library to see what in particular they had in mind for weeding. Removing open materials when online equivalents are available does not necessarily mean a large-scale project that would require 15,000 volumes. There are going to be other entries in this report, things like libraries that have very little tangible material left in their stacks. This may come of a surprise for some regionals when they learn how much has been weeded from the libraries collections over time. I'm hoping that this puts the newer regional coordinators out to get a sense of what is available in the libraries around the region and I am hoping that the more experienced regional coordinators have a better sense of what material is located and where. I apologize for this, the reports that I am compiling, it has to be configured in landscape mode and it has to be done on legal size paper so I am really sorry about that.

>>> As I've been compiling the data I have had a few takeaways, I haven't particularly been focusing on doing analysis yet. Mostly I am focused on compiling the report. In general I have noticed libraries are reporting that they are working more so in the past, a lot of people reporting that they are working with -- I see a lot of libraries make notes of their exploring becoming preservation stewards. I have seen libraries report that they are they are EL only are digital only and we happen to know that they are not, it is actually a heads up for us that we need to make it easier for libraries to understand what format they are in.

>>> A number of libraries are reporting that they are remodeling or changing the use of their physical space. There is a high number of that. I have to go back into previous year's data to see if that is actually an increasing trend or not so that will be interesting. That is just some of the preliminary observations I had as I am compiling this data. Each region has its own findings.

>>> If you have any feedback for us regarding the biannual survey itself or the region reports, also if a region has questions they would like to ask their selective's to help them manage regions, we are open to discussion about including them in future biannual surveys. Thank you very much. Do I have any questions?

>>> Just appreciation for the upcoming report. Okay, thank you Ashley.

>>> Hi this is Lisa Russell, I am a program analyst and project assistance. I am going to talk about regional -- and the FDLP exchange. Regional discard as we mentioned earlier, Q & A -- JPO received approval to allow regionals to discard certain items from their, with approval from the superintendent

of documents. To be eligible for this the list has to be retained for a minimum of seven years, it has to be available in digital form, -- [ laughter ] and it has to be held tangibly in a geographically distributed area.

>>> After we got approval for allowing regionals to discard, the first thing we needed to do was to establish a policy on that, and that was done. Then we implemented a process for doing it manually. Which is, as you can imagine, a very cumbersome process. So I am sure that is no surprise to you. Since September 2016 West regionals have been allowed to request permission to discard certain materials and again they do have to be on the website and have been held for seven years and so on. There are details on the current process available on this project page, you can see it here. The next steps, -- the process.

>>> Part of that process will be on FDLP exchange, the first phase has been dealing with just the basic -- it is an office process to automate that and one thing we wanted to point out here was, we talked about the library services system, and we sort of dove into FDLP exchange development and we didn't really make the connection that FDLP exchange as part of the LS S, so we wanted to start getting that out there so, people were asking hey what happened to LS S. FDLP exchange as part of LS S and there will be other pieces coming along later. We are trying to do a one stop shop for the entire process so you don't have to offer it within your region and then we posted, you can just enter it, once and it goes into, it will automatically go through the process.

>>> We launched the training site, but we are still working on the details. One of the things we did hear from the libraries is that you wanted a chance to get in there and play with it and learn it before you have to use the real system. That is available, we launched that during counsel actually in October and it is available now that you can go ahead and get in there and start playing with it. The training site and other project information is available on the project page of the URL here. The training side will change when the project, when the production site launches. It will all be on one site.

>>> One thing to note with the training site is that our plan currently is if you are getting an account set up in the training site we are basically going to clone that site, and set the clone side up as the production site so all of your accounts will all ready be set up the way you set them up in the training site. We will be wiping the data out of the production site so that all of that stuff you've been playing around with anymore won't be in there. We are planning to keep the data and the training site for a little while when we moved that because we don't want someone who is in the middle of doing testing, we don't want to wipe out the test. That would not be appreciated, it is happened to me once or twice. [ laughter ] I know it doesn't go over well. Having said that, some of it could accidentally get wiped so be aware. But the plan is to keep the training site data in the training site as we move forward.

