

Proposed Legislative Changes for the FDLP - Transcript

Please stand by for realtime captions.

Hey. Hello, everyone. Glad you are joining us today. We have probably about six or seven minutes before we get under way. Thanks for spending some time with us today.

Good morning to some of you and good afternoon to the others of you who are joining us today through the FDLP Academy. The topic of the webinar today is the proposed legislative changes to chapter 19 of title 44. And we are going to cover that cover the depository library program, the cataloging and indexing and GPO's system of online access. Today I'm sharing the stage with my colleague Cindy Etkin who is the senior programming planning special list. I'm Laurie Hall. I'm the superintendent of documents and the managing director of library services and content management. Just a little background. We are, of course, recording this for future use. So if you have to leave the webinar room to go take care of a reference question or take care of a child or a cat or animal, please feel free to do so, so you can always go back and preview the presentation and see the presentation and the chat later. So when Cindy and I started talking about putting this webinar together, we decided in the audience there would be folks that are brand new to the program. The FDLP program and who may not know the background of the legislative process and the potential changes that have been going on for many, many years. And we knew there would be a few of you in the audience that have been with us for as many years as I have and Cindy have, and have very, very in-depth knowledge of all the different proposals and legislative changes that the community has tried over the years to update title 44. So we are going to try to give you a little background for those of you who don't know a lot about it. And we will take you up to where we are today. And then we will take question and Apps. Okay. So let's talk a little bit about the background. The last major change to chapter 19 which covers the FDLP and the cataloging and indexing program was done in 1962. Wow, that is a long time ago. And over the years there has been a wide variety of legislation proposed throughout, from different committees on the hill, from our administrative oversight committee, the joint committee on printing, Senate rules and House administration. And Cindy and I added a few of those here that addressed some of the issues that a lot of folks have known about for many, many years because there has been an acknowledged need that we need to change some of the legislation that guides not only the federal depository library program and GPO. So you can see some of the proposed legislation. Some of it never went anywhere. Number two was the information access enhancement act of 1993. Better known as GPO access, FD cyst, and Gov info. There was other bits of legislation in 1998. Some folks, Cindy says she was involved in that effort. And also the most recent effort the FDLP Modernization Act of 2018 which I was involved in and many of you were involved in which unfortunately did not go anywhere either but it was a really good process. And during all of those processes and all of that time, you know, there has been active participation from all of the community, community members at the time, the library associations, the members of the depository library council at time. As we have gone through since 1962; there has been a wide variety of community input to make those changes. Or propose those changes to the Federal Depository Library Program. What has been happening since '62 and we don't have legislative changes, how do we get things done? So I thought I would talk a little bit about that. If the legislation doesn't change, how do we manage to move forward and make the necessary changes to running the program? And we've done those through administrative changes, when we need something changed for those of you who remember the monthly catalog and paper, when we wanted to go to an online catalog which is now the catalog of U.S. Government publications, we ask the for an administrative change. We got permission and went to the hill or oversight committees and pleaded our case and got administrative

change to allow us to do the move from the printed MOCAT to the online Government of publications. And we do that through our oversight committee. We asked for waivers, we asked for policy changes. Just like the recent regional discard policy change. We asked for that, and that was approved. And we also go to them over theirs for new things when we ask for a budget request. So a lot of times those budget requests may be a system's modernization effort. It may be we're asking for funding to do some pilot projects. That is how we started our digitization effort. Because obviously that is not in title 44. We asked for money to do a pilot to test it out. And that is how we introduced new changes and things we wanted in the program so we are not so far behind and keep the program moving forward in the digital age. So you know, we've done a lot of different things. We've had partnerships because we don't have gift authority which allows us to work with other people who do have the ability to do things that we may not have the ability to do. And a lot of this over the years is bailed on also the interpretation of title 44, the legislative history. What our general council interprets in title 44 or the hill staffers and members of Congress and oversight committees how they interpret what is in title 44. So a wide variety of things be we have different things in our tool box which allow us to make changes based on what the community wants, what we think we need for the administration, the program, et cetera. The biggest problem of moving forward without legislative change is that, any of these things, these administrative changes, these waivers, are buried in memos. Things that are not attached to legislation. So that anybody looking at the legislation does not know about these waivers or memos. We do, the JCP and the members of the committee know about the memos. But they are not out there for general, it's not consolidated. So anybody picking up Title 44 doesn't know about these other administrative changes and waivers and policy decisions that are not in the law. So that can cause some issues, and that is one of the big reasons we would really like to have changes to Title 44.