>>> GPO staff are available to meet with regents who are testing and revising their processes working with the training site. Myself and Melissa Fairfield are doing a lot of that. We just met with some regionals and we want to make sure you have that option, if we can put up a session and talk to how your process would work if you wanted to try testing it. Those are good for us, too because sometimes we hear about things that you guys are doing and it is like oh, well how would that work? It lets us know future enhancements that we may need to make on the site. Those are good for us and we are happy to do it, just let us know.

>>> Depository coordinators could contact GPO fork contact information, there is a thing that you can set up with your password which we've been hearing from a lot of people that they are not getting the emails they should be getting. I am not sure if it is getting stuck in spam filters or if that is been turned

off, most of the emails are supposed to be turned off on the training site although that should be left on. So the best way to get your account information would be to just contact GPO. There is a feedback page that is also linked to the project on the website here. As I mentioned we don't have a date yet on the production site launch. We are still working on that.

>>> The next steps in the development will just be incorporate the regional discard processes so that we are automating the process that we were talking about. And hopefully making it a little less cumbersome. Then after we have done that we are going to look at the preservation and steward requirements so we can try to get that information into one place.

>>> Here are the URLs for both of the project pages. Then I can go ahead and take questions.

>>> Any idea when the launch will happen, 2018, 2019, 2020? I can say at this point that we are targeting 2018. As far as the month and day I can't get that specific but we do hope it will be in the somewhat near future. [ laughter ] if we don't shut down. Any other questions for Lisa?

>>> Do you think -- if you think of questions afterwards you can contact us using the feedback form that I mentioned earlier or you can email me. You can always email me directly.

>>> Okay folks, with that we are going to take a brief 10 minute break. Stay on the line and we will be back with you at 3:10. -- 3:10 PM. Thank you.

>>> [ Webinar Scheduled to Resume at 3:10 pm ] okay everyone this is Lori Hall, I am going to do the presentation because obviously Cindy is probably sitting in an airplane right now. We are going to talk a little bit about what is going on with Title 44 Reform, just a little background for those of you , a lot has been going on since early May 2017. I want to give you a little highlight. In May 2017 Davida Vance Cook, the director of GPO, testified at the committee on House administration about GPO is an organization and was asked specific questions on Title 44. Throughout the summer the committee on House administration asked GPO a lot of questions and we have replied, we spoke with a lot of information about the workings of GPO , the workings of the FDLP and the Superintendent of documents program. There were a couple of thousands of pages of responses to questions.

>>> In July Davida charged the depository library counsel with providing her with the recommendation for chapter 19 revisions. We also at that particular point in time asked for community feedback on their changes. In that time as well, a lot of the library associations, AA, double L, ALA, was in contact with us at GPO talking about variations and different changes to Title 44 that we were looking for. Until the draft bill of December 11, we had a lot of information coming to us from all over the country. And also some other participants, people that were really not a part of the normal library community, that we were used to receiving information from.

>>> There was a lot of ideas, this slide that Cindy put together, illustrates a collaboration, and intersection of ideas. Each of the groups that gave us ideas provided, so let's go to the next one. So here are some of the things that we got from individuals, organizations, the little checks are the ones that have appeared in the draft that we are going to talk about in a minute or two. The individuals wanted changes in Title 44 dealing with preservation of both tangible and digital, definitely were concerned about free access to public information. That was a critical component of our responses from various people.

>>> Everybody had questions about existing Title 44 and what that meant -- definition of publication was. Concerns that the definition needed to make it clear that it was just not tangible information products but digital information products as well that were part of the FDLP. There were issues of privacy concerns, more digital information to being part of the program as well. There was discussion and suggestions about shared print archives, digital posits, which we talked about many times, more concern about flexibility in regional discard and substitution. And also giving us the GPO grant and gift authority.

>>> From organizations, many of the same themes and topics. A few additional ones. Some were noted to strengthen relationships with federal agencies, to ensure that we had more ability to acquire materials for the program and not just tangible materials. So there was also more interest in repealing the 10,000 book requirement and more interest in digital preservation, of our content and to protect the integrity of the digital content coming from the agencies, new and different categories of libraries for the program.