So the most recent foray into changing legislation was the FDLP Modernization Agent of 2018. As we all fondly know, it's 5305. It was referred from the Committee on House Administration. But unfortunately it died in the committee at the end of the 115th Congress. But just in that effort, once again, we had the community provide input to house administration. We had hearings and staff meetings. We had sharing of information. The Depository Library Council and GPO provided comments to the house administration committee on legislation. We were active and we hoped that would move forward. Unfortunately it didn't. It gave us a really good introduction again to what we were looking for. A lot of things have changed since 1998. So when the last bill was introduced, I think that is what was on the slide. It really put us closer to what our environment was and is right now in the digital age. So we were glad that, that got us back on the trail to proposing some new legislation. Okay. So what has happened in the 116th congress? So this is 2019. So the 5305 did not pass. But now all of a sudden the senate committee on rules and administration, they also are interested in our suggested changes to Title 44. The house committee saw our suggested changes that came out, and then the senate rules committee is also interested in what we want GPO wants, what the community wants to amend and change Title 44. So we also during 2019 we had new members of the Depository Library Council. And we had a brand new director. So that does make a difference. So in December of 2019, our strategy was we were asked to provide some proposals up to the hill. And our strategies were based on what we had done before. We did not want to do a total overhaul. We thought we wanted some little wins, which we did. And we wanted to make sure that we talked about the national collection. We wanted to make sure we changed some of the definitions of publications so it would be format neutral. And more flexibility for you and your library. You know the digital only option we had new regionals across state boundaries. And we wanted to have GPO assisting with the disposition of these collections and remind people about the academy returning education and training for all of the staff that are serving public and serving communities with Government information. So that was our strategy based on our previous work with 5305.

So what happened in the 116th Congress in 2020, once again we have, we hear from the committees that are our oversight committees they are interested in our thoughts and changes. There is now new members of the Depository Library Council. And now Mr. Halprun came last December, 2019. As a last director, he saw our original proposals and said I really want to take a look at these. I'm not going to, I want to have a chance as the new director to really dig into what the FDLP proposals are. So he wanted to look at a more comprehensive strategy for change once he was the leader of GPO. So we took those proposals that we were looking at in December of 2019, stepped back a little bit. He came in and looked at them again, made a lot of suggestions and changes. And then we submitted our proposals to both of the committees, that's the house administrative committee and the senate rules committee in July of 2020. And then in October of 2020 and December, we had meetings with committee staff to talk about the proposals that we had put forward and these proposals had been revised by Mr. Halpren as well. He got a chance to take a look at the proposals that we were thinking about and put his comments in and recommendations on legislative action and legislative changes. So the proposals that are now up with the committees, I'm going to give you a general over view. For the FDLP cataloging and indexing, we added some new sections where we put a purpose. What is the purpose of the program? Purpose of the cataloging and access service. We talked about the national collection. We revised seven sections. And actually this is the first time that GPO has provided actually draft legislative proposals. In 5305, we were asked for comments but we were not actually involved in drafting the language. We gave our suggestions and we were interviewed and asked for comments. But in this case we've actually taken and done legislative mark up change changes in our proposal. So that is a first. That is a little bit of the background where we are. And Cindy will talk from here about, in detail, about the proposal. So Cindy, take it over.

Thanks, Laurie. And I have dialed in by phone so I hope you can all hear me okay. If someone can give me a thumbs up on that I will go ahead and continue.

I can hear you, Cindy.

Okay, terrific then. So as we were drafting the proposed language, we had a lot of things on our mind. Particularly 5305, the FDLP Modernization Act that Laurie mentioned before. And there were a lot of good things in that. A lot of people supported it. GPO supported it. But there were some things if we had our brothers, we would not have worded it a particular way or wouldn't vin colluded certain things. While we had the major concepts in mind, we didn't go back and lift language from 5305. We had in mind all the comments that we received from Depository Library Council, the library community, the library associations and organizations provided feedback as well. And we had to consider the needs of GPO to administer and move forward the public information programs with the superintendent of documents. So things have changed a little bit certainly since 1962. But even since 5305 was introduced in 2018. But we did keep all of that in mind as we were looking forward. And I've shown this slide before, but it's a really good one. Here's the priorities from the input that we got back in 2017-2018. From individuals from organizations. And you've got GPO's priorities there. These lists are not in priority order. It's how I put them on there. But there is a lot of, a lot of cohesiveness there. A lot of agreement on what the priorities should be. A lot of have con sepsis. Which we were really glad to see. And it shows it a little bit better for those that are visual like me. So a lot of consensus. We really thought we were on the right track by going back and looking at these. And so we started. And Laurie mentioned that we wanted to do little wins. And so at that point in 2019, we were looking at our top priorities being a definition that included digital content, included tangible content, format neutral as Laurie mentioned. We added a definition in 1901 and added quite a few definitions. If you look at title 44 now. There is one

definition in that for Government publication. But we added information life cycle management. We added permit public access. And using the term public information which means as we wrote it, federal Government publications, information resource regardless of physical formal medium, compiled by Government employees or Government expense by an agency or a contractor thereof or educational value. So that gets in our first priority is to get electronic content mentioned in our statutory language.

Cindy, I'm sorry to bother you, there seems to be a lag in the slides with some of the attendees. Folks, at this point you should see digital only depository libraries on your screen. If you are not seeing that, please let us know in the chat.

Okay, do you want me to hold up, Kelly? Or go on?

It's about half of everyone is and half of everyone is not. Why don't I reload the slides and see if that cures this for everyone. Sorry, folks. Just give us one minute.

Okay, we will take a pause for refreshments.

Okay, I've reloaded the slides. Cindy, I'm giving you back the controls. From what I gathered in the chat, folks were not seeing those on slide ten, those --

This?

Yeah. That was the start of it, it seemed.

Okay. So let me just back up. And you all also have a link to the recording. And can get the slides on a PDF file as well. But this just goes to show the thinking of the thoughts of the individuals that provided us comments, the organizations, as well as what GPO's had in mind for our priorities. What we needed to do to administer the program.

Okay.

And this shows it visually. With the blue being depository library council, the red from community, and green from GPO as we responded to the committee on house administration and the questions for the record asked one of the hearings they had on Title 44 revision. Okay. Back to definitions. Again, information life cycle management, permanent public access, public information. There is quite a few definitions that we add. But the highest priority at the beginning of our drafting was getting a definition that included format neutral and the very real need to include, make sure that digital content was included. Okay. The other priorities was to take a look at section 1909 in Title 44. This is where there was the 10,000 book requirement. This is where there was or is the authority for firsthand investigation. Our inspection program. And we wanted to make some changes to this. We didn't think that 10,000 books was a very good way to determine sustainability for becoming a depository library program or library. So we were looking at other base to do it. We wanted to get rid of that 10,000 volume thing. And it was also a way to tweak language to allow for digital only depository library. The first line. Only a library able to provide access to, custody of, and services for deposited tangible materials or access to and services for online digital content. So just tweaking a little bit of language we got in there digital only depository libraries. We also changed in this section although it's a little bit further down. We got rid of the firsthand investigations and we added consultation and training. Training is very important to us. It's very important to you. And it was nowhere in Title 44 at this point. So that was a priority as well

we mentioned from the earlier slide. I want to point out that second highlighted line, looking at the sustainability for housing depository collections and for providing access services. This is prior to designation that the superintendent of couples will make visits to depository libraries. Or someone acting for the superintendent of document. The sustainability by look at and visiting and talking with folks there. And I wanted to highlight that because, excuse me. And you will see later that this shows up in a comment from the depository library council when they reviewed this. One of the comments, they didn't think this was quite strong enough for only depository libraries only.