>>> The little red checkbox once again were things that we have identified that have been covered in the draft legislation. The only one on this list that isn't is item selection, the draft legislation, the proposed legislation doesn't actually address item selections like the current bill does.

>>> There is a typo on the slide. December 11 2017 we were given a copy of a draft of a bill from the committee and House administration. The bill itself has not been introduced. There were three chapters that we were asked to come in on. Stuff that related to chapter 1 that related to the organization and operation of the Government printing office itself. Other authorities and chapter 5 no fee public access to government information. Once we receive that document,, GPO as a whole, sent copies out to the library associations, to the depository councilmembers and to the members of the community to receive their feedback. Here is some of the positive feedback we have received.

>>> There are quite a few slides here so bear with me as I go through some of the highlights. The positive parts, things that we asked for, and the comments we received from the community, the bill did include, the draft bill did include so the right for no fee access to government information, protecting user privacy, it recognized the format not just print and micro fax but talked about digital format. It strengthened the agency's obligations to furnish us with not just tangible materials for the program but digital information dissemination products, that is what IDP are, not individual development plans. And it also talked about digital deposit and digital content. There are some positive things that most of our community had identified as wanting and those things were in the draft bill. It also provides for regionals to opt out of receiving tangible products. It establishes a national collection of products and talks about the lifecycle and responsibilities for maintaining and managing it. It authorizes the cataloguing and indexing for the whole national collection. And it identifies a program to bring more fugitive documents under bibliographic control.

>>> So this lifecycle management responsible is would be obviously acquiring collection, planning, authenticating, cataloging metadata records for them it cereals -- for the materials. Preserving and digitizing if necessary for reformatting purposes.

>>> Here are some additional things that were in the draft bill that we are happy about and we know you're happy about as well. Allows for the regionals to share collections across state boundaries. It gives grant and gift authority, also highlighted the education continuing education program that is the FDLP Academy and recognize that that was important to the community. It provides for the appointment of

advisory committees and recognizes that the current number of regional depository libraries is not really necessary. So it gives us flexibility in the number of regional selection.

>>> There were some minimal requirements for the FDLP, they needed to provide members of the public to know fee access, they had to ensure that the library staff was knowledgeable about the resources in the FDLP collection and how to use online information. And that the personnel, the superintendent of documents regulations and requirements for being a member of the program.

>>> For selective depository libraries the draft talked about access, being able to select these products, these tangible IDP's and it maintained a collection of five years after receipt. Acknowledge the collaboration between regionals, and selective's. And included that there would be no limit on the number of selective depository. For regional depository libraries the draft legislation talked about providing access to the IDP's in tangible form, allowed regionals to decline IDP, divided access to all IDP's regardless of format, coordinated and collaborated with selective's, and also agreed to provide services to selective's. Selective depository library's.

>>> They also provided for options for types of depository libraries. That they may receive electronic digital deposit, or digital deposit content, they also, the depositories are not required to participate in training or continuing education programs. So those were some additional options that they included.

>>> It also made recommendations for the number of depository libraries. There was to be regulations that limit the number of libraries designated as selective. They limited the number of regional depository libraries looking -- located in any state to two. They provided for the designation of at least two regional depository levers and each census region. And each one could be -- could request to be designated as --

>>> They also included the members of Congress recommend libraries were selected and senators recommend libraries for regional designations. So here is just a slide of the census region. If anybody was interested in how that related to the legislation.

>>> Okay, they also anticipated for transition from the old legislation to the new legislation, so prior to 1962 those designated as depositories were not designated specifically as selective or regional. And once this legislation, potentially was impacted that each of those libraries would be grandfathered in and could declare which ones they were. Okay.

>>> Those are some of the positive things that were related to a lot of the comments that you provided. We were really glad to see that they were included.

>>> One clarification question from Beth Harper, regionals will be required to provide access to all IDP's or regional select regardless of format, correct?