Laurie mentioned the flexibility for libraries, in particularly for regionals. And wanting to share collections across state boundaries. This is all in section 1912. This is also where we inserted GPO into the process of discarding materials so that we could be in a position to get materials for digitization. Where we could help with the disperse of those materials. If they needed copies in better condition, allow regionals to fill in gaps, et cetera, et cetera. It goes a little bit further than what is sometimes happening within the states. And this is all to build the national collection. So here you see in section C regional depository library different states may share the responsibilities by entering into agreements. So that is in 1912. One of the priorities. And I want to highlight this other statement here, in accordance with Superintendent of documents policy. We've used this in several languages. That kind of phraseology because this will provide us flexibility down the road. We don't want to have to wait another 50-60 years for legislative change if it happens. And this is one way that we can make changes internally and not have to go through a legislative process. It's much easier for us to change a policy than it is to change a statue. So you will see that kind of language in several places throughout the document. And we do have a section in there for the national correction and I didn't print any of the actual content of that section. It's quite lengthy. But one of the things that I will share with you is that the national collection is one of those sections that Laurie mentioned. And in our package, it's section 1918. And the national collection consists of the distributed collections in depository library for tangible materials. And it also includes digital content and in our scenario we have brought chapter 41 into chapter 19. So that the system of online access we know got in something now is part of the national collection. Which is big. So we have the national collection. We've got the digital component. And of course we have depository library collections for tangible. And we have some partners that are also hosting digital content for the national collection. So if you look at there is a table here and I went through it section by section with a very brief explanation of what kind of change we wanted to make in those sections. This is something we shared out in the fall. So you may have already seen it. Laurie mentioned the new section on the purpose. Not all sections in title 44 or any U.S. code title have a purpose. And if you look at the drafting manual for legislation, they prefer you not have a purpose section. When we thought it was really important in our case to have one. Because we have a complex system. A lot of players we have a lot of the agencies with different branches of Government. We are serving libraries and libraries have needs. And this is all for the greater good of access to Government information with a lot of moving parts in here. We wanted to make sure that people understood that. And we wanted to get in that purpose that it's the public's right to free equitable access. And that is what we are all about is providing access. And then it also establishes the public information programs that together function to identify, acquire, catalog preserve, reemanate, and reformat, and provide no fee for public access to the body of federal public information for future generations. So having a statement like this with the different functions allows us to do those things without necessarily having a complete section about it. It gives us some more flexibility. So that if we build up our preservation program, for example, and we can do that. It says in here to reformat. And so have the information available for future generations. En that is preservation. When you look at the life cycle management definition, has a lot of different functions including preservation. So we're giving ourselves the authority through definitions and through statements like this that are allowing us flexibility to build what we need and to be able to do what we

need to do to meet our goals. And our mission and our vision. 1901 is the definition. 1902. This is about agencies providing us lists. And you know the list thing is really per scriptive. Let me replace that with more general language. 1905 we added the ability for delegates to congress to designate depository libraries. And provided a role fo the Superintendent of Documents in the designation process.

Okay. Is everybody on slide 16? The continuation of the table? Are we good now? Okay.

Yes.

Okay. Good. 1907 we revised that. To offer materials to GPO's. That provision in title 44 now says that the federal agencies have to offer their materials to NARA and to the library of congress. NARA is not going to be accepting tangible materials for much longer. And so this is an opportunity again for us to get into a loop that will allow us to add more materials to the national collection. Either share them on exchange or in a manner so the library can pick up the material and providing tangible copies for us to digitize and adjust more content. 1909 we already talked about the 10,000 book thing is gone. 1911 this is allowing regional and states not served by our regional to discard in accordance with Superintendent of Documents policy and guidance. So this is one of the places we use that phrase. Allowing libraries to do something they previously couldn't do. But without getting real down into the nitty, gritty details of how we are going to do it. We are going to rely on guidance and policy. The how can often change more frequently. Again, this is one of the things that can bring flexibility to the program through this kind of language. 1912 of course is regional information is. And allowing the regionals across state boundaries to share collections and again putting GPO into the disposition process. And then we come to the two new sections. 1917 is the cataloging and access services. And so this is what a was in chapter 17, section 1710 and 1711. Cataloging and indexing program. Repeal those. Bring it in so that it's part of the public information program of the Superintendent of Documents. But putting all of that stuff together under chapter 19 and bringing it all together. And 18 again is the new section for the National Collection.

So if you take a look at H.R. 5305 we had it in mind as we were drafting this. There is some things, not everything, of course, but some of the major things that are in 5305 that we did not include. There is a section in there about at Superintendent of Documents and the employees and information on wages during weekends and holidays and that stuff doesn't belong in a chapter on Depository Libraries. Employee kind of stuff is in other parts of Title 44. They had a regulatory process for the program in 5305. Which was really pretty stringent. And for every new policy, we would have to go through the regulatory process that you see executive branch agencies go through in using the federal register, getting comments, and all of that. So it's putting a legislative branch agency into an executive branch process. And again, this is one of those things that we didn't particularly like, but at 5305 we would have done it. When cost estimates were made, this particular provision would have cost about almost \$2 million over five years. And it would have the -- and that included two full-time employees which of course the cost of those employees would go beyond the five years. So this is one of the things that the Congressional Budget Office didn't like. Because they look for revenue neutral things. We thought that kind of odd because we had regionals and selective libraries today that are taking care of preservation services in their library. We didn't necessarily see the need for a separate kind of designation. So we did not include that in what we sent up. There was a very prescriptive and laborious notification process for agencies and GPO. Because a part of this was also going back to the regulatory process and putting notifications in, in the federal register. And we were thinking that if agencies are not complying with what we have now, it would be even more problematic to see than try to comply with all of these provisions that had tight deadlines and again very, very laborious. And one thing we learned from the