>>> And I hold on that question a little bit because I think I need to reread that. So Kelly is going to hold on that question and we will answer that at the end. IQ.

>>> So here is the concerns that we had. Some of the concerns that you have as well. There is two prescriptive types of information, very very detailed information to process oriented, we would have liked to see a lot higher level information and not give us the exact details out, everything was going to

work. From our feeling, there is still no teeth and the draft legislation that make agencies comply with providing us content. That is kind of our problem that we have now.

>>> A lot of the agents -- agencies do not understand that the electronic is considered a part of the program and it doesn't really get us to get those agencies to comply. Sometimes the regulatory process that we know can be very very cumbersome and burdensome and time-consuming and we are concerned that if we have to have any kind of major regulations that things will never get done. Part of the acquisitions piece that we are concerned about as well for bringing fugitives into the program, getting all the digital, it puts too much operational responsibility at the agencies and the agencies right now have a limited personnel, they are more interested in getting things published and their information out there. Sometimes we are not quite sure that we have enough trouble even now getting them to do work with us.

>>> So we are looking for some different, new ideas on how to make that relationship better. There was also, in the draft, that the collections development decisions were to be a joint decision between the agencies and GPO. And we are a little concerned about that. We really feel that the organization should make the decision on what goes in the program. But we are conjointly -- working jointly with agencies for passing information back and forth. We are a little concerned if we ever had to make a decision we would never get a decision made it with an agency. There was no provision for selective depositories to be digital only. Preservation responsibilities for this national collection for digital material is in multiple agencies and that can potentially be problematic. We also need some clarification with, when we talked about a preservation digital designation, we are not quite sure what that meant. There is not a lot of information about that other than facts. There was more collection responsibilities placed on selective depository libraries and selective depositories must retain tangible materials for five years, which there was no provision for substitution and we know that is a really critical thing for selective's.

>>> Also some of our concerns, it kind avoids the ability for regionals to disbarred tangible content. We have the preservation to do a program now which we like and we have had the other legislation or other recommendation from the joint committee so we are working on that.

>>> Education should include the public at large as well since they are direct users. The FDLP Academy and continuing education is not just for the depositories. And depository staff. It does go beyond folks in the depository libraries because we do get people who have interest, the general public, their free webinars, so we wanted to make that clear. The education that the FDLP does through the FDLP Academy is not just for our community, it is out there for everyone.

>>> We did have a concern about, and other chapters, where they had talked about congressional publications and there is a provision in the draft for each Congress to make a decision about the format of their publications. Where that makes some sense if you're publishing brochures or different types of material, yes, they change with different administrations or by the type of publication concerned, we were concerned that long-running series like hearings for instance would change with every Congress. We find that problematic because now we are looking at ways to get automated metadata from different types of materials and the more formulaic the layout of a publication is, the easier it is. So we were concerned about random changes in the styles of publications which means they are not going to be 8 1/2 by 11 anymore, they may be big, huge, small, so we are concerned about that.

>>> There is also, there is some mention of recalls, withdrawals, disposals from digital collections but there is no information in there about PII and some of our other concerns related to maintaining it and withdrawing material from digital collections.

>>> Those are the concerns from the library perspective. We also had some concerns and these concerns did go up just recently, I think we posted it last, this week in the very beginning of the week. GPO as a whole submitted their comments to the committee on House administration for the FDLP and GPO as a whole. We sent that comment out to the community this week through a news alert, we sent it out to the DLP and members of the library associations have also seen copies of the consolidated comments from GPO management.

>>> Those concerns relate to the name change going back to the Government printing office. There is major concern about the outsourcing of congressional printing. One of the things that we are very concerned about is right now, the congressional printing comes into GPO and we are concerned that if the congressional printing is outsourced that it might increase the fugitive problem. It is also, it could potentially increase the ability for us to get and return congressional information in a timely manner. We are also concerned that if it is outsourced some of the data fees of information that we sent up to for instance Congress.gov, there may be holes in that data feed. Data may not get up there as fast as it does now. Those are some of our concerns.