study that we did was the federal research division of the library of congress a couple years ago that agencies would be glad to provide us with information about their content. But it would have to be easy and it would have to be something that they could do, in the only easily, but without new staff. And so this very prescriptive laborious notification process wasn't it. So we made it a little bit more general. And also had a provision that the Superintendent of Documents with named agency official determine the best method for cataloging and providing public access to information dissemination products. This is our program. This is what we do. And I'm not sure that we really need consultation on the best method to catalog. We have world class catalogers at GPO. That is not to say if they have that data, they can provide it to us. But we shall in consultation -- and I'm not sure folks and agencies would want to spend the time consulting on this as they see as our responsibility as well. So in 5305 is full of a lot of details and a lot of language. But on the big things, on the big things there was still a lot of consensus incorporated into what we provided. The national collection, the flexibility for the region. And the digital content. All of that is in what was provided in our summary, our little snippets of language to the committee. Let's get into what the depository library council said to us. They looked at this and they reviewed it. And this is a general over all statement that they made in the beginning of what they transmitted to us. . Listically these proposed changes show a promising direction towards more flexibility for deMissouri tour libraries a modernized understanding of publishing practices. We thank council for this particular statement. I think it tells us we are going in the right direction and that they provide support for what we are doing. That is not to say they didn't question some things. And they rightfully did so. So looking that same table, by the section by section of extracted comments that we received from the depository library council. they liked the new section on the purpose. They recommended in section 1901 in one of the definitions we have in there was fugitive document. They wanted to recommend the discontinuation of the term fugitive. And we have since been looking at that particular issue and have changed that. But our language went up to the hill in July. So it's not reflected in what we sent up. 1902 reflects a wider scope of the FDLP ensuring the Superintendents of Documents is dually notified of digital content. Again this is the phrase that I pointed out on an earlier slide. Housing and depository selection is where they don't think there is enough focus on digital only or mostly digital depository. And the phrase did go on a little bit. But they rightfully question it and I think we could have been stronger in that language. 1907, they like the language from publications to public information. Reflecting of a wider variety of format. 1911 approves of proposed changes. 12 they want to keep the previous worrying about the disposition process. The 17 they would have liked to have seen language that indicated the cataloging services and thes at log of U.S. Government and publications can be offered free of charge. And they like the idea of the national collection. that is coming from our depository council. So where are we now? In 2021, it's a new year, a new Congress so we really don't know where we are. There was an election of course. You all know about in November. There was some retirements in the house. Retirements in the senate. People won elections, people lost elections. Committees are still in the process of being sworn. People intend to move around on different committees. Particularly if it's a chance to go to a committee of a different topic that they might be interested or what have you. So right now we really don't know where we are with our oversight committee and senate rules or the house administration. When we look at the house, clerk of the house website does have Zoe Lofgren as chair and Rodney Davis as ranking member. Everything else is vacant, vacant, vacant. So we don't know who will be assigned to those committees. Again membership may change. Not only the membership, but the staff we work most directly with through our legislative affairs office. They may be changing. They work for a particular member of congress. And if that person moves to a different committee, they may very well move with them. And yet, we remain hopeful. We remain hopeful. It hasn't been 20 years since the last time this was introduced. It was only last 2018. So we are getting closer in the years between. But we remain hopeful. And if nothing happens, Laurie talked about the different ways that we can keep moving forward and even though it may not be

reflected in our statutory language, we may have other Avenues that we can take to try and make happen what we need to make happen to better serve depository libraries and so meet our mission and vision of being able to provide Government information when and where it's needed. So I want to share this with you. It's a brand new web page that is up now. And it is tracking, beginning to track what we are doing in this latest effort for revisions. There was a page up there with 5305 and all of that content, there is lots of stuff there. Lots of stuff of what is going on. There is hearing, testimonies, webinars and presentations, and feedback and all of that was there. And it's still there. It's on the same page. And further down on this particular page, there is a link to this page so you can get to all of that background, all the information about 5305 and that particular process. And that page will also link, also does link that to this newer page. So on this page, you will find the package of our proposed language that we sent up to the hill. To the committee on house administration and the senate rules committee. There is a summary that I shared with you here. That is also shared back in the fall. That is there. And we also have posted the document with the feedback from the depository library council that they provided us. Just a couple weeks ago. Now you saw from one of the Laurie's slides that we met with the members of the House Administration and Senate staffers. In that first meeting we had to tell them why we want to change and justify what we wanted to do. And we mentioned we had priorities. And that the basis of them was from all of the feedback that we have provided, gotten from the depository library association and from others. And emergency admittedly that was a couple two or three years old now. And so they thought it would be a good idea if we got more feedback. So we have council feedback. And so we are still listing feedback from the Depository Library community or anybody that wants to provide us their thoughts on this particular issue. So also on this page, and you probably can't see it. It says GPO welcomes your thoughts. You may submit them using a form. And it will go to a form. There is a question about what do you like most? What do you like least? Is there something that you expected that we would have provided that wasn't there. And a big old empty box that you can put anything in there that you want. Your thoughts about the direction. Thoughts about pieces of legislation that you would like to see anything you have that will help us in this effort to inform how we move forward and how we can possibly change, revise what we have done so that we can better meet your needs based on what we hear from you. And there is going to be an announcement going out later about this. About the feedback thing as well. This page you can get to it through the FDL -- [FDLP.gov/projects](https://www.fdlp.gov/projects) page. And with that we will open it up to questions. And Laurie and I will try to answer them.

Thanks, Cindy. I just put a few things in the chat just because the timeline was getting a little muddy. The proposals that Cindy mentioned that went up in July of 2020, the Depository Library comments that we just received in January 2021 were based on review of those July proposals. So all of that information is just like Cindy said, on the new web page we are getting ready to put up. But I wanted to give a quick little timeline. Things go by fast and I just wanted to remind everybody what that sequence was. So any questions?

Let me catch you up on some of the chat while you were guys were presenting. James Jacob says the things I'm most interested in strengthening are rewording the fugitive, expanding the FDLP scope, and strengthening the wording about executive agent sills working with GPO to build the national collection.

Thanks, James.

Amy Quincys I agree, James, but I want permanent public access enshrined in law.

Permanent public access is one of those definitions that we added.

James also suggested the GPO meet with OMB executive agencies CIO's and webmasters to brainstorm ways to get more executive info into the national collection.

James, are you going to put all of this in the form too?

Yeah, I think just to remind everybody the DLC committee gave a feedback to me and Mr. Halpre next about the replacement of the word fugitive and that just came in the last couple of weeks. So that was not included in our July proposal.

Sherry Laster would like you to speak to grant and gift authority and why these are not included in GPO's proposal. Was this the same thinking as the regulatory proposal

Yeah, I can address that. In 5305, the grant authority was way too expensive. It impacted the revenue neutral intent that the congressional budget office didn't like. Plus it's also we've never done grants and it was one of the same issues of having, we don't have that ability. We would have to hire a lot of staff who lots of education is just not something we've ever done before. So it was the same kind of issue but that is one of those things that is on the table that we're willing to, we would like to have gift authority. So that is one of those topics that once we get a better sense of what the staff thinks can go through during this administration that we would likely propose at least the gift authority part of it.

And what we shared with you is just the language that went up related to the federal depository library programming cataloging and indexing and system of online access. There were some other things from GPO that went up that were administrative kind of things. And gift authority was included in that part of the proposal. So let me just share also that what we worked up was not drafted like a bill. It was kind of as our legislative affairs office kind of describes it as a pick list. You know. You go back to that strategy where we said we wanted little wins. And then it grew because we wanted to be more comprehensive. But it still may be that the committee doesn't want to do all of this at one time. So here's what they have to choose from all of these different language stuff. And we hope they choose a lot of it. All of it. But who knows. Where was I going with this? I forget.

I think you were going with it, at least I think, Cindy, we gave them our wish list. This is a whole new group up on the hill. They are just now getting together. Their legislative priorities, we don't know what they are. We prepared the proposals that went do different staffers. Different members. So we're not sure how it will be received by this new group of people. We are willing to propose new things and different things. And explain and justify our case. But we just don't know yet how it will be received.

Right. So as we are talking about little wins to begin with back in 2019, we were talking about just the infections I highlighted. 1901, 1909, 1912 and the national collection being a new section. And as we looked more and with the leadership of director Halpren. We got an e-mail, do you want to add more? We can add more? So we added more. So this is ultimately went up. I saw a question in the chat, excuse me. Did some sections go away? Let me see.

1903, 04, 06, 08, 10, 13, and 16.

Oh, thanks. And you know, I'm at home, but I still have my Title 44. No, if it didn't say repeal on our thing, it's still there. And one of the areas that we did not touch, and this is a difference between 5305 and what we submitted and didn't submit in this case. 5305 got rid of all of the different by law

designations. We didn't do anything with those. We think those are important designations that can be made. We didn't do anything with those. Those are still in there, Bill.

Bill would also like to know, what is the intent or meaning of the following wording in section 1917. Engage in activities that enhance access to and awareness of Government and public information.

Thanks for that question, bill. That's kind of one of those things that will give us flexibility. All of the marketing efforts that we do and the promotional materials that we provide, none of that is written in title 44. Those are the kind of things that would absolutely be something that we would want to continue to do and provide those materials to you all so you can share all the information about your depository operation. Anything that may come along in the future. Again, we don't want to wait 50-60 years to go through legislative changes. We are also looking for ways that could provide us flexibility in the future.