>>> There is also the concern for dismantling the joint committee on printing, I think it calls for two committees to work together. To handle the GPO which could potentially be a problem because when are you going to get consensus? We have had very good response and a working relationship with the JCP over the years, dealing with Title 44 and helping us make changes within the law. To better the program. So we are a little concerned about that.

>>> We are also concerned once again with the interaction between the agencies to get material into the lifecycle process. We really would like a liaison program that we are going to be putting together. We find that a little problematic because the government is so large, because there is so much information, it's just going to be a big burden. Which it all that he is. Decentralizing of agency printing, that brings the issue up of fugitives again. How to go out and make sure we get what is supposed to be in the program. There is a provision for eliminating tangible distribution of the statutes at large for the program. That we identified to the committee.

>>> It also eliminates production of the congressional record index. That is a really critical thing for us because it helps users really get into the congressional record and find unique things within those documents.

>>> Let me tell you a little bit about the next step. Cindy wanted to point out that -- how it relates to what we asked for in the national plan. The joint, the health administration committee was really interested in what was called for in the national plan so they were very aware of what was recommended in the national plan and they took a lot of that into consideration when they did the proposed draft.

>>> The next steps, regardless of where this legislation is drafted or where it goes, there were quite a few things that have come out of this exchange of information, that we are going to pursue. Obviously Cindy all ready talked about the shared regionals, across state lines. We are going to pursue that, we are working now on ideas of how to better interact with the agencies. Whether the legislation goes forward

or not, we learned a lot and there are some things that we feel we can take forward to better the program. I think what is next on the agenda for the bill, the proposed bill, I understand that there are some meetings with the Library Association, there have been some additional meetings with other key stakeholders, I think there is one coming up with the Library of Congress. And we are hearing that there will be potentially a markup in the coming week. So that is where we are in this round since May. A lot of things have gone on, a lot of information exchanged. We thank everyone for providing feedback, questions, working with the committee, providing them in pit, providing our staff with input. Including Andy, Sherman, on the eighth floor, working with the Library Association hearing your comments, hearing your voice. And concerns. So I think that the last slide, so now I can go back to your comments. And questions.

>> Regionals will be required to provide access to all IDP's, or regional selects, regardless of format. Correct?

>>> I'm going to have to go back and check on that because that means potentially that would mean you would have to provide --

>>> I think that is correct but I will go back and check on that. Just to make sure. I don't want to say something that is not correct. That is not in there.

>>> And then you addressed this somewhat, is there any sense of when the bill may go to markup?

>>> I heard it was going next week but then someone also emailed me and said it might be a couple more weeks before markup because they wanted to make sure they had, they are having a meeting with the Library of Congress I believe. And some other potential stakeholders. They wanted to make sure that they heard from everyone.

>>> I think there still is some time to provide comments, letters, questions to the committee on House administration.

>>> Can you give an example of the building too prescriptive?

>>> Bill, I'm going to have to look at some pages but from my mind, hold on Bill, while I'm looking. I think one that I'm thinking of, Bill, is the part about the F DLP Academy. They kind of call that out and while we are interested in them calling out you know the need to allow us to provide continuing education, we would have wanted them to be more general. They didn't have to go specifically to that one. They just should have in there, that we should administer the program as we see fit including marketing, education, training, those kinds of things. I think that was one of the examples were they really got down to a very very specific detail where we would have hoped they would've just given us overall ability to operate the organization. That was one of them. Oh yes, thank you Lisa, I knew there was something in there.

>>> There is something in one of the pages that talks about the agency has one year to -- after the publishing of this or enacting, assigning of the bill to provide us a list of all their publications. Oh my gosh, all of their publications. That was one of the things that got really into the details that I'm thinking, I don't want that in legislation because can you imagine, that is from the beginning of when the agency started. So I don't want to list from the beginning of the agency, I don't want that to be in law. [ laughter ] does that answer your question bill? That is one of the examples. Okay a comment about regional numbers and census areas being that there is only a minimum of eight regional libraries?