Yeah, I think that is one of those definite things. Because we like to reach out to Cindy does now to the civics renewal network. And other places for us to be able to promote Government information with Ben's guide and other associations that are not routinely in the FDL community and there is no place for that in title 44 now. So we've had our legislative group upstairs, our various general councils question our buying promotional material for you. Even some of the education things that we were doing because if you are strictly interpreting title 44, it's not in there. But we think that is really, really important to have an educational component. Have a promotional component. Have an ability to go outside of the FDL community and promote Government information. So I think that is a critical piece for us.

Another example of that kind of activity, Bill is when folks are on the road visiting libraries. If there is a library in the area and there is a vacancy for the depository designation in there, we might want to drop in and visit library and talk to them. A library that isn't currently in the program but we would be extending time. So staff resources of visiting them. Doing a little promotion.

Recruiting.

We have a question from Kathryn. Fugitive was removed. Was alternate language used? Or otherwise provide access to and preserve them.

No, that language is still in what we sent up to the hill. I think what is actually being objected to is not the fact that we want to collect fugitive documents, but the fact that we are calling them fugitive documents. And that is something that we have since been looking at internally in the library services and content management. And we do have an alternate term we would like to use. But it's not in what we sent forward because that was back in July. So the whole effort to collect those kinds of materials whatever they be named is still there. As it was in 5305.

Yeah, we've heard that.

We definitely have heard that. But in general from our perspective we want to, we want to make sure that our resources, materials are not thrown away. Some of you regionals are very, very good regionals. You are very conscience and do your due diligence. But we have some regionals over the years that lose really good staff, have major changes in their institutions that impact their ability to do some things. And we just want to make sure for the purposes of the national collection that materials are either, as Cindy

pointed out, we are either given to GPO to digitize or other partners to digitize. preservation stewards. Make sure they have good quality copies of historic materials that they are looking. We want to make sure that we're not stalling up the process. We are there to help libraries do that disposition so that, that national collection materials are not lost. And that is our intention to be part of the process if we are needed. So that is that part of that.

Yeah, let me give you some specific language that is used. And the language that in the disposition of Government publication from depository libraries in the area certify them. libraries designated as regional depository in coordination with the cup of documents on the disposition. So we want to work with and coordinate with, not take over.

We are running over on time but there is, we are going to wrap up all the comments that everyone put in this chat. And I will make sure that Laurie and Cindy have those. What about publications or information products that have been declassified by an agency?

Bill, I can't remember if we specifically mentioned those or not. But they would certainly come in under scope. They would be included under scope. But the question comes the notification of the declassification. So that was something we could improve upon in that area. Bill, thanks for raising that. And for those of you who have more questions, fill out the form and ask your questions in that big empty box. You know put comments or your questions and we will take the questions from there and work with them and provide answers as well.

Yeah, and thanks, everyone too. Because this is obviously an on going thing. We'll have more information once I do believe some of the folks at GPO are meeting today or tomorrow. The first meeting actually I think was today at 4:00 with the staffers on house admin. So we will definitely have more to share once we meet the new staffers and the new folks in charge at our oversight committees. And we may have additional information to share at the April meeting. Cindy is going to once you provide us all of your information on your little survey, we will consolidate that, read all the comments and provide that information back to the DLC and the community. So please provide us with your comments. We know the committee members in the December meeting really want more recent feedback. Wanted to be sure that our proposals were out there for you to make comments on. So more to come on this.

Yes, thank you all for your interest in this. It's important to us. And I'm glad it's important enough for you all to join us today. And please strongly encourage you to fill out the little survey and provide your feedback, ask your questions so we know what you all need. Thanks again, everybody.

Talk to your counsel members too. E-mail your counsel members and let them know.

Yep. Thanks, everyone. See you next time.

Take care, everyone. [Event Concluded]