>>> I would have to count. I have to go back and compare and actually count that. I will hold on to that question.

>>> This is Ashley, you're talking about the census areas, were you referring to regional discard?

>>>, No, and the legislation it actually says, let me see if I can find it. I didn't bring my copy here and I don't have it all marked up but it does talk about regional and it does allow for the prostate boundaries and then it does mention the census. I think there is a calculation that regionals would become, we don't need as many regionals but the number eight is, I can't without going back to the legislation. It allows us not to have so many as we do now. And I'm not sure if they have set a floor. I think you are asking if the floor is eight. I would have to go back in, Robin is looking but I don't have my actual copy of the legislation. So that was Carmen? I'll get back to you Carmen on that one.

>>> She said yes that is what she meant.

>>> It's another example of too much details here, the locator services.

>>> Yes, right. There is a bunch of stuff, on page 91 line 15, they talk about locator services and we have asked them to change that to discovery services. So that was another one.

>>> Any other questions?

>>> Thank you Dan I don't have 97 with me but I will go look at 97. Yes.

>>> There is a question about what the IDP FM is for again.

>>> The IDP is not individual development plan, some of us to have children and asked actually all federal employees have an individual development plan. This is information dissemination product. That includes, it's not defined, it can be tangible or electronic or micro facsimile, it is information dissemination product yes.

>>> Okay, any other questions? I guess one question that I would have even for the group, we are monitoring, we are submitting requests for any clarification on questions. We are sharing information that we are giving to the committee and now I think it is a wait and see game. Waiting for the committee to mark up and get the bill actually numbered and printed. So that is where we are. In the interim, like we say, we are still going forward with reaching out to the agencies. We do have some budget set aside to potentially do some work with the I MLS. To talk about options if GPO is given grant authority. We have had some phone conversations with staff.

>>> We are -- the regional prostate boundaries, we are looking at that and preparing that and potentially could take that up to JCP or other organizations to get approval to do that if this legislation, it takes time to go anywhere. So I think that is what we are doing in the next couple of months, a little bit of a waiting game. And being prepared. Somebody is asking me, Lori will you be at ALA midwinter, I know the possible shutdown is affecting everyone in different ways and no, unfortunately we will not. Cindy is the only one that is on her way. We decided yesterday that at the last minute, since we don't know if we are shutting down tonight, we have people sitting at airports waiting to return, stranded in Cleveland. I'm sorry, Cleveland. Or Chicago. That we would not be participating or not be traveling.

Because we would have to just turn back around if the government was shutdown. We have offered the option though, to go to others next week to do another webinar. To talk with the committee and address some of the other issues. We have posted the ALA handout that we were going to head out.

>>> But it is just unfortunate, this has happened to us too many times and we have decided that it just is too stressful for all of us to have to return or travel and come back.

>>> Thank you Sherry, we will. Are there any other questions? About the topic? What we have discussed today? Page 14? Okay page 14. One of the questions coming up, are you satisfied with how the draft bill handles digital preservation? I guess my first response to that is I am glad they have identified that it is critical, even identifying preservation as a topic in the draft reservation is a first step in the right direction. I think digital preservation is kind of a new, it's not new, but it is an evolving science or evolving area. So I am glad that they have put something in the bill.

>>> We didn't have a session today with Jessica our digital preservation library and to talk about the digital repository audit which is now underway. But we are glad that they have addressed and brought the issue into the legislation. Is it exactly what we wanted?

>>> There will be additional information on the audit posted@tran13.gov.

>>> More information is coming on FDLP.gov on the digital repository audit, there is a project page that will go out shortly. Hopefully that addressed the question. It may not be everything we wanted but sometimes we don't want all the details. We will make the decisions based on our expertise. Okay. Thanks everyone, for being available. We hope to be in the office tomorrow. [ laughter ]

>>> If you have any additional questions, I hope, we will get this posted. If we are here. [ laughter ] if we don't, it will be done as soon as we are back in the office. And thank you, and if you do have any additional information, or questions, let us know. Good to be talking to all of you.

>>> [ Event Concluded ]